5

Exclusion, Avoidance, and Social Distancing

Mikki Hebl, Juan M. Madera, and Eden King

> In the end antiblack, antifemale, and all forms of discrimination are equivalent to the same thing—antihumanism.
>
> Shirley Chisholm

Despite increases in the representation of men and women from diverse backgrounds in the contemporary American workforce, resistance to such diversity persists. Historically, this resistance has taken the form of overtly negative behaviors and explicit discrimination (e.g., refusal to hire or promote an individual on the basis of group membership). However, more recently, resistance to diversity in organizational contexts has taken a more subtle form involving more covert and interpersonal behaviors (e.g., increased interpersonal distance, decreased eye contact). Thus, resistance to diversity and its manifestation is a problem that has primarily changed from overt and obvious manifestations to more subtle and more complex forms (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Hebl, Foster, Mannix, & Dovidio, 2002).

The purpose of this chapter is to highlight the different ways in which diversity resistance is manifested in interpersonal exclusion, avoidance, and social distancing. We focus on the manifestations, consequences, and strategies for the remediation of discrimination in the context of the workplace. First, we briefly describe the manifestations of discrimination, particularly focusing on interpersonal discrimination. Second, we describe the potential consequences of this form of workplace discrimination for both individuals and

organizations. Third, we outline the various strategies that both individuals and organizations may carry out to remediate discrimination in the workplace. Fourth and lastly, we discuss implications and conclusions.

Manifestations of Discrimination in the Workplace

Discrimination in the workplace recently has been conceptualized as taking two forms, *formal discrimination* and *interpersonal discrimination* (Hebl et al., 2002). Formal discrimination involves behaviors that are illegal, overt, and obvious, and include examples such as excluding individuals from employment, advancement, resources, access, or other opportunities. Such examples often provide the basis for high profile organizational discrimination cases. For instance, a former CEO of Shoney's restaurants discriminated against Black individuals by refusing to hire them for visible positions (e.g., waiters, hosts), instead placing them in low-paying, noncustomer contact positions (cooks; Watkins, 1993). Formal discrimination is similar to what other researchers have referred to as explicit forms of discrimination (Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002), which often involve conscious or overt intentions to discriminate.

Quite differently, interpersonal discrimination involves the display of behaviors that are legal, more subtle, and often nonverbal in nature. For example, individuals might choose to maintain increased social distance from, reduce interaction times with, or smile less often at stigmatized targets. It is important to note that interpersonal discrimination is sometimes verbal, as an individual might ask fewer questions or give shortened responses to stigmatized job applicants (Hebl et al., 2002). There is typically no course of action to pursue for a victim facing interpersonal discrimination because the behaviors are often ambiguous, legal, and interactional in nature. Interpersonal discrimination is similar to what other researchers have referred to as implicit forms of discrimination (Dovidio et al., 2002), which sometimes involve unconscious intentions to discriminate.

There are a number of reasons why research, which we review in the next section, suggests that interpersonal discrimination is becoming more common than formal discrimination. First, laws have been enacted to restrict the display of formal discrimination. For instance, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the Civil

Rights Act, and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 promote the access, employment, and advancement rights that protected individuals receive. Such laws, however, do not restrict the displays of interpersonal discrimination. That is, interpersonal discrimination remains legal, not sanctioned by law, but is currently outside the parameters of law.

Second, organizational policies also have been enacted to further protect the rights of individuals. Legal sanctions do not protect the rights of members of all stigmatized groups (i.e., gay and lesbian individuals, obese individuals); thus, many organizations are extending protected group status to include members of additional groups as well. As a result, many organizations now have zero-tolerance policies for discrimination and/or provide diversity initiatives that ultimately lead to the reduction of formal discrimination. As with legal sanctions, however, organizational policies also are limited in the ways that they restrict interpersonal forms of discrimination.

Third, pressures to act in politically correct or socially desirable ways may also reduce the prevalence of formal discrimination, and such attitudes may directly lead individuals to monitor and restrict the formal discrimination that they display (Dovidio, Glick, & Rudman, 2005). Many people are likely to express their prejudices only in ways and situations in which their prejudicial motives can go undetected. In a longitudinal analysis, Dovidio and Gaertner (2000) found that self-reported prejudice was lower in 1998–1999 than it was in 1988–1989. Furthermore, White participants do not discriminate against Black relative to White candidates in obvious situations that clearly indicate prejudice (e.g., when credentials of one versus the other are either very strong or very weak) but they do discriminate by recommending the White over the Black candidates (76% versus 45%) when the appropriate decision is more ambiguous (e.g., when both had moderate qualifications).

Fourth and finally, the expressions of interpersonal discrimination may be particularly robust because many people simply do not have access to their true attitudes. Work by Dovidio and his colleagues (Dovidio et al., 2001; Dovidio, Kawakami, Johnson, Johnson, & Howard, 1997) has suggested that although explicit, conscious attitudes may have a strong connection to the formal types of behaviors people express (i.e., explicit statements of their attitudes), implicit attitudes are more likely to link up with nonverbal and more interpersonal behaviors. In other words, the expression of negative inter-

personal behaviors may be done unconsciously (see also Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). Moreover, even when people are conscious of their behaviors, they may be less successful at monitoring and restricting their more interpersonal and nonverbal behaviors than their conscious and overt behaviors; thus, people may still display residual negativity that manifests itself in interpersonal discrimination (Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002).

In summary, the manifestation of discrimination may be taking a subtler form due to legislation, organizational policies, genuine attitude change, social pressures, and unconscious mechanisms. Given these explanations for the changing expression of prejudice, it is not surprising that the behavioral manifestation of contemporary resistance to diversity in organizations is taking more subtle and interpersonal forms. We next review empirical studies that have been conducted on this subtle type of resistance to diversity in organizations.

Research on Interpersonal Discrimination

A number of studies empirically reveal that discrimination is being manifested in more subtle ways. For example, Hebl et al. (2002) examined formal (i.e., hiring measures) and interpersonal (i.e., nonverbal behaviors, amount of conversation) discrimination that both job applicants (either homosexual or assumed heterosexual) perceived from store employers and store employers actually displayed toward the applicants. In particular, 18 confederates entered stores wearing hats labeled with "Gay and Proud" or "Texan and Proud," but they remained unaware of what labels their hats contained. Store employers did not show signs of formal discrimination: that is, applicants, regardless of the hat they were wearing, were equally likely to be told that there was a job available, receive permission to complete a job application, and actually receive a job callback. However, store employers did engage in significantly more interpersonal discrimination with those wearing the stigmatized versus the nonstigmatized hat. Specifically, employers spoke fewer words to, had shorter interactions with, and were perceived to show more negativity (from the perspectives of both the applicants and independent observers) toward stigmatized than nonstigmatized individuals. The perceived negativity that applicants and observers noted involved employees being more

nervous, hostile, motivated to end the conversation prematurely, and standoffish toward stigmatized than nonstigmatized individuals.

This initial study confirms that discrimination, at least in the context that was examined, is manifested through interpersonal behavior, such as displaying less friendliness, interest, and helpfulness, rather than through obvious discriminatory behaviors, such as explicit remarks or refusing to hire the stigmatized applicant. This same pattern of behaviors—the presence of interpersonal discrimination and absence of formal discrimination—has been found in respect to obese targets (see King, Shapiro, Hebl, Singletary, & Turner, in press). Taken together, these findings suggest that resistance to diversity in organizational contexts takes the form of negative interpersonal behaviors like exclusion, avoidance, and social distancing.

Additional research has examined how nonverbal expressions of interpersonal discrimination can hinder women's performance as leaders. In a study of gender and leadership, Butler and Geis (1990) trained both male and female confederates to become leaders in mixed-sex groups. The men and women used the same scripts and were trained to make the same suggestions, use the same wording, and apply the same tactics in trying to get their respective groups to follow them. When asked, members of the groups said they had nothing against female leadership; yet, their nonverbal behaviors showed a different story. Essentially, female leaders became the targets of nonverbal disapproval—group members (both male and female) frowned at them as they talked, and when the female leaders continued to talk, group members frowned even more. Male leaders were not the targets of the same disapproval; rather, group members greeted their suggestions with smiles and nods. These results suggest that group members were not fully accepting of female leadership but instead of showing this discomfort in an overt way (by stating it aloud or on follow-up questionnaires), they instead displayed it via more covert nonverbal behaviors.

Subtle discrimination also has been manifested in faulty memories of how applicants perform in interview paradigms. For instance, Frazer and Wiersma (2001) examined White interviewers' immediate and longer-term reactions to Black and White applicants. Consistent with the pattern of findings reported by Hebl et al. (2002), the researchers found no evidence of formal discrimination against Black applicants in interviews; that is, they were immediately rec-

ommended for hire in equal proportions to that of White applicants. However, an interesting pattern emerged when interviewers were asked to recall the answers of applicants one week later. Specifically, interviewers recalled the answers given by Black applicants as being less intelligent than those given by White applicants (though their answers were actually identical), illustrating a more subtle form of discrimination. Thus, consistent with the interpersonal discrimination framework, although interviewers were able to avoid formally discriminating in the interview setting itself, more subtle biases could be detected.

Interpersonal discrimination can also be manifested in exclusion, avoidance, and social distancing through informal social networks in the workplace. Having expansive informal social networks has been shown to provide assistance, social support, and information about work that is pertinent for work performance (Brass, 1984). As such, networks are central for one's mobility, promotion, and emergence as leaders. The absence of such networks, however, leads to feelings of isolation (Kanter, 1977) and lack of identification in the workplace (Tsui & O'Reilly, 1989). Unfortunately, research suggests that minority employees and, in particular, minority managers have fewer intimate network relationships (Ibarra, 1995). The question arises as to why this is the case. We believe that interpersonal discrimination is at least partially to blame for minority managers' reporting that they face more barriers in relationships with cross-race employees than with same-race employees (Thomas, 1990). Such barriers become even more problematic when one considers that there are few minority managers to begin with; hence, they must often seek relationships with minorities from other departments or institutions to gain helpful social and informational support. In essence, then, minorities may only be receiving half the benefits of mentoring—the psychosocial support, but not the instrumental support, that provides exposure, advocacy, and resources leading to advancement.

Additional research demonstrates that manifestations of interpersonal discrimination depend on the context of the interactions. That is, the target of interpersonal discrimination can change the type or nature of interpersonal discrimination. For example, Hebl, Glick, Singletary, and Kazama (2005) investigated behavior toward pregnant women in nontraditional (job applicant) and traditional (store customer) roles. Female confederates, either wearing or not wearing a pregnancy prosthesis, entered retail stores and posed as job applicants or as customers. The results showed no evidence of formal discrimination (e.g., job callbacks for applicants, help for customers), but did show interpersonal discrimination toward "pregnant" women (i.e., the confederates wearing the pregnancy prosthesis). However, the particular interpersonal behaviors depended on the stereotype congruity of the role enacted by the "pregnant" woman. That is, when the confederate was in the role of a pregnant job applicant, employees exhibited more hostile behavior (e.g., rudeness) toward "pregnant" (versus nonpregnant) confederates. Hostile sexism is an antagonistic attitude toward women, encompassing a wide range of negative affect (e.g., antipathy, resentment, anger) toward women (Glick & Fiske, 1996), which is analogous to formal discrimination because both are obvious. Such results suggest people did not perceive "pregnant" women applying for job favorably. However, employees exhibited benevolent behavior (e.g., touching, over-friendliness) toward "pregnant" (versus nonpregnant) confederates in the role of a pregnant store customer. Benevolent sexism involves a chivalrous attitude toward women that feels favorable but they perpetuate gender stereotypes, such as casting women as weak creatures in need of men's protection (Glick & Fiske, 1996), which can be considered analogous to interpersonal discrimination because both are subtle. Such results suggest that people reinforced "pregnant" women enacting the role of customer by offering them extra help. As a whole, these findings reveal that not only does the context influence the behavioral expressions of discrimination, but the context may also change the type or nature of interpersonal discrimination.

Consequences of Interpersonal Discrimination in the Workplace

The consequences of interpersonal discrimination for its targets might be considered minor when compared with the effects of more blatant types of discrimination. However, subtle forms of discrimination are not trivial matters and may be just as pernicious in their effects as effects that occur from more overt types of discrimination (Dipboye & Colella, 2005). As Valian (1998) asserts, it is the small molehills of difference that can become mountains of disadvantage for targets over time. In this section, we describe evidence that shows the negative consequences of interpersonal discrimina-

tion in the workplace. These consequences may have adverse effects for both the employees who are targets of the discrimination as well as organizations that allow such discrimination to occur. We will consider the effects of interpersonal discrimination on targets' job-related performance and advancement in the workplace, as well as the consequences for organizations as a whole.

Effects on Job-Related Performance

Exclusion, avoidance, and social distancing can influence the quality of interactions in the workplace, which may then negatively influence performance. In a seminal study, Word, Zanna, and Cooper (1974) illustrated the impact that subtle differences in verbal and nonverbal behavior had on applicants by examining an interview context in which White interviewers were interviewing Black or White applicants. Their first experiment revealed that White interviewers spaced themselves farther from, made more speech errors with, and terminated interviews more quickly with Black than White applicants. Moreover, these behavioral differences impacted the performance of the applicants themselves. When participants in their second experiment were subjected to the same behaviors that were directed toward Black applicants from the first experiment, such applicants were more nervous during the interview and ultimately performed worse than those who were not subjected to such behaviors.

Thus, interpersonal discriminatory behavior can undermine the performance of those receiving such behaviors. As another example of these effects, Vescio, Gervais, Snyder, and Hoover (2005) examined the effect of patronizing behavior from male leaders on female subordinates' performance. Patronizing behavior was defined as giving subordinates ample praise while withholding valued resources (e.g., raises and promotions). Therefore, patronizing behavior can be considered subtle discrimination because the act of withholding valued resources is masked with praise. In the first experiment, results showed that male leaders gave ample praise to the female subordinates whom they stereotyped, but gave the same women fewer valued resources than their male counterparts. Moreover, in the second experiment, participants received either valued or devalued positions in combination with either praise or no praise from a male

leader. Women who were treated in patronizing ways (i.e., praised and devalued positions) were angrier and performed poorer on cognitive tasks than women and men in the other conditions. That is, men and women performed similarly in all conditions except for the patronizing condition, in which women performed poorly. Thus, subtleties of patronizing behavior from male leaders can create very significant gender differences in performance.

Interpersonal discriminatory behavior can affect the quality of interactions in the workplace. For example, Snyder, Tanke, and Berscheid (1977) demonstrated the effect of interpersonal discrimination through the emergence of a self-fulfilling prophecy in an interview context. Participants were college men who were given a packet of information about another research participant, which included her photograph. The photograph was of either an attractive woman or of an unattractive woman. The men then interviewed a female confederate over the phone. The results revealed that men who thought they were talking to an attractive woman responded to her in a warmer, more sociable manner than did the men who thought they were talking to an unattractive woman.

In a very recent study, Shapiro, King, and Quiñones (2007) also demonstrated the effect of interpersonal discrimination in a performance training context. They set out to examine how the effects of prejudice and discrimination might influence training through the emergence of a self-fulfilling prophecy. Essentially, trainers were led to believe that they were training an obese or an average weight (manipulated through a picture) trainee in a computer task. The trainers noted their expectations of the training interaction and the trainee. Then, they were asked to conduct training. In reality, those that were being trained were naïve participants who simply believed they were being trained at a task and had no knowledge of the weight manipulation. The results first demonstrated that trainers in the obese condition had lower expectations of the training, expected less success from the trainee, and evaluated the trainee and the training more negatively than trainers in the average weight condition. Second, the results demonstrated the insidious effects of low expectations. In particular, trainees in the obese condition evaluated the trainer and the training more negatively, and in certain conditions, even performed worse. Although the interactions were not recorded, we do not believe the results were generated because trainers overtly discriminated against those they believed to be overweight. Rather,

we believe the results occurred because, consistent with the findings of Snyder, Tanke, and Berscheid (1977), trainers used different levels of affect, paraverbal behaviors, and word choices to either encourage or discourage the trainees. And importantly, the trainees picked up on these differences, which in turn led to their lowered performance.

As a whole, these studies show that interpersonal discrimination has negative implications for targets' performance. It is certainly more challenging to measure and examine the effects of this type of discrimination, but the studies we reviewed in this section converge in showing that as interpersonal discrimination increases, one can anticipate decreases in performance and other work-related behaviors.

Effects on Advancement in the Workplace

Exclusion, avoidance, and social distancing can also influence advancement in the workplace. One area in which this may be particularly evident, albeit subtle, is in the distribution of developmental experiences that lead to advancement. In a study designed to examine this possibility, Kazama (2004) measured the developmental experiences that male and female managers had participated in over a five-year period. Results revealed that while male and female managers reported participating in similar levels of such experiences, male managers reported engaging in qualitatively more challenging experiences than did female managers, even after controlling for job, company, and industry tenure. Although it is possible that men may simply be making more out of their experiences than are women, Kazama's results support the notion that interpersonal discrimination may be at play: Men and women are getting the same amount of experiences but they are qualitatively different. That is, men may be getting more challenging experiences than are women, and it is these challenging experiences that are predictive of individual success and advancement (e.g., Bray & Howard, 1983; McCauley, Ohlott, & Ruderman, 1989; McCauley, Ruderman, Ohlott, & Morrow, 1994).

Interpersonal discrimination may also have a negative influence on the form and utility of social networks. For instance, network analyses have shown that minority managers develop psychosocial relationships with other minority employees, but must rely on White managers for instrumental support (Ibarra, 1995). Similarly, research demonstrates that gay employees are often excluded from social networks that can hinder their advancement (Friskopp & Silverstein, 1996). In particular, Friskopp and Silverstein (1995) found that many gay employees feel the stress of considering the "coming out" process or fear the responses that might occur if they disclose their sexual orientation to coworkers. Many gay employees report feelings of stress, fear, vulnerability to blackmail, and other forms of harassment, as well as discomfort with socializing with other coworkers. Such reservations lead to less networking and lower self-esteem. It is important to note, however, that "coming out" was actually linked with more networking, higher job satisfaction, and higher self-esteem (see also Griffith & Hebl, 2002; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001).

Differences in expectations, less informal ties, negative facial expressions, or other more subtle behaviors do have a significant impact on women and minorities' advancement in the workplace. Such small differences in treatment at the workplace may, over time, accumulate to large disparities. In fact, in a computer simulation study, Martell, Lane, and Emrich (1996) demonstrated that a 1% bias in performance appraisals can subsequently translate into a 15% bias over time. Similarly, interpersonal discrimination may lead to significant disparities for women and minorities. In other words, as noted previously, "molehills" of inequity over time create "mountains" of disparate treatment (Valian, 1998). Unfortunately, the empirical evidence cited here suggests that members of protected groups are not protected from these subtle forms of discrimination or their consequences.

Organizational Consequences

Lastly, discrimination does not only distress the targets of discrimination, but evidence also shows that it can hurt organizations. For instance, King et al. (2006) found that interpersonal discrimination resulted in negative consequences for organizations. Specifically, obese customers who experienced interpersonal discrimination purchased less than what they had originally intended to purchase, were less likely to return to the store, and were less likely to recommend the store to others than were customers who did not experience such discrimination. In addition, King and colleagues (King,

Hebl, George, & Matusik, 2006) found that the extent to which women perceive their organization maintains an inequitable climate for women was related to decreased job satisfaction, affective commitment, and helping behaviors, and increased job stress and intentions to leave. Therefore, there is the potential of financial costs to organizations in terms of lower sales (King et al., 2006) and possible turnover (King et al., 2006).

In sum, there are clear and negative consequences of discrimination for both its targets and their organizations. Interpersonal discrimination may lead to decreased performance as well as inequitable advancement rates. In addition, such discrimination is associated with negative implications for the "bottom-line" of organizations in the form of customer purchasing behaviors, as well as employee job attitudes and behaviors.

Remediation Strategies for Individuals and Organizations

The pernicious nature of contemporary discrimination and its consequences make it essential to identify and understand strategies that individuals and organizations may carry out to reduce such behaviors. Unfortunately, there has not been a great deal of research examining such strategies. There are at least two notable exceptions to this (King et al., 2006; Singletary & Hebl, 2006) and both of these studies examine strategies that the target (rather than the organization) can adopt. It is important to note that we do not advocate that the burden be placed on the targets, who are victims. Rather, we hope that organizations take the lead in remediating both formal and interpersonal discrimination. That said, there are effective strategies that individuals can adopt to reduce discrimination. We begin by discussing these individual-level strategies in detail and then review some findings that suggest the plausibility of certain organizational-level strategies in reducing covert forms of discrimination.

Individual Strategies for Remediating Interpersonal Discrimination

In a recent study (King et al., 2006), researchers conducted a field study that examined the interpersonal discrimination (i.e., interaction length, perceived negativity, smiling) that was displayed by customer service personnel toward obese (versus non-obese) shoppers seeking customer service. The authors proposed that interpersonal discrimination on the part of store personnel would be less likely to occur when justifications for expressing prejudice were removed. More specifically, according to the Justification-Suppression Model of the Expression and Experience of Prejudice (JSM; Crandall & Eshleman, 2003), individuals are more likely to act on their prejudice and display discriminatory behaviors when they are given a justification for doing so. However, social constraints, values, and expectations may potentially work to remediate the display of discrimination by leading individuals to suppress their prejudice.

Following this line of reasoning, King et al. (2006) manipulated high and low justification conditions through the attire of the customer (i.e., wearing unprofessional clothes or casual) in experiment 1 and through the dieting and exercising of the customer (drinking a diet beverage and commenting they exercise or drinking a high-caloric beverage and commenting that they do not exercise) in experiment 2. As predicted, King and colleagues found that when justifications for prejudice were removed, obese shoppers experienced a decrease in interpersonal discrimination: Store personnel smiled at them more and interacted with them for longer periods of time, and independent coders listening to the interactions rated less negativity in the low justification relative to the high justification conditions.

The King et al. (2006) study is the first known study that specifically targets the remediation of interpersonal discrimination. In a second study by Singletary and Hebl (2006), the authors examined the potential remediation of interpersonal discrimination by examining three different strategies that gay and lesbian job applicants might adopt. First, they examined the *strategy of acknowledgment*, or directly referring to one's stigma during an interaction (Hebl & Kleck, 2002; Hebl & Skorinko, 2005). Acknowledgments may be beneficial if they portray targets as well-adjusted and comfortable (Hebl & Skorinko, 2005), and if they are met by positive reactions from coworkers (e.g., Griffith & Hebl, 2002). Acknowledgment can also reduce thought suppression or other self-regulatory behaviors, which otherwise increase the activation of stereotypic thoughts (Devine, 1998; Macrae, Bodenhousen, Milne, & Jetten, 1994; Monteith, Sherman, & Devine, 1998).

Second, Singletary and Hebl (2006) examined the *strategy of compensation*, which occurs when individuals try to overcome the perceived discrimination they might receive from others by engaging in compensatory behaviors such as using humor or being overly friendly (Miller, Rothblum, Felicio, & Brand, 1995). Past research on compensatory behaviors suggests that they can be successful in reducing overt discrimination. For example, overweight individuals who anticipate the possibility of discrimination because they are told that they will seen by evaluators act in more socially skilled ways than those who are told that they will not be seen by evaluators (Miller et al., 1995). Extending this research, the authors anticipated that a compensation approach might also reduce subtle forms of discrimination by counterbalancing initially negative reactions.

Third, Singletary and Hebl (2006) examined the *strategy of individuation*, or providing information that distinguishes oneself from the stereotype or stigmatized group (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). In this situation, individuals provided information about themselves that accentuated their unique qualities. Individuation has been shown to be successful in reducing stereotyping because it is presumed that it focuses perceivers' attention on the target individual rather than on the larger category to which the individual belongs (e.g., race, size; Wilder, 1981). For instance, when children were told to develop distinctive and individuated views of physically disabled children, they were less likely to discriminate against them and were more likely to see them as different from each other (Langer, Bashner, & Chanowitz, 1985).

In addition to replicating the original results of the previously described Hebl et al. (2002) "gay and proud" study, which showed the presence of interpersonal discrimination when confederates sought employment, Singletary and Hebl (2006) found that adopting any of the three strategies resulted in a reduction of interpersonal discrimination relative to adopting no strategy. The success of the three strategies was reported by the confederates themselves, observers of the interaction, and independent raters who later listened to audiotapes of the interactions. The strategy that was most uniformly recognized across these three perspectives at reducing interpersonal discrimination was compensation, followed by acknowledgment, and then individuation. But again, it is important to note that all three strategies produced some reduction of discrimination. Such reduction might be further modulated by examining how individual differences moderate the extent to which one particular strategy is more or less effective. We hope future research might examine the interaction between individual differences, remediation strategies, and situational contexts in an attempt to identify what sort of individuals should optimally use which strategies.

The King et al. (in press) and Singletary and Hebl (2006) studies confirm that being the target of interpersonal discrimination is not an immutable condition. There are behaviors that targets can adopt to prevent or ameliorate the negative impact of these more subtle behaviors. Although these initial studies have identified a few of such potential strategies, we certainly believe that there are others that are yet unexamined but may be even more successful at eliminating subtle and covert forms of discrimination.

Organizational Strategies for Remediating Interpersonal Discrimination

In reviewing potential remediation strategies, we feel—for a number of reasons—it is important that the remediation efforts not rest solely on the targets of discrimination themselves. First, while these strategies have been demonstrated to be successful, such strategies may require self-regulatory resources, which are limited (Baumeister, Muraven, & Tice, 2000; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000) and lead to self-depletion and exhaustion (Richeson & Trawalter, 2005). Over time these strategies may become a burden, or they may not always be feasible. For example, in interacting with other employees, a stigmatized employee might have to engage in compensatory behaviors and at the same time must focus on their work. Engaging in both work tasks and remediation strategies may require too much from cognitive and/or regulatory resources. Second, we believe putting the burden of remediation solely on targets themselves is inherently unjust. Targets should be given support and resources to overcome the negative implications that they face. Accordingly, organizations should work towards reducing resistance to diversity and its manifestation in subtle discrimination in both formal and informal ways.

Formal organizational policies influence perceived discrimination and are related to perceptions and outcomes of discrimination (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). That is, to the extent that organizations offer policies that are inclusive of diverse backgrounds and perspec-

tives, diverse employees perceive less discrimination and have more positive attitudes about their jobs (King et al., 2006; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Such policies may include educating employees about micro-inequities, welcoming same-sex partners to company social events, ensuring that the representation of minority group members in management positions is proportionally equivalent, training top management to identify and reduce interpersonal discrimination, or establishing mentoring programs to support the success of diverse individuals. Taken together, preliminary evidence suggests that organizations can help circumvent discrimination by adopting organizational policies that stress the importance of diversity.

These policies may impact each component of Schneider's (1987) attraction–selection–attrition (ASA) model of organizations. For example, past research shows that women and minorities take into account the extent to which organizations have supportive policies and structures when considering job opportunities. For example, Black applicants are attracted to organizations that consciously recruit minorities by including minority employees in their advertisement efforts more than organizations that do not do such advertising (Avery, 2003; Avery, Hernandez, & Hebl, 2004). Similarly, gay employees have more positive work attitudes and are more likely to be "out" in organizations that have gay-supportive policies than in organizations that do not have such supportive policies (Griffith & Hebl, 2002).

In the selection process, valid selection procedures can be utilized to reduce both discrimination and resistance to diversity. For example, a large body of research has demonstrated that structuring employment interviews improves their psychometric properties and hinders the emergence of bias, because using predetermined questions for every applicant produces an assessment of job candidates that is less open to interviewer bias (Campion & Palmer, 1997). Not only can structure protect potential targets of discrimination, structure can also protect organizations from litigation. For example, Williamson, Campion, Malos, Roehling, and Campion (1997) linked interview structure and litigation outcomes and found that structure enhances interview reliability and validity. They found that structure is linked to litigation outcomes, because (a) structure increases consistency across candidates, which helps justify business necessity, (b) structure reduces the overall subjectivity and, therefore, potential for bias in the decision-making process, (c) and structure

is likely to enhance perceptions of procedural justice. Thus, structured, objective, and valid procedures for selection are more likely to reduce resistance to diversity than are unstructured procedures.

In addition to the aforementioned formal organizational policies, organizations might also utilize informal strategies for reducing resistance to diversity and its manifestation in interpersonal discrimination. For example, increasing intergroup contact through social functions or teamwork can also be another strategy that organizations might adopt to remediate discrimination. Research illustrates the importance of intergroup contact for improving intergroup attitudes (Gaertner, Dovidio, Rust, Nier, Banker, Ward, Mottola, & Houlette, 1999; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Shelton & Richeson, 2005). In his seminal work, Allport (1954) proposed the "contact hypothesis," which suggests that increasing intergroup contact leads to more favorable attitudes and outcomes. In other words, the attitudes of potential stigmatizers will be improved through an increase of intergroup interactions. Testing the contact hypothesis in a comprehensive meta-analysis, Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) found that increased contact was significantly related to decreased prejudice on the part of the stigmatizer. There are, however, important contingencies of intergroup contact that must be noted (Pettigrew, 1998). First, there must be mutual interdependence to accomplish and a common goal. Second, there must also be equal status, where differences are not reinforced. Third, contact should occur in a friendly, informal setting where there can be contact with multiple members of the outgroup. Fourth and last, contact is most likely to reduce prejudice when social norms promote and support equality. Thus, greater inclusion from all levels of organizations would be required for intergroup contact to be successful in reducing discrimination.

Increasing contact may not only decrease prejudicial attitudes and beliefs, but may also lead to more informal network ties for women and minorities (Friskopp & Silverstein, 1996; Ibarra, 1995). Interracial contact, for example, can be quite discomforting and threatening for White individuals, because White individuals strive to behave in non-prejudiced ways. As such, they tend to avoid interracial contact (Blascovich, Mendes, Hunter, Lickel, & Kowai-Bell, 2001; Richeson & Trawalter, 2005). Minority members also tend to avoid interracial contact, because they are concerned with how they will be treated (Shelton & Richeson, 2005). It is no surprise then that Black and White employees tend to struggle with forming ties with each other

(Thomas, 1990; Ibarra, 1995). However, Shelton and Richeson (2005) found that as the out-group members become a part of ones' own ingroup, prejudicial thoughts and interracial anxiety decrease. In other words, as Black and White individuals become friendly, they are more likely to have positive interactions and become less fearful of interacting with other outgroup members. As such, organizations can help minorities and White individuals form ties with each other through informal social functions. By doing so, organizations can proactively remediate against the negative effects of avoidance and social distancing. For example, minorities and women can expand their networks, whereas White individuals lose the fear of mixed interactions. Increasing intergroup contact might also increase mentoring relationships for minority groups, which are associated with increased career satisfaction, salary compensation, and job satisfaction (Chao, 1997; Dreher & Ash, 1990).

The research that we have outlined indicates that organizations can play a big role in the manifestations and consequences of discrimination at the workplace. Similarly, we propose that organizations are responsible for taking substantial initiatives in creating an inclusive atmosphere for women, minorities, and other stigmatized individuals. Organizations can adopt organizational formal and informal policies that promote diversity, structure recruitment and selection practices, and increase intergroup interactions at the workplace. Such practices can lead to positive outcomes for women and minority employees, including fair hiring decisions, reduction of anxiety and fear of intergroup contact, and improved network ties for women and minorities.

Conclusions and Implications

Resistance to diversity is manifested in subtle and complex behaviors that may be even more pernicious than the traditional, overt forms of discrimination typical of the past (Dipboye & Colella, 2005). The motivation for and causes of prejudice are often not due to conscious, malicious intentions, but rather due to unconscious mechanisms (Dovidio et al., 1997; Dovidio et al., 2001; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Hebl & Dovidio, 2005). As such, prejudice may manifest in negative facial expressions (Butler & Geis, 1990), body language (Hebl et al., 2002), and negative interpersonal behaviors and their interpretation (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Hebl et al., 2005; King et al., in press). Thus, avoidance, exclusion, and social distancing may be the hallmarks of resistance to diversity in the contemporary American workplace.

These subtle interpersonal behaviors may account for disparities faced by women, minorities, and other stigmatized individuals in the context of work. For example, women and minorities suffer from smaller networks and have fewer mentors at work, therefore creating barriers that can hinder their career development (Ibarra, 1995; Thomas, 1990). As another example, the behavioral manifestations of implicit, unconscious prejudice can lead to a lower selection rate for Black applicants (Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, & Vaslow, 2000; Ziegert & Hanges, 2005). Such discrimination can also have negative consequences for organizations including the bottom line (King et al., 2006). In addition to the costs of litigation, discrimination can influence customer purchasing behaviors (King et al., 2006) and employee job attitudes and behaviors (King et al., 2006).

Given the insidious nature and consequences of interpersonal discrimination, it is imperative that both targets and organizations identify strategies through which to avoid, reduce, or remediate such behaviors. Preliminary evidence suggests that diverse individuals who address their stereotyped identity (King et al., in press), or otherwise compensate for or distinguish themselves from their identity (Singletary & Hebl, 2006), may reduce the interpersonal discrimination that they face. Furthermore, formal and informal organizational policies supporting diverse employees can be successful in attracting, selecting, and retaining a diverse workforce (e.g., Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Thus, diverse individuals and their organizations may be able to develop the tools necessary for reducing resistance to diversity.

When managed effectively, diversity can be an asset to organizations. Having a diverse workforce can enhance creativity (McLeod, Lobel, & Cox, 1996), add value to the organization in terms of return on equity, enhance productivity, and provide a competitive advantage over racially homogenous organizations (Richard, 2000). Organizations that promote and value diversity are more likely to attract women, minorities, and other stigmatized individuals, capitalizing on this diverse human capital, and are more likely have lower absenteeism, turnover, and job dissatisfaction in their workforce and attain marketplace value in terms of increased company stock

price (Wright, Ferris, Hiller, & Kroll, 1995). Thus, with the increasing number of women, minorities, and other stigmatized individuals entering the workforce, organizations that proactively take steps to successfully manage a diverse workforce might have a competitive advantage over organizations that do not effectively manage a diverse workforce.

In conclusion, understanding the dynamics of how diversity resistance manifests in interactions in the workplace adds to a more comprehensive view of the experiences of women and minority employees. This chapter described how discrimination can manifest in subtle, interpersonal ways, and illustrated that such discrimination can have negative implications for diverse employees and their organizations. Accordingly, we contend that it is critical for researchers and practitioners to work toward an understanding of strategies for proactively combating this covert and pernicious form of resistance to diversity.

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Avery, D. R. (2003). Reactions to diversity in recruitment advertising: Are differences black and white? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 672–679.

Avery, D. R., Hernandez, M., & Hebl, M. R. (2004). Who's watching the race? Racial salience in recruitment advertising. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34,* 146–161.

Baumeister, R. F., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (2000). Ego depletion: A resource model of volition, self-regulation, and controlled processing. *Social Cognition, 18,* 130–150.

Blascovich, J., Mendes, W. M., Hunter, S. B., Lickel, B., & Kowai-Bell, N. (2001). Perceiver threat in social interactions with stigmatized others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80,* 253–267.

Brass, D. J. (1984). Being in the right place: A structural analysis of individual influence in an organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29,* 518–539.

Bray, D. W., & Howard, A. (1983). The AT&T longitudinal studies of managers. In K. W. Schaie (Ed.), *Longitudinal studies of adult psychological development* (pp. 266–312). New York: Guilford Press.

Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81,* 72–97.

Butler, D., & Geis, F. L. (1990). Nonverbal affect responses to male and female leaders: Implications for leadership evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 48–59.

Campion, M. A., & Palmer, D. K. (1997). A review of structure in the selection interview. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 655–703.

Chao, G. T. (1997). Mentoring phases and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51,* 15–28.

Crandall, C. S., & Eshleman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression model of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin, 129,* 414–446.

Dipboye, R., & Colella, A. (2005). *Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999. *Psychological Science, 11,* 319–323.

Dovidio, J. F., Glick, P. G., & Rudman, L. (Eds.). (2005). On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 62–68.

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., & Howard, A. (1997). On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled process. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33,* 510–540.

Dreher, A. H., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 539–546.

Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. (1990). A continuum of impression formation, from category-based to individuation processes: Influences of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 23,* 1–74.

Frazer, R. A., & Wiersma, U. J. (2001). Prejudice versus discrimination in the employment interview: We may hire equally, but our memories harbor prejudice. *Human Relations, 54,* 173–191.

Friskopp, A., & Silverstein, S. (1996). *Straight jobs, gay lives: Gay and lesbian professionals, the Harvard Business School, and the American workplace.* New York: Touchston/Simon & Schuster.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Rust, M. C., Nier, J. A., Banker, B. S., Ward, C. M., Mottola, G. R., & Houlette, M. (1999). Reducing intergroup bias: Elements of itnergroup cooperation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 388–402.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491–512.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 102*, 4–27.

Griffith, K. H., & Hebl, M. R. (2002). The disclosure dilemma for gay men and lesbians: "Coming out" at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 1191–1199.

Hebl, M. R., & Dovidio, J. F. (2005). Promoting the "social" in the examination of social stigmas. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9*, 156–182.

Hebl, M. R., Foster, J. B., Mannix, L. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2002). Formal and interpersonal discrimination: A field study of bias toward homosexual applicants. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 815–825.

Hebl, M. R., Glick, P., Singletary, S., & Kazama, S. (2005). Hostile and benevolent behaviors toward pregnant women: Complementary interpersonal punishments and rewards that maintain traditional roles. Unpublished manuscript, Rice University.

Hebl, M. R., & Kleck, R. E. (2002). Acknowledging one's stigma in the interview setting: Effective strategy or liability? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 223–249.

Hebl, M. R., & Skorinko, J. L. (2005). Acknowledging one's physical disability in the interview: Does "when" make a difference? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 35*, 2477–2492.

Ibarra, H. (1995). Race, opportunity, and diversity of social circles in managerial networks. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 673–704.

Kazama, S. M. (2004). Manager's distribution of developmental experiences in the workplace. Doctoral dissertation. Rice University.

King, E. B., Hebl, M. R., George, J. M., & Matusik, S. F. (2006). Negative consequences of perceived gender discrimination in male-dominated organizations: A field study. Unpublished Manuscript.

King, E. B., Shapiro, J., Hebl, M. R., Singletary, S., & Turner, S. (2006). The stigma of obesity in customer service: A mechanism of remediation and bottom-line consequences of interpersonal discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 579–593.

Langer, E. J., Bashner, R. S., & Chanowitz, B. (1985). Decreasing prejudice by increasing discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 113–120.

Martell, R. F., Lane, D. M., & Emrich, C. (1996). Male-female differences: A computer simulation. *American Psychologist, 51*, 157–158.

Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 247–259.

McCauley, C. D., Ohlott, P. J., & Ruderman, M. N. (1989). On-the-job development: A conceptual model and preliminary investigation. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 1*, 142–158.

McCauley, C. D., Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, P. J., & Morrow, J. E. (1994). Assessing the developmental components of managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 544–560.

McLeod, P. L., Lobel, S. A., & Cox, T. H. (1996). Ethnic diversity and creativity in small groups. *Small Group Research, 27*, 248–264.

Miller, C. T., Rothblum, E. D., Felicio, D., & Brand, P. (1995). Compensating for stigma: Obese and nonobese women's reactions to being visible. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 1093–1106.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65–85

Pettigrew, T., & Tropp, M. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 93–114). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1244–1261.

Richard, O. C. (2000). Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 164–177.

Richeson, J. A., & Trawalter, S. (2005). Why do interracial interactions impair executive function? A resource depletion account. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 934–947.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 437–453.

Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2005). Intergroup contact and pluralistic ignorance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 91–107.

Shapiro, J., King, E. B., & Quiñones, M. (2007). Expectations of obese trainees: How stigmatized trainee characteristics influence training effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 239–249.

Singletary, S., & Hebl, M. (2006). Remediating interpersonal discrimination: A field study examination. Unpublished manuscript. Rice University.

Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*, 656–666.

Thomas, D. A. (1990). The impact of race on managers' experiences of developmental relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38*, 169–194.

Tsui, A. S., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1989). Beyond simple demographic effects: The importance of relational demography in superior-subordinate dyads. *Academy of Management, 32*, 402–423.

Valian, V. (1998). *Why so slow? The advancement of women.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vescio, T. K., Gervais, S. J., Snyder, M., & Hoover, A. (2005). Power and the creation of patronizing environments: the stereotype-based behaviors of the powerful and their effects on female performance in masculine domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 658–672.

Wilder, D. A. (1981). Perceiving persons as a group: Categorization and intergroup relations. In D. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (pp. 213–257). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Williamson, L. G., Campion, J. E., Malos, S. B., Roehling, M. V., & Campion, M. A. (1997). Employment interview on trial linking interview structure with litigation outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 900–912.

Wright, P., Ferris, S. P., Hiller, J. S., & Kroll, M. (1995). Competitiveness through management of diversity: Effects on stock price evaluation. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 272–287.

Word, C. O., Zanna, M. P., & Cooper, J. (1974). The nonverbal mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies in interracial interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 10*, 109–120.

Ziegert, J. C., & Hanges, P. J. (2005). Employment discrimination: The role of implicit attitudes, motivation, and a climate for racial bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 553–562.

6

Traditional Selection Methods as Resistance to Diversity in Organizations

Patrick F. McKay and Jimmy Davis

> Society is always engaged in a vast conspiracy to preserve itself—at the expense of the new demands of each new generation.
>
> John Haynes Holmes

Over the past decade, most of the growth in the labor force has occurred among minority groups and women (Fullerton & Toossii, 2001). This shift in the labor force will accelerate in the period through 2020 because of the retirement of White baby boomers, and replacement by a much younger and more diverse population. By 2028 there will be 19 million more jobs than workers who are adequately trained to fill them (Business and Higher Education Forum, 2002). Forty percent of those available to take these jobs will be members of minority groups (Business & Higher Education Forum, 2002). Women and older adults are also potentially valuable human resources to cover projected labor shortages (Blumental, Cober, & Doverspike, 2000; Fullerton & Toossii, 2001). Accordingly, efforts to increase diversity in the U.S. workforce have become an important organizational staffing policy (Doverspike, Taylor, Shultz, & McKay, 2000; McKay & Avery, 2005).

There are a number of incentives for firms to overcome resistance to workplace diversity. First, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2006) received 75,428 discrimination claims in 2005. Losing a discrimination claim can be costly to organizations considering that plaintiffs can receive maximum punitive damages of $300,000 (Civil Rights Act, 1991). Furthermore, negative publicity