

**Strategies to Change Organizational Culture: Using Intragroup Variations in Perceptions
of Access to Privilege to Understand the Effects of Diversity Strategies on Intergroup
Attitudes**

By

Monica Lynn North

**B.A., Economics
University of California, Berkeley, 1984**

**Submitted to the Sloan School of Management in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of**

Doctor of Philosophy in Management

**at the
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
March, 1995**

**© 1995 Monica Lynn North
All rights reserved**

**The author hereby grants to MIT permission to reproduce and to distribute publicly paper
and electronic copies of this thesis document in whole or in part.**

Signature of Author

Certified by
**Lotte Bailyn, T. Wilson Professor of Management
Thesis Advisor**

Certified by
**Birger Wernerfelt
Chair of the Doctoral Program Committee**

ARCHIVES

**MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY**

MAY 31 1995

LIBRARIES

Strategies to Change Organizational Culture: Using Intragroup Variations in Perceptions of Access to Privilege to Understand the Effects of Diversity Strategies on Intergroup Attitudes

By

Monica Lynn North

Submitted to the Sloan School of Management in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Management

at the

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

March, 1995

ABSTRACT

Organizations face pressures to employ a diverse work force. Given these pressures, they want to create an environment in which all individuals, regardless of race/ethnicity or gender, can perform to their fullest potential. At the same time, organizations are aware that the work environment is hostile to the retention and career development of these individuals. Thus, many companies are developing strategies to change the organization's culture to create an environment tolerant of diversity.

Based on interviews with fourteen diversity managers of large U.S. corporations, I developed a typology of diversity strategies from which I classified strategies as either visible or subtle. My dissertation examines individual reactions to visible and subtle strategies for changing organizational culture. I collected data from two large U.S. organizations; one organization uses a subtle diversity strategy, and the other uses a visible diversity strategy. I mailed surveys to a random sample of 1690 managers, or the technical or professional equivalent.

Two research questions guided my data collection: 1) does the type of diversity strategy a company uses influence how people react to the strategy; and 2) does the type of strategy influence how people view other race/ethnic gender groups in the context of diversity? To answer these questions, I utilize the concept of orientational categories. Rather than rely on traditional social groupings of individuals based on their race/ethnic and gender background, I use orientational categories to examine variations in intergroup attitudes and reactions to diversity strategies within social groupings. Orientational categories represent individual differences in perceptions of social reality. Privilege is associated with career advancement opportunities, and diversity strategies are concerned with creating equal career advancement opportunities for all groups. Thus, perceived relative access to privilege is a pertinent social reality in the context of studying diversity strategies. I find that reactions to the strategy and intergroup attitudes depend on the type of strategy an organization uses and the race/ethnic gender group of the individual, and the orientational category of the individual moderates the effect of both.

Thesis Committee: Professor Lotte Bailyn (Chair)
Professor Ella E.J. Edmonson Bell
Professor John Carroll
Professor Kathy Kram

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although my name appears as the author of this piece of work, it is in no way a solitary effort. Many other people deserve acknowledgment for their support in a number of capacities.

My family deserves credit for the sacrifices they made for me. About my husband, John, I cannot say enough. I never would have written this dissertation without his support. He has been my companion, friend, motivator, punching bag, comforter, advisor, financial backer and more. In the midst of writing my dissertation, we doubled our family size. It has to be hard on the babies to have a mom who is always trying to put them to sleep and find baby-sitters so that she can work. Thank you, John, for being with me and thank you Joshua and Zachary for teaching me what in life is really important. I am the luckiest wife and mother in the world.

My thesis advisor, Lotte Bailyn, waded through pages and pages of drafts, relentlessly editing, pushing, and prodding. More importantly, she practiced what she preached. Lotte was a source of emotional support and was very understanding of the demands put on me as a mother.

I have always valued John Carroll's advice and he is a role model for how I want to be with my students. I feel fortunate to have had the opportunities to work with him in variety of contexts, all of which contributed to my professional development.

Ella L.J. Edmonson Bell does not let me get away with anything. She made me question my own assumptions and always pushed me to take the uncomfortable route, from which I would prefer to stray. Ella has been a source of inspiration, a mentor, and, most of all, a friend.

I was pleased that Kathy Kram agreed to sit on my committee. She was especially helpful in designing the questionnaire and motivating me to explore my role in the research process.

My colleagues were invaluable. We spent many hours sharing thoughts, criticizing arguments, editing papers, and blowing off steam. I learned as much from them as I did from the faculty. I feel lucky to have shared this time with a group of people that I know are the best and brightest in our field. Chip Hunter was more than an office mate for five years. He was an invaluable source of advice, a sounding board for ideas, and an editor of my papers. Most of all, however, he is a friend who believed in me when not even I believed in me. My critics and friends, Ann and Tony Frost, Yiorgos Mylonadis, Marc Weinstein, Chris Tucci, Andy King, Mary Tripsas, Jane Salk, Tish Robinson, and Fernando Suarez, provided intellectual and emotional support, not to mention many a memorable moment. They are always there for me and that means a lot.

John Willett at the Harvard School of Education inspired me to follow my heart. Myra Strober at the Stanford School of Education gave me a hug of encouragement when I needed it most, and I will never forget her for that. Maureen Scully was always ready to help (when our schedules miraculously coincided).

My parents, Stuart and Barbara Lynn, deserve a lot of credit for their support and for instilling in me the values, motivation, and discipline required to write a dissertation. They, as well as my in-laws, Gordon and Betty North, also deserve credit for all the baby-sitting hours they put in so I could complete the dissertation. My sister, Anthea, and

brother, Matthew, were also always there for me when I needed a long paper edited or a baby-sitter.

Eddie Elliott, Glenn Gilchrist, Carol Kissenger, Josh Stillerman, Wayne and Lisa Kurtz, Al and Cathy Hodson, and Mike and Laurie Clark gave me a life outside of Sloan!

Finally, I never would have written this without the cooperation of the diversity managers at Wireco and Pipeco and the 407 people who responded to my survey.

So you see, even though I take credit for any mistakes in the dissertation, I cannot take full credit for the rest. I never would have done it without all these people, and I cannot imagine trying.

Thank you all.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Today's competitive environment means that organizations have to use all of the best resources available. Competitive, practical, and legal pressures push organizations toward employing a diverse managerial work force. First, the trend toward exploration of new and diverse markets requires hiring managers who understand the markets so that organizations can remain competitively viable. This is true both in the international and the domestic spheres. The globalization of the economy, an increase in competition, and an increasingly diverse United States consumer base all have United States companies searching for new markets. The globalization of the economy requires U.S. organizations to understand the needs of foreign markets. In addition, understanding the culture can facilitate conducting business in these countries. The increase in competition stems in part from a global economy - U.S. companies have to compete with foreign companies as well as U.S. companies - but also from a decrease in consumer expenditures associated with the recent recession. United States' industries such as steel, clothing, and electronics face fierce competition from other countries. As workers are being laid off from their jobs and their disposable income declines, they are buying less and less. Thus, companies need to increase their consumer bases and are turning to previously ignored markets. The U.S. population is more diverse than ever, and all indicators point to the trend continuing. Where products were once targeted for white, middle-class, suburban consumers, we are finding more products aimed at a more diverse population. Internationally and domestically, companies can benefit from employees who speak the languages, know the customs, and are familiar with the needs of the vast variety of markets.

Second, the reality is that the workforce is more diverse. One source suggests that 68% of new entrants to the workforce between 1990 and 2005 will be from racioethnic groups other than white male (Exter, 1992). At the same time, only 52% of the people leaving the work force are from these groups. To maintain competitiveness, organizations must hire the best employees, and this means selecting from a labor pool that includes not only white men, but also white women and people of color. Further, as their numbers, and often incomes, increase, female, urban and non-white consumers are becoming a powerful lobby group. They are demanding that companies hire and promote from their populations, and demonstrate their power by buying from companies that do have a diverse managerial work force.

Third, although this context may change in the near future, many organizations must comply with Equal Opportunity Employment laws.¹ Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 issued by President Lyndon Johnson require that all federal contractors and subcontractors with contracts of \$10,000 or more must take “affirmative action” to ensure that white women and people of color receive equal treatment during recruitment for employment and during employment. Further, other equal opportunity legislation prohibits discrimination based on race, sex, color, national origin, or religion in salary, working conditions, and employment processes.²

Thus, maintaining competitiveness means paying attention to the potential contributions of white women and people of color, as they constitute an increasing share of the human capital resources available to organizations (Ahlburg & Kimmel, 1986; Johnston & Packer, 1987; Offerman & Gowing, 1990). Given these pressures to employ a diverse managerial workforce, organizations want to ensure that “diverse” people are able to contribute their talents to the organization to their fullest potential. However, at the same time, organizations are increasingly aware that the work environment is often hostile to the retention and career development of these individuals. First, white women and people of color are likely to be stereotyped as not being suitable for managerial positions. Consequently, white women and people of color are more likely than white men to be victims of evaluation discrimination. In a review of literature concerning the progress of women in management, Dipboye (1987) writes that despite evidence supporting differences between men and women in personality, responses to work and overall work effectiveness, stereotyping by white men persists as the primary roadblock to their progress. Brenner et al (1989) replicate Schein’s (1973) study of the relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management stereotypes and find that 25 years later male middle managers still believe men possess characteristics that make them better managers. Braddock and McPartland (1987) write that in employers’ evaluation of minority candidates, they tend to use negative group images rather than direct assessments of individuals in their selection process. Numerous other studies also catalog the persistence of stereotypes against white women and people of color (Bass, Krussel, &

¹ As I am wrapping up my dissertation, we are witnessing a movement in the United States to eradicate Affirmative Action laws.

² Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Alexander, 1972; Catalyst, 1991; Dubno, 1985; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Fernandez, 1982; Garland & Price, 1977; Naughton, 1988; O'Leary, 1976; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974).

Second, white women and people of color are less likely than men to be part of informal networks, especially those connected to top management (Braddock & McPartland, 1987; Brass, 1985; Lincoln & Jon, 1979). Consequently, they receive less social support (South, Bonjean, Markham, & Corder, 1982). Third, white women and people of color face barriers to mentoring so they are less likely than white men to have had a mentor (Dipboye, 1987; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Fitt & Newton, 1981; Noe, 1988a; Ragins, 1989; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990; Thomas, 1986; Thomas, 1989). In the last ten years, research has documented the importance of mentor relationships for career advancement (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1988; Kram, 1983; Kram & Bragar, 1991; Noe, 1988b; Wilbur, 1987). Fourth, while all employees face work-related stresses, white women and people of color face additional stresses that white men do not. For example, Bell (1990) describes having a foot in both the black and the white worlds as a "bicultural life experience." Her respondents felt they had to prove they were competent and they fit into the white world, while at the same time exerting additional energy to maintain their black identities and ties to the black community.

Many companies are developing strategies to change the organization's culture to create a less hostile environment that is more tolerant of diversity. These diversity strategies differ from Affirmative Action programs (Thomas, 1991). While Affirmative Action programs focus on the creation of a diverse work force, diversity strategies focus on managing the environment to enhance the productivity of all individuals, including white men. Strategies include diversity training for managers and other employees, communication statements from senior managers, mentoring programs for white women and people of color, and diversity task forces (Blanton, 1994). These strategies are consistent with a philosophical ideal of what the corporate culture should look like with respect to a diverse work force. Most Fortune 500 companies have some type of diversity program, and one consulting company estimates that companies spend one to two million dollars a year on diversity consultants (Shao, 1994), whose number is skyrocketing. One estimate places the number of diversity consultants between 3,000 and 5,000 (Shao, 1994).

While there is certainly economic rationale for employing a diverse workforce, the widespread adoption of diversity programs may be causing additional problems. The most visible problem is backlash by white males, who are “feeling frustrated, resentful, and most of all, afraid” (Galen, 1994, p. 50). At the same time that companies are emphasizing a diverse managerial workforce, they are “downsizing” and experiencing massive lay-offs and forced early retirements. Before the interest in diversity, and even with Affirmative Action, managerial jobs were the domain of white men. Now, in companies that are pushing diversity strategies, white men are finding themselves competing with white women and people of color for even fewer jobs and promotions. They have never before had to compete with these groups of people and now find it easy to blame stalled careers and job losses on white women and people of color.

Yet it is not only white males who feel a backlash from diversity strategies. While being the main beneficiaries of diversity strategies and having a direct stake in witnessing such cultural change, white women and people of color may feel “they must overcome the stigma that they achieved their positions on the basis of their race or gender rather than merit” (Alexander, 1994). This places additional stress on these groups, who often feel they must perform better than the best white male in an effort to prove that they are qualified for their jobs. Minorities are “saddled with expectations of under-achievement that make any mis-step a confirming catastrophe” (Alsop, 1994, p. 17). Women and minorities have an extra burden of representing their entire racioethnic and gender group, as individual mistakes are attributed to the entire group. This extra stress and burden manifests itself in “rage and confusion” (Alsop, 1994, p. 17) and can detract from organizational responsibilities and work effectiveness.

Thus, while companies need a diverse work force, and need to create an environment conducive to the hiring, retention, and promotion of diverse individuals, there are potential pitfalls and backlashes to diversity programs that are related to the baggage individuals bring into the organization from their social relations outside the organization. Diversity strategies, rather than mitigating intergroup tensions, can accentuate them. Organizations trying to implement diversity strategies may face resistance from employees, both those claiming reverse discrimination and those fearing stigmatization. Individuals may have mixed feelings about diversity. On the one hand they recognize the need for such strategies and may realize personal benefits. On the other hand, they may fear for their own careers or resent the extra psychological stresses of the actual implementation of the strategies. In this study, I examine reactions to diversity strategies.

Experiences with Affirmative Action programs suggests that we will find resistance both from white men who claim reverse discrimination and other groups who worry about the perception that they did not obtain their positions based on merit. However, the questions I ask run deeper. I am interested in whether the type of diversity strategy a company uses are related to different types of reactions, and I am interested in how people from different racioethnic gender groups feel about each other in the context of diversity strategies.

There are reasons of both theoretical and practical importance for conducting such a study. I contribute to the literature on cultural change by examining the implementation of a particular type of strategy, one that threatens incongruence between status hierarchies within organizations and status hierarchies outside of organizations. Diversity strategies represent an attempt to change a dominant organizational culture, one that favors the homosocial reproduction of white male managers (Kanter, 1977). Because the culture is one that has been pervasive for many years, and is supported by the majority of organization members, the implementation is likely to meet a great deal of resistance. I also contribute to literature on intergroup relations by examining how strategies developed at the organizational level make intergroup differences salient, and consequently affect intergroup attitudes. The effect of salience on intergroup dynamics has been studied in experimental conditions (Hogg & Turner, 1987), but not in a natural setting. I examine the effect of salience on intergroup dynamics in a natural setting in two organizations with diversity strategies.

It is also of practical importance that diversity strategies make salient racioethnic and gender differences. Under such conditions, intergroup attitudes are intensified and exhibited more explicitly by members of the different groups. Such a dynamic can help clarify the perceptions and attitudes held by different groups and can consequently help companies tailor their programs to meet the needs of different racioethnic and gender groups. In addition, understanding different reactions to the diversity strategies can help companies facilitate implementation of the strategies.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this section, I draw on three streams of literature to develop a set of questions. First, I examine the literature on cultural change to explore reactions to diversity strategies. Second, I use intergroup theory to generate inquiries into intergroup attitudes of

employees under different diversity strategies. Finally, I use Bailyn's (1989) concept of orientational categories to understand intragroup heterogeneity and reactions to the diversity strategies. I present the questions in three stages. First, I use the literature to develop questions regarding the reactions of white men. I focus first on white men because most theory has focused on this group. I then re-apply the literature to develop questions about the attitudes held by people of color. Finally, I present questions about the attitudes held by white women.

Questions About White Men

Strategies for Change

Diversity managers from some of the large U.S. companies on the forefront of addressing diversity issues agree that to attain diversity goals, diversity must become part of the culture of the organization. This is a difficult proposition because diversity strategies represent a "revolutionary change process," (Schein, 1985 p. 308), as they are an attempt to change the status quo by redistributing access to power and resources. Diversity strategies strive to upset the current status hierarchies and can represent a threat to those who have historically controlled the power in organizations. Superordinate motives of organizational viability may not be enough to create the desired cooperative atmosphere when such motives are perceived to conflict with individual motives of self-viability. Creating a state of interdependence among individuals from different social groups is ineffective without "a new culture in which to view and understand each other" (Blake, Shephard, & Mouton, 1964 p. 111). It is difficult to change attitudes and stereotypes, especially given the historical and social context in which organizations and diversity strategies are embedded. New organizational expectations need to be institutionalized, and organizations are trying to do this by modifying the norms guiding individual behavior. Diversity managers believe that a change in organizational culture is necessary to prevent individuals with power, namely white men, both from ignoring the potential contributions of less powerful individuals, white women and people of color, and from

engaging in activities that might inhibit white women and people of color from performing to their full potential.³

“Organizational culture” is a pattern of basic assumptions, beliefs, values, and expectations shared by members of an organization (Schein, 1985; Siehl & Martin, 1984). The part of culture that organizations try to change with diversity programs is the culture regarding the appropriate positions of white women and people of color within the organization. Organizations are trying to change the assumption that white men deserve higher status positions, the belief that white women and people of color possess certain characteristics that render them unsuitable for higher status organizational positions, the value placed on homogeneity, and the expectations of behaviors appropriate for advancement within the organizational hierarchy.

Interviews⁴ with fourteen diversity managers in large U.S. organizations indicate that organizations are, in fact, using different strategies to convey a change in organizational culture with respect to diversity. I found that organizations use what I call visible and subtle methods of communicating a desired change in culture. I did not coin these terms in a vacuum. Siehl and Martin (Siehl & Martin, 1984) suggest that organizations transmit changes in organizational culture either through explicit methods, including rules and procedures, broad policy statements, formal training programs, and quantitative controls, or through implicit methods, such as jargon, organizational stories, and rituals. They argue that implicit methods alone are not enough to communicate culture; explicit methods must reinforce the implicit methods. Similarly, Schein (1985) classifies strategies as primary and secondary mechanisms, and maintains that secondary mechanisms work only if they are reinforced by the primary mechanisms. Primary mechanisms include what leaders measure and control, leader reactions to critical events, deliberate role modeling, criteria for allocation of rewards, and criteria for recruitment, selection, and promotion; secondary mechanisms include the organization’s design and structure, organizational systems and procedures, stories, legends, and myths, and formal statements of organizational philosophy.

³ This statement is based on preliminary interviews that I conducted with fourteen diversity managers. These interviews helped me understand the various diversity strategies companies have in place, as well as the issues around changing a culture to become more accepting of diversity.

For two reasons I did not find either Siehl and Martin's or Schein's typology useful for categorizing the diversity strategies of the companies I contacted. One, neither provides a clear set of dimensions for determining which strategy a company is using. Two, although the strategies I classify as visible are similar to the explicit or primary strategy, the strategies I classify as subtle do not correspond with an implicit or secondary strategy.

TABLE 1.1
Visible and Subtle Strategies of Communicating a Change in Organization Culture

Dimension of Program	Visible Strategies	Subtle Strategies
Motivation for strategy	Top-down	Grass roots
Articulation of policies	Specific strategic initiatives	Broad diversity goals
Evaluation of success	Success in terms of hiring, retention, and career paths	Success not measured
Training	Diversity part of core curriculum of every training program	Voluntary participation in diversity workshops.

Based on the interviews with the diversity managers, I determined four dimensions that describe diversity programs as either visible or subtle methods of communicating culture: motivation for the diversity strategy, articulation of policies, evaluation of success, and training programs (see Table 1.1). In companies with visible strategies, top management initiates the strategies and mandates compliance throughout the organization. Clearly articulated specific strategic initiatives and criteria for measuring successful goal attainment are characteristic of visible strategies. Rewards and punishments for organization leaders are tied to leaders attaining specific goals. For example, one CEO has threatened to fire any division senior vice-president who fails to meet the diversity criteria outlined by the diversity department. The concept of diversity is incorporated in every training and development program, from leadership training to writing workshops, and diversity classes are mandatory for everyone. Often there are specific programs, such

⁴ See previous footnote.

as mentoring programs and company-sponsored employee networks, to increase contact between powerful organizational members and white women and people of color. Although one social group usually forms the core of the company-sponsored network, members of other social groups have incentives to attend the meetings. At the meetings, top managers share information about the company, promotion opportunities, and other work-related issues. In addition, attendees discuss not only career development issues relevant to the core social group, but also issues relevant to all workers. Since the meetings are seen as a source of information, many individuals outside the core are encouraged to, and in fact do, attend.

Subtle strategies, on the other hand, involve broad, sweeping goals with no “meat on the bones,” as one diversity manager described such policies. They tend to have emerged over a period of time, and were initially initiated by grass roots employee groups such as women’s networks or black caucus groups. Although individuals are expected to change behavior commensurate with the broad goals, ramifications for noncompliance do not exist, and there are no criteria for measuring success. Often, top management communicates a commitment to diversity by its presence on diversity committees. Employee participation in workshops and diversity programs, however, is voluntary.

Thus, diversity strategies represent the various strategies organizations employ to communicate the desired changes in culture. Siehl and Martin (1984) and Schein (1985) both would maintain that subtle strategies on their own are insufficient to change culture, and that they must be supplemented by visible methods of changing culture. Such may be the case when the changes in culture are consistent with the values and expectations of the dominant group in the organization, but diversity strategies represent attempts to change the status hierarchies and present a threat to the dominant group. Like Affirmative Action programs, diversity strategies are confronting more resistance, especially from white men, as they make salient the intended change in status hierarchies. White men are becoming angry and resentful toward other groups whom they perceive as benefiting from the diversity strategies at the expense of white men (Alexander, 1994; Galen, 1994). Because changing culture involves changing beliefs and values (Sathe, 1985; Schein, 1985), changing culture is difficult. Any strategy for change is likely to encounter resistance and “the more radical the proposed change in culture’s content, the greater its resistance to change” (Sathe, 1985). Thus it is possible that resistance to change among white men will be higher in an organization with a visible strategy for

changing organizational culture than in an organization with a subtle strategy. Consequently, visible methods may not be appropriate, as measured by resistance, when a change in organizational culture involves a change in status hierarchies.

Question one: When a proposed strategic change involves an upset in the status hierarchies, is resistance to change among white men higher in a company with a visible strategy for change than a subtle strategy for change?

Intergroup and Social Identification Theory

Intergroup theory and social identification theory are of particular relevance to a study of the relationship between diversity strategies and individual attitudes. First, intergroup theory maintains that there will be intergroup attitudes, defined as ethnocentric, antagonistic, or self-deprecatory (Hogg & Turner, 1987), between two groups when there are opposing claims to scarce resources. Ethnocentric intergroup attitudes are those that indicate more concern for one's own group than for other groups. Antagonistic intergroup attitudes are those that derogate other groups. Self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes are those that derogate one's own group. The hierarchical and pyramidal nature of organizations limits mobility opportunities for a large number of individuals, especially as they move higher up in the organization (Rosenbaum, 1989). Thus, promotions become scarce resources. Further, the distribution of promotions in organizations is highly correlated with race/ethnic and gender background, accentuating the status hierarchy within organizations. Differences in social status will intensify intergroup attitudes (Tajfel, 1972). Whenever social stratification is based on unequal distribution of scarce resources, the social situation will be characterized by ethnocentrism and out-group antagonism (Tajfel, 1972).

Second, social identity theory is concerned with the effect of social categorizations on intergroup behaviors. The theory posits that when social identity is more salient than personal identity, intergroup behavior and attitudes will result (Hogg & Abrams, 1988). Research has shown that while competition is sufficient for intergroup attitudes to occur, it is not necessary. However, the perception that different social groups exist is sufficient to trigger these intergroup attitudes (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Thus, two forces, differences in social status between groups and salience of social groups, can intensify intergroup attitudes, and diversity strategies contribute to both forces. In the following

paragraphs, I will discuss social status and salience. But first, I discuss the assumptions underlying, and define some of the key terms central to, intergroup theory.

Assumptions and definitions

First, consistent with the assumptions of the social psychological study of intergroup relations, it is my position that there are properties of groups that exist independent of the individuals that comprise the group, but that the study of intergroup dynamics requires examination of how group membership affects individual attitudes and behaviors toward members of other groups (Sherif, 1966; Stephan 1991).

Some researchers of group dynamics define groups as entities distinct from the individuals that comprise them. For example, McDougall (1921, p. 63) speaks of a 'group spirit:'

The group spirit, the idea of the group with the sentiment of devotion to the group developed in the minds of all its members, not only serves as a bond that holds the group together or even creates it, but ... it renders possible truly collective volition (p.63).

At the same time, other researchers of group dynamics maintain that there is no psychology of groups independent of the individuals that comprise them. For example, Allport (1924, p. 40) argues that "there is no psychology of groups which is not essentially and entirely a psychology of individuals." He points out that group behavior is "learned by each individual from the specific language and behavior of other individuals." and that "were all the individuals of a group to perish at one time, the so-called 'group mind' would be abolished forever." Researchers of intergroup dynamics, such as Sherif and Sherif (1979), define groups as having properties that are distinct from the individuals that comprise the group, yet are a function of these individuals:

A group is a delineated social unit with properties which can be measured and which have consequences for the behavior of its members. These properties include the structure or organization of the group and the set of norms regulating the behavior of members in pursuing group goals (pp. 8-9).

It is this premise that provides support for the assumption that intergroup attitudes are a function of group membership.

Second, consistent with current definitions of a social group, I assume that membership in a social group does not require physical interaction; rather, psychological interaction is sufficient (Alderfer & Smith, 1982; Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Turner, 1982): “Members [of a social group] seem to share no more than a collective perception of their own social unity and yet this seems sufficient for them to act as a group” (Turner, 1982). Social psychology is concerned with exploring “the psychological processes involved in translating social categories into human groups” (Hogg & Abrams, 1988, p. 17). Human groups are statistically or demographically distinct categories, and a social group is “two or more individuals who share a common social identification of themselves or perceive themselves to be members of the same social category” (Turner, 1982).

Third, stereotypes are sets of traits attributed to social groups, and are used to categorize people into social groups or to predict and explain behavior (Stephan, 1991). They are cognitive tools that help individuals segment, classify, and order the social environment, thus facilitating their engagement in many social behaviors (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Hence, social groups are inevitable because they fulfill individual and societal needs for order, structure, simplification, and predictability, and consequently allow people to understand the world around them and know how to act (Hogg & Abrams, 1988).

Fourth, intergroup relations refers to relations between two or more social groups and their respective members (Sherif & Sherif, 1979). Intergroup attitudes reflect how members of groups explain their experiences and influence relations with members of other groups (Alderfer & Smith, 1982; Billig, 1976; Blake, et al., 1964; Sherif, 1966). Individuals make social comparisons so as to maximize intergroup differences and in-group similarities⁵.

Finally, it is impossible to understand the nature of intergroup behavior without understanding the social context in which such behavior exists. Society comprises social

⁵ This assumption differs from Festinger’s theory of social comparison, who maintains that people make comparisons to better themselves.

categories which stand in power and status relations to one another. Individuals define themselves in terms of their social group memberships, and the power and status of their social groups relative to others affect individual social behavior (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

I now return to the discussion of social status and the salience of social groups and how they relate to intergroup attitudes in the context of diversity strategies.

Social Status

Differences in social status between social groups intensify intergroup attitudes. Historically, white men have competed only with other white men for positions of high status in organizations, while white women and people of color have traditionally held lower status positions. Now, other racioethnic gender groups are claiming rights to compete for high status positions, and diversity strategies legitimize this right. As white women and people of color make inroads into these positions, we see a shift from congruent to incongruent embeddedness. Congruent embeddedness exists when the status relationships or hierarchy within the organization mirrors that in society at large; incongruent embeddedness exists when the status hierarchy within the organization differs from that in society at large (Thomas & Alderfer, 1989). When there is congruent embeddedness, sexist and racist assumptions regarding the suitability of women and people of color for managerial positions are allowed to persist in the organization (Thomas & Alderfer, 1989). Consistent with Kanter's (1977) theory of tokenism, this reasoning suggests that as the organizational structure shifts from congruent to incongruent, sexist and racist assumptions should decline within the organization. A competing theory, called the minority group size-inequality hypothesis in the sociology and psychology literature (Allport, 1954; Blalock, 1956; Blalock, 1967; South, et al., 1982), predicts the opposite will occur. This theory states that as the number of minority individuals increases they will suffer from more discrimination from members of the dominant group. Evidence supports this latter theory at the social and individual levels. At the social level, Reed (1972) finds a positive correlation between the percent of black residents and the number of lynchings in Mississippi counties between 1889 and 1930. At the individual level, Giles (1977) finds a positive relationship among white Southerners between racially hostile attitudes and the proportion of county residents who are black, and South et al. (1982) find that an increase in the number of women in a work

group is negatively related to the amount of social support females receive from male coworkers.

The reasoning underlying the minority group size-inequality theory is twofold. First, as the numbers of minorities in a group increases, the frequency of contact between members of the dominant and minority groups increases. Consequently, discrimination increases (Blau, 1977; Blau, 1980). Second, “the larger the relative size of the minority... the more minority individuals there should be in direct or potential competition with a given individual in the dominant group” (Blalock, 1967 p. 148). Members of the dominant group begin to discriminate against members of the minority groups because the minority individuals present a threat to the economic and political security of the dominant group. Discriminating against the minority groups is a way to mitigate the threat. A finding by Harlan and Weiss (1982) reconciles these two competing theories. They find that when there are only a few minority members in a group, the token theory is relevant; the intergroup dynamics reflect Kanter’s (1977) and Thomas and Alderfer’s (Thomas & Alderfer, 1989) predictions. However, when there are larger numbers of minority members in a group, the minority group size-inequality theory is relevant; discrimination and antagonistic intergroup dynamics occur.

Diversity strategies threaten to cause a shift from congruent to incongruent embeddedness. Because they increase the presence of white women and people of color in managerial positions, they also threaten to change the relative social status of white men in the organization. Since the diversity strategies present a direct threat to white men’s career possibilities, we should expect that minority group-size dynamics will prevail. Thus, white men who perceive that large numbers of white women and people of color are making inroads into management will also perceive a threat to their careers, as indicated by the minority group-size hypothesis.

Question two: What kind of threat to their status do white men perceive from diversity strategies? What is the relationship between the perception of a threat from white women and people of color and reactions to the diversity strategy.

Salience of Social Groups

Salience of social groups can intensify intergroup attitudes (Hogg & Turner, 1987), and diversity strategies accentuate the salience of social groups. In the social psychology

literature, salience is defined in terms of inter- and intra-category “collective encounters” (Doise, 1978; Doise & Sinclair, 1973). Inter-category collective encounters, i.e. two white men meeting two African-American women, accentuate salience. Intra-category collective encounters, i.e. two white men meeting two white men, attenuate salience.

Experimental conditions (Hogg & Turner, 1987) support the hypothesis that sex salience increases in-group identification and out-group differentiation (Oakes & Turner, 1985; Turner, 1985)⁶. Since the main emphasis of most diversity programs is on racioethnic background and gender the salience of racioethnic and gender groups is naturally enhanced.

When conditions accentuate race and gender salience, we find more intergroup attitudes, and the type of attitudes that occur in each group differ and are a function of the social relations between the sexes and among the races. Because visible strategies will accentuate racioethnic and gender salience more than subtle strategies, we should expect more intergroup attitudes in the organization with visible strategies.

Question three: Is there a relationship between strategy for change and intergroup attitudes? Is there a relationship between intergroup attitudes and reactions to the diversity strategy?

Orientational Categories

In the application of intergroup theory to organizations, Alderfer and others suggest there are two types of groups in organizations, identity groups and organizational groups (Alderfer & Smith, 1982; Thomas & Alderfer, 1989). An identity group consists of individuals with similar biological characteristics and historical experiences, and organizational groups are formal work groups defined by the organization’s structure. Identity groups are what the social psychologists call social groups. It is an organizational reality that the two types of groups are not independent. In organizations we tend to find a work force stratified along the same racioethnic and gender lines as society. White males occupy high status positions, and other groups occupy the lower

⁶ There is also experimental evidence that salience increases self-categorization in religious groups identification (Charters & Newcomb, 1952), ethnic identity (Dion et al, 1978), and gender identity (Rosenkrantz, et al, 1968).

status positions. Diversity strategies are directly concerned with the correlation between identity and organizational groups and are trying to diminish work force stratification along racioethnic and gender lines.

More specifically, Alderfer (1982) defines a group as:

“a collection of individuals (1) who have significantly interdependent relationships with each other, (2) who perceive themselves as a group by reliably distinguishing members from non-members, (3) whose group identity is recognized by non-members, (4) who, as group members acting alone or in concert, have significantly interdependent relations with other groups, and (5) whose roles in the group are therefore a function of expectations from themselves, from other group members, and from non-group members” (p. 38).

Unlike organizational groups, identity group membership does not require physical interaction. Members of identity groups only need to share a collective perception of their own social unity (Turner, 1982). Early definitions of interdependence (Campbell, 1958; Lewin, 1948) were based on the concept of physical social interaction. Yet, it is quite possible for two individuals to have a high degree of social interaction, and a low degree of common fate, or a low degree of social interaction and a high degree of common fate. The later definitions emphasize a psychological sense of association, where members perceive themselves as sharing a common fate (Alderfer & Smith, 1982; Turner, 1982). Thus, interdependence of identity group members is more psychological than physical and stems from common histories and work experiences.

Defining identity or social groups in terms of common social identification is limiting in that doing so presumes homogeneity within identity groups. By classifying an individual as belonging to a racioethnic gender identity group, and ignoring other individual differences, we are making assumptions about that individual's past experiences, both within and outside the work place. In doing so, we lose important intragroup differences and may overlook key differences in perspectives among the racioethnic gender identity group members. In addition, it ignores the differing degrees of perceived psychological interaction with the in-group, and perceived psychological distancing from the out-group.

In a society, individuals can be grouped any number of ways and it is society that chooses the way. The choice of groupings is merely symbolic and serves to legitimize “economic constraints defining those who are dominated and the power of those who dominate” (Deschamps, 1982, p. 89). Guillaumin (1994) argues that such categorizations allow members of the dominant group to be seen as individuals, while members of the dominated groups are seen as members of the group, their main characteristics being based on the traits that the dominant group attributes to the group as a whole. To work within the boundaries of a definition of a group based upon simple racioethnic gender lines perpetuates a social order in which one group, the dominant group, imposes its language and status and power hierarchies on the less dominant groups (Deschamps, 1982; Guillaumin, 1994). More specifically, and more importantly, such an approach “largely ignores the crucial issue of the extent to which the individual identifies with the cultural traditions of the group” (Cox, 1993, p. 8) .

Rather than treat racioethnic gender groups as a single entity, I use “orientational categories” (Bailyn, 1989, p.481) to look at members of these groups as individuals with different perspective and attitudes. Orientational categories are a way of classifying individuals to reflect differences in their subjective interpretations of social reality. Using orientational categories, I am able to investigate intragroup differences in perceptions, attitudes and reactions to diversity strategies.

The concepts of fairness, or justice, and privilege are at the heart of diversity strategies. Diversity strategies embody the nature of access to privileges, as they are an attempt to create equal opportunities for all. Thus, access to privileges is a pertinent social reality in the context of diversity strategies. Further, perceptions of relative access to privileges is a key differentiating variable as to perceptions of status stability. Perceptions of access to privileges imply views about what groups in the company have opportunities to move to higher status positions in the organization. As discussed above, different perceptions about status stability will result in different intergroup attitudes. To understand intergroup dynamics, it is necessary to understand the relations among the groups in a social context, especially the power relations and perceptions of relative power and status among the groups (Alderfer & Smith, 1982; Billig, 1976; Hogg & Turner, 1987). Because society associates men and whites with high status and women and non-whites with low status, white men who perceive their status to be stable and legitimate will express less extreme and overt in-group favoritism and discrimination. White men who

perceive their status to be unstable will express more extreme and overt in-group favoritism and out-group discrimination.

Research on reactions to Affirmative Action programs supports the premise that different perceptions about status stability will result in different attitudes. Tougas (1989) finds that white men who strongly identify with their group and embrace a male dominant ideology are less likely to perceive women in the work force as a disadvantaged group. Consequently, they are more likely to react negatively to Affirmative Action programs. He shows that reactions to Affirmative Action programs are influenced by beliefs about how the opportunity structure works, and for white men to favor affirmative action, they must first recognize that women as a group are unfairly treated and that their career opportunities are more limited than men. Thus, his research supports the premise that access to privileges is a key differentiating factor in perceptions of organizational opportunities and that the reactions to diversity strategies, as well as intergroup attitudes, will vary with variations in perceptions of access to privileges.

Question four: How do intragroup variations in perceptions of status stability moderate the relationship between strategy for change and both reactions to the change and intergroup attitudes?

I do not entirely abandon the concept of racioethnic gender identity groups. Social categorization can have psychological effects on group members; one consequence of social categorization is that members of one group are psychologically separated from members of another group. If the categorization is constructed by a dominant group of individuals to better differentiate themselves from other groups, wide-spread adoption of the social categories legitimizes the social divisions and the status accompanying the divisions (Billig, 1976). Further, mere identification with one group rather than another creates the perception of in-group similarities so that similarities among group members, or rather the perceived similarities, are products of the categorization. Thus, while examining the social groups as comprised of individuals is a first step in breaking down some of the barriers that prevent researchers from identifying important intragroup differences, it is still necessary to recognize the social forces that can create a psychological connection among members of a racioethnic gender group.

Questions about Black Men and Women

I consider black men and women as one analytical group. However, I do so only after careful consideration of the data.⁷ The historical experiences of black men and women, as well as their historical relationships with white Americans, are different. Further, to combine men and women of color together denies each group their gender identities, and studies comparing the experiences of minority men and women suggest that they do have unique organizational experiences. For example, Thomas (1989) writes that taboos embedded in the historical context of cross-race sexual relationships between black men and women and white men and white women contribute to differences in mentoring experiences of black men and women. Also, black women hold a unique position as both a black individual and as a woman. Although there is some debate as to whether this is seen as an advantage (they constitute a two-for-one in the Affirmative Action count) or a disadvantage (the experience both gender and race discrimination), the reality is that they share neither gender nor race in common with the dominant group. Black men, on the other hand, do share gender in common with the dominant group. However, they are not immune to cross-race dynamics that have characterized relationships between white and black men for the duration of their history in America. Thus, “gender and race interact in complex ways to influence individuals’ career experiences” (Thomas & Alderfer, 1989, p. 144).

Strategies for Change

Previously, I argued that white men would resist visible strategies for change more than subtle strategies for change because diversity strategies represent attempts to change the

⁷ One drawback to many studies of minority-majority relationships is that they either combine white women and people of color into one analytical category, or ignore people of color altogether. When researchers separate white women and people of color, they tend to combine all people of color into one analytical category, ignoring ethnic and gender differences. Such an approach is a first step in understanding the different work experiences of groups other than white men. It is also a first step in understanding majority-minority or dominant-subordinate group relationships. In this research, I initially intended to look at black men and women as two separate groups. However, the responses for the two groups were very similar across almost all variables. It appears that the nature of the questions I asked on the survey elicited race-salient responses more than gender-salient responses among the black respondents. Thus, I combine the two groups in my analysis. While I do not carry the analysis to the detail initially intended, I do contribute to more in-depth understanding of race and gender relations by analyzing the experiences of white women separately from those of black men and women.

dominant culture. My argument parallels Sathe's (1985) argument that any strategy for change is likely to encounter resistance and "the more radical the proposed change in culture's content, the greater its resistance to change." This line of reasoning may only address dynamics among white men. Despite popular literature arguing that black men and black women resent the additional stresses they experience because of the increased salience from the emphasis on race and gender, they have a vested interest in cultural change and should wish to see the organization undertake specific efforts to foster change. If this is the case, we should expect that black men and women would be more supportive of a visible than a subtle strategy for change.

Question five: How do black men and women react to diversity strategies? Will there be more support in a company with a visible strategy for change or in a company with a subtle strategy for change?

Intergroup Theory

Intergroup theory examining status incongruencies tends to focus on the attitudes of the dominant group. However, social identification theory can help us predict intergroup attitudes of subordinate groups. One study of minority and majority relations in the British parliament (Kelley, 1973) finds that members of the minority group exhibited higher levels of intergroup differentiation than members of the majority group, which resulted in higher levels of ethnocentrism. Kelley's interpretation of this finding is that there is an attempt to combat the relatively negative social identity associated with minority group membership. An additional interpretation is that minority members are more aware of their social status. It is easy for whites, especially white males, to take for granted the many privileges they experience as a consequence of their race and gender (McIntosh, 1988). Thus, unless they perceive a direct threat from the minority group, the majority group will perceive less intergroup conflict than minority members who would like to change the status system, and in Kelley's study there was no direct threat from the minority group.

Further, it is likely that salience is non-symmetrical. In particular, the social category of white male is not as salient as non-white male groups. Salience is not independent of the power relations among groups. Deschamps (1982) argues that to dominant groups in a society, only members of the dominant group have individuality. Minority groups are viewed as entities composed of undifferentiated elements. Once minority members are

designated as a member of some group, individuals are defined by the terms describing that group. Thus, salience of non-dominant groups is greater than the salience of the dominant groups. The above-mentioned study by Kelly (1973) indicates that the impact of the greater salience of minority groups may be that minority group members will express more in-group favoritism and out-group differentiation than majority group members. Her study was conducted on groups with equal social status, yet is consistent with an experimental finding that females, a low status category, tend to be more ethnocentric than males, a high status category (Hogg & Turner, 1987)

Social identity theory maintains that there are two belief systems with respect to social status hierarchies that members of subordinate groups may hold (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The first belief system is that status boundaries are permeable and if you are unsatisfied with your present position it is possible to pass from one group to another through hard work, talent, or luck. In the diversity literature, this is known as assimilation. Minorities believe that if they behave like the dominant group, and adopt the values of the dominant group, they will be accepted by the dominant group and enjoy the benefits awarded the dominant groups. In fact, if the status system has been legitimized and justified by all members of the group, these minorities may even derogate their own group and display positive attitudes toward the dominant group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The other belief system is that status boundaries are impermeable and that it is impossible to move to another group. The response of minorities with this belief system will depend on whether they perceive any cognitive alternatives to their lower status position. Cognitive alternatives include new dimensions for intergroup comparison, redefining the value of an existing dimension, and comparison with a different out-group. Thus, if cognitive alternatives exist, the status quo will go unchallenged and there will be minimal intergroup behaviors. On the other hand, if there are no cognitive alternatives, and the legitimacy of the status system is questioned, the subordinate group will challenge the dominant group, and intergroup conflict will occur. Diversity strategies present a cognitive alternative to lower status positions. Because visible strategies are more salient, the cognitive alternatives are more explicit. Thus, we should expect fewer intergroup attitudes in a company with a visible strategy.

Question six: Is there a relationship between strategy for change and intergroup attitudes? What is the relationship between intergroup attitudes and reactions to the diversity strategy?

Orientational Categories

Social identity theory argues that, taken as a whole, the more members of a social group believe status boundaries between groups are impermeable, “the more uniformity they will show in their behavior toward members of the relevant out-group, ... and the more they will tend to treat members of out-group as undifferentiated items in a unified social category, rather than in terms of their individual characteristics.” (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, p. 36). On the other hand, the more members of a social group believe that status boundaries are permeable, the more they will display in-group variability of attitudes toward the out-group.

A classic white-American strategy for maintaining privilege (Wellman,) is found in the notion that if-I-can-make-it-anyone-can. Consistent with a belief that status boundaries are permeable, there is a belief that hard work results in social mobility. More black people, however, are likely to believe, based on their past experiences, that their low status position is stable because of impermeable status boundaries. Thus, I expect to find little variability in intergroup attitudes among black respondents.

Question seven: Is there less variation in intergroup attitudes and reactions to the diversity strategies among black men and women than we would expect given the variation in perceptions of status boundary permeability? Do perceptions of status boundary permeability moderate the relationships among the other variables?

Propositions about White Women

White women are an interesting group. On the one hand they share commonalities with both white men and black men and women, and, on the other hand, they share nothing with either group. White women share with white men the culture and privileges correlated with whiteness. Yet they also share with black men and women the experience of discrimination, albeit gender rather than race. At the same time, white women tend to have a completely different relationship to white men than do black men or women. Thus, the reactions to the diversity programs we should expect to find should be a combination of the reactions we expect to find among white men and among black men and women.

Strategies for Change

A study examining women's reactions to affirmative action uses relative deprivation theory, social identity theory, and procedural justice theory to explain the finding that some women endorse affirmative action programs more than others (Tougas & Veilleux, 1989). Tougas maintains that a woman will endorse affirmative action if she feels discontented with the position of women and also feels that affirmative action offers a fair remedy. Women who strongly identify as an employed women will feel especially discontented about the position of women in the economy and be favorably disposed toward affirmative action programs. At the same time, women are influenced by the strength of their attachment to the disadvantaged group. Procedural justice theory asserts that people value justice in general and procedural justice in particular. Thus, women will endorse collective actions that seem fair and do not endorse collective actions that seem unfair.

Applying this line of reasoning to the current situation, the reaction of white women to the diversity strategy depends on the group with which they most identify. Previously, I argued that white men would resist visible strategies for change more than subtle strategies for change because diversity strategies represent attempts to change the dominant culture. Discussing dynamics among black employees, I maintained that the relationship between support for a strategy for change and whether the company employs a visible or subtle strategy depends on the belief structure of the employee. This is also true for white women, although the relevant belief structure relates to perceptions of race and gender salience. White women who perceive more race than gender salience will identify with white men and, like white men, will tend to resist a visible strategy for change more than a subtle strategy for change. On the other hand, white women who perceive more gender than race salience will, similar to black men and women, perceive a vested interest in cultural change to increase boundary permeability, and should wish to see the organization undertake specific efforts to foster change. If this is the case, we should expect white women to be more supportive of a visible than a subtle strategy for change.

Question eight: Is there a relationship between the type of diversity strategy a company uses and the reaction to the strategy? How do race and gender salience influence this relationship?

Intergroup Theory

The reference groups for white women, and the extent to which white women harbor negative intergroup attitudes toward the reference groups, also depend on whether the white women perceive more gender or race salience. If they perceive more race salience than gender salience, the reference group for their intergroup attitudes are people of color. They will harbor more negative intergroup attitudes toward people of color, and fewer negative intergroup attitudes toward white men. If white women perceive more gender salience than race salience, the reference group for their intergroup attitudes are men, and white men in particular. They will harbor more negative intergroup attitudes toward white men, and fewer negative intergroup attitudes toward people of color.

Question nine: What is the relationship between strategy for change and intergroup attitudes? Is there relationship between reactions to the diversity strategy and intergroup attitudes?

Orientational Categories

In the previous two paragraphs I hinted at the role orientational categories play in understanding reactions to the diversity strategies. In fact, for white women, even more so than white men or black men and women, orientational categories are central to understanding the reactions. Because race and gender salience are related to status boundary permeability, the questions about the relationships between diversity strategies, reactions to the diversity strategies, and intergroup attitudes translate into questions regarding how perceptions of status boundary permeability mediate the relationships.

Although white women experience discrimination and lower status because of their gender, they also benefit from the privileges correlated with their race. They share many of the same cultural experiences as white men, as they tend to be the mothers, daughters, sisters, and wives of these men. Thus, while their organizational experiences differ from white men, they will also differ from those of black men and women. The reactions of white women to diversity strategies and the extent to which they harbor negative intergroup attitudes toward white men and people of color will depend on their orientation with respect to status stability and boundary permeability. Their orientation with respect to status boundary permeability is directly related to whether they perceive gender or race as more salient. White women who perceive gender as more salient than

race will perceive less boundary permeability, and thus more status stability, because they will focus on gender discrimination more than race discrimination. On the other hand, white women who perceive race as more salient than gender may perceive their status as stable or unstable, depending on how permeable they perceive their status boundaries relative to those of people of color. Those who perceive boundary permeability for whites but not for other groups will perceive their status as relatively stable. Those who perceive boundary permeability for all groups will perceive their status as less stable.

Question ten: How do perceptions of status boundary permeability mediate the relationships among diversity strategy, reactions to the diversity strategy, and intergroup attitudes?

SUMMARY

Table 1.2 summarizes the questions for each racioethnic gender group. Basically, the questions boil down to three sets of questions. The first set of questions asks about reactions to the diversity strategies. The second set of questions asks about intergroup attitudes and how they related to both diversity strategies and reactions to the diversity strategies. The third set of questions asks how intragroup variations in perceptions of status stability and status boundary permeability mediate the relationships among intergroup attitudes, diversity strategies, and reactions to the strategies. In the discussions preceding each of these sets of questions for each of the racioethnic gender groups I have given some foreshadowing of the answers I expect to find.

TABLE 1.2
Research Questions

	Strategies for Cultural Change	Intergroup Attitudes	Intragroup Heterogeneity
White Men	Is resistance to change among white men higher in a company with a visible strategy for change than a subtle strategy for change?	<p>What kind of threat do white men perceive from diversity strategies and what is the relationship between perception of threat and reactions to the diversity strategy.</p> <p>What is the relationship between strategy for change, intergroup attitudes and reactions to the diversity strategy?</p>	How do intergroup variations in perceptions of status stability relate to variations in intergroup attitudes, and how do they moderate the relationship between organizational strategy for change and individual reaction to the change.
Black Men and Women	What is the reaction of black men and women to a proposed strategic change? Will there be more support in a company with a visible strategy for change or in a company with a subtle strategy for change.	<p>What is the relationship between strategy for change and intergroup attitudes?</p> <p>What is the relationship between strategy for change, intergroup attitudes and reactions to the diversity strategy?</p>	<p>How do perceptions of status boundary permeability mediate the relationships among the other variables?</p> <p>Is there less variation in intergroup attitudes and reactions to the diversity strategies among black men and women than we would expect given the variation in perceptions of status boundary permeability?</p>
White Women	What is the reaction to change among white women? Is there a relationship between race and gender salience and the reaction to the change?	What is the relationship between strategy for change and intergroup attitudes? What is the relationship between reactions to the diversity strategy and intergroup attitudes?	How do perceptions of status boundary permeability mediate the relationships among diversity strategy, reactions to the diversity strategy, and intergroup attitudes.

CHAPTER TWO: METHOD

This chapter describes how I studied the questions presented in the previous chapter, as well as several methodological issues that are unique to research in sensitive areas. I present this material in a temporal fashion, beginning with my strategy for and the difficulty with finding research sites. Second, I present my research design, which is a variation of a static-group comparison survey design. Third, I discuss the level and unit of analysis. An intriguing aspect of this research study is that it spans levels of analysis, linking actions taken at a macro level in the organization to group and individual level attitudes. Fourth, I share the methodology underlying my research process. Rather than using the data to test theory, I use an iterative process of moving back and forth between data and theory to generate a conceptual picture describing the data. Fifth, I describe my sample, and, finally, I discuss several limitations in doing research in the diversity arena.

FINDING A RESEARCH SITE

The largest stumbling block I encountered in commencing this study was finding a research site. Because of the threat of discrimination lawsuits, companies are very reluctant to allow a researcher to dredge up data that could potentially be used to show any kind of bias. This is despite all promises of confidentiality and obligations to the company.

My initial strategy was to contact companies that I knew had addressed diversity in some fashion. Magazines such as Working Woman and Business Week, a previous study by the Catalyst Company (Catalyst, 1991), and newspaper articles in The Wall Street Journal, The New York Times, and The Boston Globe provided the names of approximately 30 companies that had addressed diversity issues. I was able to contact and conduct telephone interviews with diversity managers from 14 of these companies.

Rather than asking outright whether I could study diversity at the company, I initially gathered as much information as I could about the diversity strategy. At this stage, there appeared to be a public relations attitude about the diversity program. The diversity managers with whom I spoke tended to speak with a great deal of enthusiasm about all the changes that were happening within the company with respect to diversity. Toward

the end of the interview, once I had established as much rapport as possible in a 45 minute telephone conversation, I asked the diversity managers what kind of research they felt was important at this time and would most benefit their company. My final question asked about the possibility of conducting research at their company. The majority of respondents (9) said it would not be a problem, and for a while it looked as though I would be able to select a research site based on the theoretical criteria I was developing throughout the interviews. In particular, I began to develop a framework in which I was able to categorize companies as having either a visible or a subtle strategy, and I wanted to study a company with each strategy. In the end, I was able to gain access to two companies, Wireco and Pipeco. In the rest of the companies, I ran into one of two problems. The most common problem (N = 10) was the legal department. As mentioned earlier, companies were afraid of lawsuits. Despite promised confidentiality and anonymity, the legal departments were afraid that someone would be able to subpoena my data, or that my data would be accessible to employees who could use it as a basis for a law suit, and at the end of the day the companies would be financially burdened as a result of my research. The other problem I ran into was the lack of resources, time and people, to assist in such a study. Since my research design did not require significant effort or any money from the company, it is possible that this latter reason in truth disguised legal concerns.

Of the two companies to which I ultimately gained access, one, Wireco, was not a problem at all. When I asked if I could study diversity at Wireco, the diversity manager said yes and directed me to one of her assistants who was extremely helpful throughout the study. At the other company, Pipeco, I was told I could study diversity and I set up a face-to-face interview with the diversity manager to discuss the specifics of the research proposal that I sent him. At the interview, I was again told I could study diversity at Pipeco and the diversity manager offered to set up interviews with about 40 diversity managers at the various business units. This was not part of the research proposal and I told him as such. He told me he would see what he could do. We discussed several ways of sending out my questionnaires and he said he would get back to me. After waiting for a response for a period of time, and receiving none, I called the diversity manager. He was out of the office for an extended period of time recuperating from back surgery. I contacted one of his assistants and explained that I was ready to mail out the survey and needed the list of names. The assistant was of the impression that everything was already agreed upon, and I must admit I did nothing to inform him otherwise. He promptly sent me the requested sample and I was able to proceed with the study at Pipeco. I never did

find out whether the impression was correct or not, and still consider it a stroke of luck that I was able to study diversity programs at Pipeco. It is also luck that I had classified Wireco as having an implicit strategy and Pipeco as having an explicit strategy.

To test the assumption that Pipeco has a visible strategy, while Wireco has a subtle strategy, I asked the respondents to indicate on the survey whether or not their company has any policies or programs that address issues brought about by a more diverse workforce. I then asked the respondents to indicate whether they have attended any diversity workshops or programs and to list the workshops they attended. If the assumption is correct, more Pipeco than Wireco respondents will be aware of a diversity strategy and have participated in diversity workshops.

Table 2.1 shows the percentage of respondents from each company who are aware of a diversity strategy. A higher percentage of respondents from Pipeco than Wireco are aware that their company has policies or programs to address diversity issues (Chi-square=16.61, $p < .001$). The data indicate that Pipeco employees are approximately four times more likely to be aware of a diversity strategy than are Wireco employees (estimated odds ratio=4.46).⁸

TABLE 2.1
Respondents Aware of a Diversity Strategy and Respondents Who Have Attended a Diversity Workshop

	Wireco	Pipeco
Percent aware of a diversity strategy	84%	96%
Percent attended a diversity workshop	59%	80%
Total number of respondents	211	196

An additional characteristic of a visible diversity strategy is that employees are required to attend some type of diversity workshop. Table 2.1 also shows the percentage of

⁸ Pipeco respondents are 23.5 times more likely to have heard of a diversity strategy than to have not heard of the strategy. Comparatively, Wireco respondents are only 5.27 times more likely to have heard than not heard of the strategy.

respondents who have attended a diversity workshop, both for all respondents and for only the respondents who are aware of a diversity strategy. In both categories, a higher percentage of Pipeco respondents than Wireco respondents have attended some kind of diversity workshop. Of all respondents, Pipeco employees are 3.35 times more likely to attend a workshop than Wireco employees. Of the respondents who are aware of a diversity strategy, Pipeco employees are 2.74 times more likely to attend a workshop than Wireco employees.

RESEARCH DESIGN

I used a variation of a static-group comparison survey design for my study. There are two factors I considered in developing a research strategy. The first factor is the diversity strategy. Based on the initial interviews with the fourteen diversity managers I classified diversity strategies as either subtle or visible (see Chapter One). Thus, at one level, I compare the diversity strategies of two companies. The second factor is the racioethnic gender background of the respondent, since I am interested in understanding how people from different racioethnic gender groups view each other in the context of diversity strategies. Thus, at another level I collected data to compare the attitudes of individuals from eight different racioethnic gender groups.

The two most serious threats to internal validity when using this design are selection and mortality (Cook & Campbell, 1979). It is possible that there are aspects of the companies that led them to put the different strategies in place. It is also possible that employees at the organizations chose to work at them because of the diversity strategy in place, and that employees not happy with the diversity strategies left the organization to work elsewhere. However, at both companies, diversity is a new enough phenomenon that, although it is possible, it is unlikely that employees would leave their jobs during a recession because of the strategy.

Based on the interviews with the diversity managers from fourteen U.S. companies, as well as a review of the literature, I developed a questionnaire to collect cross-sectional data from Wireco and Pipeco. The advantage of this research design is that it allows me to study reactions to the diversity strategies and intergroup attitudes in a naturally occurring setting. As I discuss in the section on methodology, this research project is inherently exploratory. Usually one associates more qualitative methods with exploratory

research. However, I elected to use a survey for three reasons. One, I wanted to collect data from a large number of people in order to generate a more complete view of how people respond to diversity strategies. Two, I wanted to ensure anonymity. The types of attitudes I elicit are not always pretty and I thought people might be reluctant to share them if they knew I could identify them. Further, since this research is conducted in an organizational context, I thought that people might worry about who would find out about their attitudes. Finally, I wanted to avoid interviewer bias. As a white female researcher, I felt that people from other racioethnic gender groups would be reluctant to share honest feelings and perceptions with me, either for fear of offending me or out of distrust because of my association with a dominant white group.

At the end of the questionnaire, I asked the respondents if they would be willing to participate in follow-up interviews. The purpose of the interviews is to provide additional insight into the respondents' answers and assist my interpretation of the data. Over 50% of the people who responded to the survey indicated they would like to participate in an interview. The interview processes is still ongoing. Although I do not directly use the data in the dissertation, the interviews have helped to guide the issues on which I focus and my interpretation of the data.

LEVEL AND UNIT OF ANALYSIS

Although I collect data at the individual level, the unit of analysis is multi-level, depending on the context of the analysis. At one level, the unit of analysis is the individual. Some researchers argue that the unit of analysis is the group. Alderfer and Smith (Alderfer & Smith, 1982) recommend using the "microcosm" group to study intergroup relations. Sherif (1966, p.66) says

we ... must consider both the properties of the groups themselves and the consequences of membership on individuals. Otherwise, whatever we are studying, we are not studying groups. We study relations between groups over and above their own internal properties.

Yet, studying intergroup relations is really the study of relations between individuals as they are affected by group membership (Stephan, 1991). Since it is the individual's

perception of social reality and the processing of this information that influence individual behavior, the basic unit of analysis is the individual.

This study links actions taken at a macro level in the organization to group and intragroup attitudes. Consequently, the study involves linking analyses across organizational, group, intragroup and individual levels. At the organizational level, I compare the effectiveness of strategies to communicate change. At the group level, I examine responses of different race and gender groups to diversity strategies. At the intragroup level I explore variation in reactions to the diversity strategies within the different race and gender groups. Finally, through examination of intragroup variations, I account for individual differences in attitudes and link the analysis of macro policies back to individual experiences. Thus, although the data are collected at the individual level, the results of the study have organizational, intergroup, and intragroup implications as well.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology underlying my research design reflects Bailyn's (1977) view of research as a cognitive process. The cognitive process involves moving between the data and theory to develop a conceptual understanding of a phenomenon. I started with a set of research questions generated from a review of relevant literature, and compared how the data I gathered fit the theory. Where the data did not fit, I examined why and re-evaluated the theory. I then re-examined the data. I continued this process until I felt comfortable that my theoretical premises fit the data.

SAMPLE

In this section, I first describe the sample and the response rate. Second, I describe the average age, seniority, and education level of the different racioethnic gender groups included in the sample. Third, I explain why I do not include all respondents in my analysis and present my working sample.

Response Rate

TABLE 2.2
Response Rate and Sample Size⁹

	Wireco		Pipeco	
	17% (N=211)		41% (N=196)	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
White	22% (N=43)	19% (N=27)	41% (N=80)	48% (N=61)
Black	17% (N=34)	17% (N=27)	33% (N=21)	32% (N=9)
Asian	12% (N=32)	16% (N=25)	29% (N=12)	42% (N=5)
Hispanic	20% (N=17)	11% (N=6)	40% (N=4)	44% (N=4)
Total Response Rate	17%	17%	38%	45%
N	126	85	117	79

I mailed surveys to 1212 Wireco employees in three Wireco business units, and 478 Pipeco employees throughout the company. The population of employees from which I took my sample held middle level management positions, or the technical or professional equivalent and above. All were United States citizens who had identified themselves as white, black, Asian, or Hispanic. To ensure adequate representation from all groups, before I took the sample I stratified the population by race and gender. My response rate was 24%; 41% of the Pipeco employees responded to the survey, and 17% of the Wireco employees responded to the survey. Table 2.2 shows the response rate broken down by

⁹ Four respondents indicated that they belonged to racioethnic groups other than the four I intended to include in the study. As this was an error in the sampling process, I excluded these individuals from the analysis.

racioethnic and gender category. Although the percentage of Blacks, Asians and Hispanics who responded from Pipeco is about the same as Whites, the overall numbers are small. This reflects the small number of individuals in these groups who work at the management level Pipeco. Because these groups had such small representation in the higher levels at Pipeco, the sample included every single Black, Asian, and Hispanic employee at Pipeco at the levels included in the sample.

There could be several explanations for the lower response rate at Wireco. Wireco employees could be more busy and have less time to respond to surveys. They could be less interested in the subject. The lower Wireco response rate could also reflect the difference in diversity strategies. At Pipeco, where the diversity strategy is visible, diversity could be at the front of the employees' minds. Pipeco employees were more likely to give lengthy comments throughout the survey. At Wireco, where the diversity strategy is subtle, the employees may not have been aware of the strategy and wondered what the survey was all about. Although it is possible that Wireco employees were more tired of filling out questionnaires, i.e. were more "surveyed out," this is not likely to explain the difference in response rates. While Pipeco contacts expressed skepticism at any employees responding because of being "surveyed out," Wireco contacts expressed no such sentiments.

Age, Seniority, and Education of Respondents

There are differences between the companies and among the racioethnic gender groups in average age, seniority, and education level of respondents. First, Table 2.3 shows the average age of respondents by company and by racioethnic gender group. Overall, the average age of Pipeco respondents is higher than the average age of Wireco respondents. The average age of the men in the sample is higher than the average age of the women, but most of this difference is due to the average age difference between the sexes at Pipeco. Overall, non-White respondents tend to be younger than White respondents. With the exception of Asians, there is not a lot of difference among the average age among the racioethnic gender groups. At Pipeco, the average age of Asian respondents is much higher than the average age of the other racioethnic groups, and at Wireco the average age of Asian respondents is much lower.

TABLE 2.3
Average Age of Respondents
By Company and by Racioethnic Gender Group

	Wireco			Pipeco		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
White	44 (6.7)	42 (5.4)	43 (6.3)	47 (7.4)	41 (5.5)	44 (7.2)
Black	41 (8.0)	39 (5.7)	40 (7.1)	44 (8.3)	39 (5.5)	42 (7.8)
Asian	40 (7.6)	37 (6.1)	39 (7.0)	50 (8.4)	46 (5.2)	49 (6.4)
Hispanic	39 (7.6)	42 (7.9)	40 (7.6)	51 (6.4)	38 (4.1)	44 (8.4)
Total Column Average	41 (7.6)	40 (6.1)	44 (7.4)	47 (7.5)	41 (5.7)	48 (7.1)
N	126	85	211	117	79	196

TABLE 2.4
Average Years Worked for Company
By Racioethnic and Gender Group

	Wireco			Pipeco		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
White	19.2 (8.2)	16.3 (5.4)	15.8 (5.9)	21.7 (8.7)	14.3 (5.6)	16.9 (10.3)
Black	15.7 (7.8)	13.5 (5.5)	14.5 (6.9)	16. (6.9)	10.4 (7.9)	14.4 (7.6)
Asian	11.2 (7.1)	11.5 (5.8)	11.3 (6.6)	20. (6.6)	15.6 (6.6)	18.8 (6.7)
Hispanic	14.9 (6.0)	18.3 (5.4)	18.3 (7.5)	25.6 (4.7)	8.1 (4.5)	18.5 (8.4)
Total Column Average	15.7 (8.3)	14.0 (6.0)	15.1 (7.5)	20.7 (8.3)	13.6 (6.1)	17.8 (8.3)
N	126	85	211	117	79	196

Second, Table 2.4 shows the average years employees have worked for their company by racioethnic and gender group. On average, Pipeco respondents have worked longer at Pipeco than Wireco respondents have worked at Wireco. The larger difference in seniority between males and females at Pipeco accounts for most of this difference. While male Pipeco employees have worked at the company on average, eight years longer than female Pipeco employees, male Wireco employees have worked at Wireco only about one and one-half years longer than female Wireco employees. Further, black employees have less seniority than any other racioethnic group at Pipeco, and Asian employees have less seniority than any other racioethnic group at Wireco. At Pipeco, black and Hispanic women have considerably less seniority than any other racioethnic or gender group.

TABLE 2.5
Highest Education Level Attained By Company and Gender

	Wireco			Pipeco ¹⁰		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
High School	6%	5%	6%	0%	1%	1%
Junior College	6%	9%	7%	0%	1%	1%
Four-year College	34%	31%	33%	40%	30%	36%
Master's	50%	49%	50%	33%	40%	36%
PhD	5%	4%	4%	27%	21%	24%
Total N	126	85	211	117	79	196

Third, Table 2.5 shows the highest education level attained by company and gender. While a higher percentage of respondents from Wireco than Pipeco have Masters' degrees, a higher percentage of respondents from Pipeco have PhDs. There are overall differences in education level attainment between male and female respondents (Chi-square statistic=11.4, p-value<.05), but most of the differences between the sexes can be

¹⁰ Percents for Pipeco do not add up to 100% because 6 respondents checked "other." These responses are not included in Table 2.5.

found at Pipeco. The highest educational level attained by the majority of men is a degree from a four year college. The highest educational level attained by the majority of women is a master's degree. A slightly higher percentage of men than women have PhDs, although the difference is not large.

TABLE 2.6
Highest Education Level Attained By Race

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>
High School	4%	1%	0%	10%
Junior College	4%	7%	0%	7%
Four-year College	41%	39%	17%	29%
Master's	36%	48%	60%	45%
PhD	10%	6%	21%	10%
Total N	201	91	74	31

With respect to race, a higher percentage of Asians than Whites, African-Americans, or Hispanics have attained Master's or PhDs (see Table 2.6). Fewer Hispanics than Whites, African-Americans, or Asians have attained at least a degree from a four-year college. There is not a big difference in educational level attainment between White and African-American respondents, although a slightly higher percentage of African-Americans have at least a Master's degree, and a slightly higher percentage of Whites have a PhD.

The Working Sample

Ultimately, I do not include all of the respondents in the analysis. First, eight of the 407 respondents did not indicate their race, ethnicity, or gender. Since racioethnic gender group is a central construct in my thesis, I was not able to include these people in my analysis. Second, out of the remaining 399 respondents, 41 indicated that they were not aware of a diversity strategy at their company. In the analysis of the quantitative data, I do not include respondents who are not aware of a diversity strategy. The research questions address the reactions of employees to the diversity strategies in their companies. Third, there were too many missing data points on 32 of the remaining 358 surveys to interpolate missing values for inclusion in the analysis. Table 2.9 shows the

number of respondents by company and racioethnic gender group I include in the analysis of the quantitative data.

TABLE 2.9
Number of Respondents Included in Analysis
By Company and Racioethnic Gender Group

	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total</u>
White Men	33	70	103
White Women	15	51	66
Black Men	28	19	47
Black Women	24	9	33
Asian Men	21	10	31
Asian Women	18	3	21
Hispanic Men	13	3	16
Hispanic Women	5	4	9
Total	157	169	326

Further, I do not include Asian or Hispanic respondents in my working sample. As the data in Tables 2.7 and 2.8 demonstrate, there is so much variation in the ethnic background of Asian and Hispanic respondents that any analysis concerning diversity should distinguish among the ethnic groups to do justice to their experiences. Although I included only United States citizens in my sample, the historical experiences of Asians and Hispanics from different countries varies widely with respect to the reasons they came to the United States, their treatment upon entry, and their degree of assimilation. Further, values and cultures vary. Since I am able to demonstrate the key arguments using data from only the white and black respondents, I do not provide a detailed analysis of the Asian and Hispanic respondents. To do justice to these groups I need to take into account the ethnic variations, and this would complicate the analysis beyond what is necessary to convey my message to the reader. However, in the next chapter, I include the aggregated Asian and Hispanic groups in the presentation of first order statistics of my key variables.

TABLE 2.7
Ethnicity of Asian Respondents

	Ethnicity of Respondent						Total
	Chinese	Indian	Korean	Japanese	Thai	Did not Identify	
Wireco	23	13	3	2	1	4	46
Pipeco	6	5	1	0	0	4	16
Total	29	18	4	2	1	8	62

TABLE 2.8
Ethnicity of Hispanic Respondents

	Ethnicity of Respondent						Total
	Mexican	Cuban	South American	Central American	Puerto Rican	Other	
Wireco	7	2	5	4	1	4	23
Pipeco	1	5	1	1	0	0	8
Total	8	7	6	5	1	4	31

LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH ON DIVERSITY

Researching diversity is subject to several limitations. The first I have already mentioned, namely gaining access to organizations based on theoretical criteria. The logic of scientific research requires purposeful selection of research sites that differ on key theoretical constructs and resemble each other on variables not included in the study that could potentially provide plausible alternative explanations for findings. However, as discussed earlier in this chapter, this was not possible.

A second limitation is sample size. Table 2.2 shows the response rates and resulting sample size for Wireco and Pipeco. Although an overall sample size of 407 is respectable, there are small numbers in several of the cells. This is especially true at Pipeco, where only nine black women, five Asian women, four Hispanic men, and four Hispanic women responded to the survey. Notice, however, that the response rate of

these groups does not differ dramatically from the response rates of other groups. This is because the total number of black, Asian, and Hispanic managers is very small at Pipeco.

A third limitation is attaining sensitive data. Organizations are reluctant to share data that are potentially damaging in a lawsuit. For example, a key piece of data that would bring together much of my analyses is the distribution of people by race and gender into different managerial levels. Neither organization would provide these data.

I would suggest that researchers who are interested in researching diversity-related issues not let these limitations daunt their efforts. An imperfect study that pays careful attention to these limitations is preferable to no study at all.

CHAPTER THREE: OPERATIONALIZATION OF VARIABLES

In this chapter, I discuss my operationalization of the key variables and present the first-order statistics for these variables. Although I do not go into further detail on the data from Asian and Hispanic respondents, I include them in this chapter. I hope the data I present here on Asians and Hispanics will motivate further, detailed research on these two very often neglected groups. This chapter discusses eight variables: 1) reactions to diversity strategy, 2) perceived effectiveness of diversity strategy, 3) ethnocentrism, 4) self-deprecation, 5) antagonism toward white women and people of color, 6) perceived threat from women, 7) perceived threat from people of color, and 8) antagonism toward white men.

REACTIONS TO DIVERSITY STRATEGY

In the questionnaire, I ask 12 questions about attitudes toward diversity strategies. A factor analysis using principal components method yielded two factors: reaction to diversity strategy and perceptions of the effectiveness of the strategy. I created two four-item indices based on each factor. Because of low reliability and inter-item correlations, I did not include two of the six items that loaded onto each of the factors.

TABLE 3.1
Reaction to Diversity Strategy
Item Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations

	Does too much to address diversity (1)	Diversity interferes with real work (2)	Spend too much money on diversity (3)	Diversity receives too much attention (4)
(2)	.59			
(3)	.65	.61		
(4)	.68	.63	.73	
Item-total correlation	.71	.69	.77	.77
Mean	1.9	2.0	1.9	1.9
Standard Deviation	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1

The reactions to the diversity strategy range from resistance to support. Resistance and support are two extreme ends of a continuum, and most reactions fall somewhere in-between. I use responses to each of the following questions to create the index (1=do not agree at all; 5 = strongly agree): 1) Wireco/Pipeco does too much to address diversity issues; 2) Addressing diversity interferes with getting real work done; 3) Wireco/Pipeco spends too much money on addressing diversity; and 4) Diversity receives too much attention at Wireco/Pipeco. Higher values of the index indicate more resistance to the strategy, and lower values of the index indicate more support for the strategy. Table 3.1 shows the correlations, means, and standard deviations for the items in the index.

TABLE 3.2
Average Values of Reaction to Diversity Strategy
By Company and By Racioethnic Gender Group
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total</u> ^a
White Men	2.2 (1.0)	2.5 (1.1)	2.4 (1.1)
White Women	1.8 (.5)	1.8 (.9)	1.8 (.8)
Black Men	1.2 (.4)	1.2 (.2)	1.3 (.5)
Black Women	1.2 (.3)	1.4 (.5)	1.2 (.2)
Asian Men	1.9 (.6)	2.3 (1.2)	2.0 (.8)
Asian Women	2.1 (.8)	1.4 (.1)	2.0 (.8)
Hispanic Men	1.6 (.7)	3.8 (1.6)	2.0 (1.2)
Hispanic Women	1.8 (1.1)	2.1 (1.2)	1.9 (1.1)
Total	1.7 (.77)	2.1 (1.04)	1.9 (.94)

^a Statistically significant differences among the racioethnic gender groups at $p < .001$.

Overall, there is more support for the diversity strategy than there is resistance to the strategy. However, level of support varies by company and by racioethnic gender background. Table 3.2 shows average values of support for the diversity strategy by

company and by racioethnic gender group. There is more support overall at Wireco than at Pipeco, and this is true for all racioethnic gender groups except white women, black men, and Asian women. The higher resistance at Pipeco may reflect the large number of white male respondents, who are more likely to resist than support a diversity strategy, from this company. There is no difference in level of support between Wireco and Pipeco for white women and black men, and Asian women at Pipeco show more support for the strategy than do Asian women at Wireco. Among all the racioethnic gender groups, white men show the least support for, or the most resistance to, the strategy. Black employees show the most support for the diversity strategies.

Table 3.3
Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy
Item Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations

	Company has an effective diversity strategy (1)	Company is effectively implementing diversity strategy (2)	Company is not really addressing diversity issues (reversed responses) (3)	Company only addresses diversity issues to create a good public image (reversed responses) (4)
(2)	.65			
(3)	.53	.56		
(4)	.44	.47	.71	
Item-total correlation	.61	.65	.74	.66
Mean	3.6	3.4	2.6	2.4
Standard Deviation	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.3

Although perceptions of the effectiveness of the diversity strategy are not precisely a reaction, they do tell something about how respondents feel about the diversity strategy. I use responses to the following statements (1=do not agree at all; 3=somewhat agree; 5=strongly agree) to create the index measuring perceptions of the effectiveness of the diversity strategy: 1) The company has a very effective strategy to address diversity; 2) The company is effectively implementing its diversity strategy; 3) The company is not really addressing diversity issues; 4) The company only pretends to address diversity

issues to create a good public image.¹¹ Table 3.3 shows the item correlations, means, and standard deviations for these four variables.

TABLE 3.4
Average Values for Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy
By Company and By Racioethnic Gender Group
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total^a</u>
White Men	3.6 (.7)	3.5 (.9)	3.5 (.9)
White Women	3.2 (.6)	2.8 (.9)	2.9 (.8)
Black Men	2.5 (1.1)	2.5 (.8)	2.5 (1.9)
Black Women	2.5 (.9)	2.8 (1.0)	2.6 (.9)
Asian Men	2.6 (.8)	3.4 (.7)	2.9 (.9)
Asian Women	2.9 (.8)	3.3 (.9)	2.9 (.8)
Hispanic Men	2.9 (.7)	2.6 (.8)	2.8 (.7)
Hispanic Women	2.6 (1.0)	3.1 (.7)	2.8 (.9)
Total	3.0 (.9)	3.0 (1.0)	3.0 (.9)

^a Statistically significant differences among the racioethnic gender groups at $p < .001$.

Table 3.4 shows the average values for perceived effectiveness of the diversity strategy by company and by racioethnic gender group. On average, white men perceive the diversity strategies as more effective than the other racioethnic gender groups. Black respondents perceive the diversity strategies as less effective than the other racioethnic gender groups. Overall, there is no difference in perceived effectiveness between Wireco and Pipeco. However, white women and Hispanic men from Wireco perceive a more

¹¹ I reversed the responses for items 3 and 4 so that the meanings of the responses are consistent among all the items.

effective diversity strategy than white women and Hispanic men from Pipeco, and Asian men and women from Pipeco perceive a more effective diversity strategy than Asian men and women from Wireco.

ETHNOCENTRISM

In this study, I use the term *ethnocentric* to refer to attitudes that focus on the needs of one's own racioethnic gender group and ignore those of other racioethnic gender groups. I operationalize ethnocentric intergroup attitudes related to the diversity strategies by examining the extent to which respondents feel the diversity strategy addresses issues unique to other racioethnic gender groups relative to their own. Respondents who focus more on the needs of their own group and less on other groups, i.e. more ethnocentric respondents, will perceive less attention is being given to their own group than to other groups. In the survey, I ask respondents to rate the extent to which they feel Wireco/Pipeco's diversity strategy addresses issues unique to individuals from different racioethnic gender groups (1=does not address; 3 = somewhat addresses; 5=very much addresses). To create an index of ethnocentrism, I first subtract the rating for the respondent's own group from that of other groups. A positive score indicates respondents perceive other groups receive more attention from diversity strategies than their own group, and are therefore more ethnocentric. A negative score indicates respondents perceive other groups receive less attention from diversity strategies than their own group, and are therefore less ethnocentric. The average of these difference scores represents ethnocentric attitudes. Higher and more positive values of the index indicate stronger ethnocentric attitudes.

Table 3.5 shows the average level of ethnocentrism for each racioethnic gender group within each company. Except for white women, who tend not to harbor ethnocentric attitudes, all groups tend to believe that diversity strategies give other groups more attention than their own group. White men harbor the most ethnocentrism. While there are not apparent differences between Wireco and Pipeco among the white respondents, there are differences among respondents from other racioethnic gender groups. Black respondents at Wireco are more ethnocentric than black respondents at Pipeco, and Asian

women and Hispanic respondents at Pipeco are more ethnocentric than these respondents at Wireco.

TABLE 3.5
Average Values of Ethnocentrism
By Company and By Racioethnic Gender Group
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

Racioethnic Gender Group (Cronbach's α)	Wireco	Pipeco	Total^a
White Men ($\alpha=.95$)	+1.8 (1.2)	+1.9 (1.0)	+1.9 (1.1)
White Women ($\alpha=.90$)	-.2 (1.1)	-.4 (.8)	-.4 (.9)
Black Men ($\alpha=.84$)	+.5 (.9)	+0.0 (.8)	+.3 (.9)
Black Women ($\alpha=.76$)	+.3 (.6)	+0.0 (.8)	+.2 (.7)
Asian Men ($\alpha=.83$)	+.6 (1.0)	+.7 (1.1)	+.6 (1.0)
Asian Women ($\alpha=.83$)	+.7 (1.2)	+1.5 (.9)	+.8 (1.0)
Hispanic Men ($\alpha=.72$)	+.5 (.7)	+1.2 (.9)	+.6 (.7)
Hispanic Women (N too small to calculate α)	+.1 (.2)	+.5 (.3)	+.2 (.3)

^a Statistically significant differences among the racioethnic gender groups at $p < .001$.

SELF-DEPRECATORY INTERGROUP ATTITUDES

In this study I define self-deprecation as intergroup attitudes that indicate less faith in the accomplishments of one's own group than other groups. I measure self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes by examining attitudes about the promotion process. I ask respondents to indicate the likelihood of receiving a promotion if competing with a similarly qualified individual from another racioethnic gender group (1 = less likely to receive the promotion; 3 = equally likely to receive the promotion; 5 = more likely to receive the promotion). I average the ratings for racioethnic gender groups other than

those of the respondent's to create a measure of deprecatory intergroup attitudes. Individuals who, on average, believe they are more likely to receive a promotion than individuals from other racioethnic gender groups harbor fewer deprecatory intergroup attitudes than those who are more pessimistic about their chances for receiving a promotion. Table 3.6 shows the average values of perceptions of receiving a promotion by company and racioethnic gender group. Larger numbers indicate a higher degree of deprecatory intergroup attitudes.

TABLE 3.6
Self-deprecatory Intergroup Attitudes
By Company and By Racioethnic Gender Group
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

<u>Racioethnic Gender Group (Chronbach's α)</u>	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total^a</u>
White Men ($\alpha=.97$)	3.9 (.9)	4.0 (.9)	4.0 (.9)
White Women ($\alpha=.81$)	3.6 (.9)	3.4 (.8)	3.5 (.8)
Black Men ($\alpha=.79$)	3.5 (.5)	3.3 (.4)	3.5 (.5)
Black Women ($\alpha=.83$)	3.4 (.5)	3.2 (.7)	3.3 (.6)
Asian Men ($\alpha=.81$)	3.7 (.6)	3.9 (.4)	3.8 (.5)
Asian Women ($\alpha=.83$)	3.2 (.7)	3.3 (.9)	3.2 (.7)
Hispanic Men ($\alpha=.77$)	3.6 (.8)	3.7 (.5)	3.6 (.7)
Hispanic Women (N too small to calculate α)	3.9 (.4)	3.0 (.8)	3.5 (.7)

^a Statistically significant differences among the racioethnic gender groups at $p<.001$.

Overall, there is little difference between Wireco and Pipeco, although Hispanic women at Wireco harbor more self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes than black women at Pipeco. Overall, white, Asian, and Hispanic men and Hispanic women from Wireco harbor more self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes than members of the other racioethnic gender

groups. We find the lowest self-deprecatory attitudes among Hispanic women and black men and women from Pipeco, and Asian women from both companies.

ANTAGONISTIC INTERGROUP ATTITUDES AND PERCEIVED THREAT

In this study, I define antagonism as resentful attitudes toward other racioethnic gender groups. Pertinent measures of antagonistic intergroup attitudes related to diversity strategies vary by racioethnic gender group. I use the perception that diversity strategies allow unqualified people to advance in the organization, as well as perceptions of threat from women and people of color, to operationalize antagonistic intergroup attitudes among white men. For white women, I use these same perceptions, modifying the measures to reflect threat only from people of color. In addition, I also use an index representing resentment toward white men to operationalize antagonistic intergroup attitudes among white women. For black respondents, I use this same index to operationalize antagonism toward white men. Tables 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9 show average values for these variables for all the groups. Although the measures are not pertinent to all groups, I include all groups for a point of reference.

Table 3.7 shows the average perceptions that the diversity strategy allows the promotion of unqualified people for all the racioethnic gender groups in both companies (1=do not agree at all; 3 = somewhat agree; 5=strongly agree). Overall there is little difference between Wireco and Pipeco in the perceptions that diversity strategies allow the promotion of unqualified people. However, Asian and Hispanic respondents from Pipeco are slightly more likely to agree with the statement than are Asian and Hispanic respondents at Wireco. Further, white women and black men from Wireco are slightly more likely to agree with the statement than are white women and black men from Pipeco. White men tend to harbor the highest level of antagonistic intergroup attitudes, although Asian respondents and Hispanic men also harbor relatively high levels of these attitudes. Not surprisingly, black respondents are the least likely to agree with the statement.

TABLE 3.7
Antagonistic Intergroup Attitudes Toward White Women and People of Color
By Company and Racioethnic Gender Group
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total</u> ^a
White Male	3.0 (1.3)	3.0 (1.4)	3.0 (1.4)
White Female	2.3 (1.2)	2.1 (1.0)	2.1 (1.1)
Black Male	1.4 (1.0)	1.4 (.7)	1.4 (.9)
Black Female	1.3 (.6)	1.0 (.0)	1.2 (.5)
Asian Male	2.4 (1.4)	2.7 (1.6)	2.5 (1.5)
Asian Female	2.3 (1.4)	2.7 (1.6)	2.4 (1.3)
Hispanic Male	2.4 (1.2)	3.3 (1.5)	2.6 (1.3)
Hispanic Female	1.5 (.5)	2.0 (1.2)	1.7 (.8)
Total	2.2 (1.3)	2.4 (1.4)	2.3 (1.3)

^a Statistically significant differences among the racioethnic gender groups at $p < .001$.

Table 3.8 shows the average values for perceptions that diversity strategies benefit women and people of color at the expense of men and white employees. This variable represents the perceived threat from white women and people of color as a direct result of diversity strategies. White men perceive the greatest threat, on average, from other groups. Within each racioethnic group, men have a higher average score than women. What is interesting is that, except among black men, this trend is not limited to the perception that diversity strategies benefit women at the expense of men; men of color are more likely than women of color to agree that diversity strategies benefit people of color at the expense of white employees. Black men have about the same average response as black women, as do Asian women, and respondents from these groups are less likely to agree with the statement than are respondents from the other groups.

TABLE 3.8
Diversity Strategies Benefit Women and People of Color
By Company and Racioethnic Gender Group
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

	Benefit Women			Benefit People of Color		
	Wireco	Pipeco	Total ^a	Wireco	Pipeco	Total ^a
White Men	2.6 (1.3)	3.1 (1.4)	3.0 (1.9)	2.6 (1.4)	3.1 (1.4)	3.0 (1.4)
White Women	1.5 (.83)	1.7 (1.0)	1.7 (1.0)	1.9 (1.4)	1.8 (1.0)	1.9 (1.1)
Black Men	1.9 (1.2)	2.1 (1.4)	2.0 (1.2)	1.4 (.8)	1.4 (.8)	1.4 (.8)
Black Women	1.4 (.7)	1.3 (.7)	1.4 (.7)	1.3 (.6)	1.3 (.7)	1.3 (.6)
Asian Men	2.2 (1.2)	3.4 (1.4)	2.6 (1.3)	2.0 (.9)	2.6 (1.4)	2.1 (1.1)
Asian Women	1.6 (.8)	2.5 (.6)	1.8 (.8)	1.3 (.6)	2.0 (1.2)	1.4 (.7)
Hispanic Men	2.5 (1.1)	3.0 (1.0)	2.6 (1.1)	1.6 (1.1)	3.7 (.6)	2.0 (1.3)
Hispanic Women	1.4 (.6)	1.5 (1.0)	1.4 (.8)	2.0 (1.2)	1.5 (1.0)	1.8 (1.1)
Total	2.2 (1.3)	2.5 (1.4)	2.2 (1.3)	1.8 (1.1)	2.4 (1.4)	2.1 (1.3)

^a Statistically significant differences among the racioethnic gender groups at $p < .001$.

Table 3.9 shows the average values by racioethnic gender group and by company of an index representing resentment toward white men. To create the index, I average the responses to three questions: 1) Rate the extent to which you agree being a white male is helpful for attaining a promotion; 2) Rate the extent to which you agree white men have higher status in the organization; and 3) Rate the extent to which you agree it is easier for white men to advance in the organization. All responses range from 1 (do not agree at all) to 5 (strongly agree).

Overall, white men, not surprisingly, have the lowest average scores for this variable. Black respondents have the most resentment toward white men. Although the rest of the racioethnic gender groups have lower average scores than black respondents, the average scores are above the median possible response (3), indicating strong resentment toward white men. There are differences between the companies in average responses within

racioethnic gender groups. White women, black men, and Asian men and women from Pipeco indicate more resentment toward white men than do respondents from these groups at Wireco. On the other hand, black and Hispanic women from Wireco indicate more resentment toward white men than do respondents from these groups at Pipeco. There is no difference in average response between Hispanic men from Wireco and Pipeco.

TABLE 3.9
Average Values for Antagonism Toward White Men
By Company and Racioethnic Gender Group
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total</u> ^a
White Male	2.0 (1.7)	2.2 (.9)	2.1 (.8)
White Female	3.3 (1.2)	3.7 (1.1)	3.7 (1.0)
Black Male	3.9 (1.1)	4.4 (.5)	4.1 (.9)
Black Female	4.0 (.8)	4.0 (.5)	4.0 (.8)
Asian Male	3.3 (1.1)	4.0 (.6)	3.5 (1.1)
Asian Female	3.4 (1.1)	4.9 (.2)	3.6 (1.2)
Hispanic Male	3.8 (1.2)	3.3 (1.9)	3.7 (1.3)
Hispanic Female	3.7 (1.1)	3.6 (1.2)	3.6 (1.0)
Total	3.3 (1.2)	3.1 (1.2)	3.2 (1.2)

^a Statistically significant differences among the racioethnic gender groups at $p < .001$.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Table 3.10 summarizes the key variables I use in the study. It shows the variable, my definition of the variable, and the meaning of the responses.

TABLE 3.10
Summary of Variables

Variable	Definition	Meaning of Responses
Reaction to Diversity Strategy	Reactions range from support to resistance.	Low values indicate support; high values indicate resistance.
Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy	Perceptions of whether the company is really implementing an effective strategy.	The higher the response value, the more effective the respondent perceives the strategy.
Ethnocentrism	Intergroup attitudes that focus on the needs of one's own racioethnic gender group and ignore those of other groups.	A positive score indicates higher ethnocentric intergroup attitudes.
Self-deprecation	Intergroup attitudes that indicate less faith in the accomplishments of one's own group than other groups.	Larger values represent higher self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes.
Antagonism	Resentful attitudes toward other racioethnic gender groups.	For each of these variables, for the pertinent racioethnic gender group, higher values indicate higher levels of out-group antagonism.

White men indicate more resistance to the diversity strategies than all the other racioethnic gender groups. This is consistent with my earlier argument that a radical change in status hierarchies will be met with resistance by those who have the most at stake to lose. In fact, white men at Pipeco are more resistant to the diversity strategy than are white men at Wireco. They also tend to perceive the strategy as more effective than other groups, suggesting that they may fear an actual shift in status taking place. Consistent with this interpretation is that white men, especially those at Pipeco, tend to believe that women and people of color benefit from the diversity strategies at the expense of white men. Further, white men, especially white men at Pipeco, harbor the most negative intergroup attitudes; they are the most ethnocentric, self-deprecatory, and antagonistic of all the racioethnic groups. In the chapter analyzing the data from white men, I will explore the relationships among these variables, and examine in depth the various experiences of white men that can explain these attitudes.

Black respondents are the most supportive of diversity strategy. Yet, of all the racioethnic gender groups, they perceive the strategy as the least effective. This is counterintuitive. One might expect black respondents, who have a lot to gain from an effective diversity strategy, to be supportive of an effective strategy. However, as I demonstrate in the chapter analyzing the data from the black respondents, black employees tend to be supportive of the concept of diversity, not necessarily the strategies their companies employ. Black respondents are among the least ethnocentric of all the racioethnic gender groups, and respondents from Pipeco are less ethnocentric than those from Wireco. It may be that, consistent with perceiving an ineffective diversity strategy, black respondents do not see any group as receiving attention from the diversity strategy. At the same time, black respondents are among the most self-deprecatory group, second only to white men. This is also consistent with perceiving an ineffective diversity strategy; they may not perceive any changes in the likelihood of receiving a promotion with the current strategies. Further supporting this line of reasoning, black women from Wireco harbor more self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes, and perceive a less effective strategy, than black women from Pipeco. Not surprisingly, black respondents are the least likely to agree that diversity strategies allow the promotion of unqualified people. Black employees are usually the victims of accusations of receiving promotions based on race, not merit. Finally, although both black men and black women disagree that diversity strategies benefit people of color at the expense of white employees, black men are likely to agree that they benefit women at the expense of men. In the chapter analyzing the data from the black respondents, I explore these results in more depth. I examine why black respondents tend to support the concept of diversity while at the same time indicating they have little faith in the effectiveness of the existing strategy. I also examine the experiences that can explain the intergroup attitudes.

White women are more supportive of the diversity strategies than are white men, Asians, and Hispanics, but less supportive than blacks. Further, white women at Wireco see the strategy as more effective than white women at Pipeco. This perception could reflect the larger inroads white women have made into management at Wireco resulting from the outcome of a legal discrimination suit.¹² Although the lawsuit addressed race as well as

¹² I do not cite the case to protect the identity of the company.

gender discrimination, white women have historically benefited more from Affirmative Action programs than people of color (Almquist, 1975; Congress, 1993; Macke, 1981; Malveaux, 1985; Nkomo, 1988; Sachdev & Bourhis, 1987; Smith & Tienda, 1988). On average, white women are not ethnocentric, and are the least self-deprecatory of all the racioethnic gender groups. They are less likely than Asians and Hispanics to agree that diversity strategies allow the promotion of unqualified people, but more likely than black respondents. Finally, they disagree that diversity strategies benefit women and people of color at the expense of men and white employees, although they are slightly more likely to agree with the latter. Finding relatively low intergroup attitudes among white women could reflect one of two experiences. One, white women, because of experiences with past sex discrimination, may be aware of the privileges afforded to them because of their race, and be more sympathetic to race discrimination. Two, most of the white women respondents are from Pipeco where women are still scarce in management. Thus, alternatively to being aware of their race privileges, they may identify more with other non-white groups than with white men. In this case, they would direct any negative intergroup attitudes toward white men. In the chapter analyzing the data from white women, I explore in more depth the variety of experiences of white women that might explain the relatively low degree of negative intergroup attitudes.

Asian men are more supportive of the strategy at Wireco than at Pipeco, and Asian women are more supportive of the strategy at Pipeco than Wireco. Asian respondents are less supportive of the diversity strategies than white women and black respondents, and perceive a more effective strategy at Pipeco than at Wireco. Asian respondents are the most ethnocentric after white men. While both Asian men and women at Wireco harbor more self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes than Asian men and women at Pipeco, Asian men are as deprecatory as black respondents and Asian women are the least deprecatory of all the racioethnic gender groups. Asian respondents tend to agree that diversity strategies allow the promotion of unqualified people, and respondents from Pipeco are more likely to agree than those from Wireco. Finally, while Asian men tend to agree that diversity strategies benefit women and people of color, Asian women do not.

Hispanic respondents are not as supportive of the diversity strategies as black men and women and white women. Their responses are similar to those of the Asian respondents, especially Asian men who are also more supportive of the strategy at Wireco than Pipeco. Hispanic men at Pipeco perceive the diversity strategy to be more effective than the men

at Wireco, and Hispanic women at Wireco perceive the strategy to be more effective than women at Pipeco. Both men and women from Pipeco are more ethnocentric than those from Wireco. Overall, the level of ethnocentrism of Hispanic men is similar to that of the Asian respondents, and the level of ethnocentrism of Hispanic women is similar to that of the white female and black respondents. Hispanic men from Pipeco are more self-deprecatory than those at Wireco. Although Hispanic men are more likely than Hispanic women to agree that diversity strategies allow unqualified people to be promoted, both men and women from Pipeco are more likely to agree with the statement than those from Wireco. Finally, Hispanic men, especially those from Pipeco, tend to agree that diversity strategies benefit women and people of color at the expense of men and white employees.

Although I do not analyze further in this dissertation the responses of Asian and Hispanic respondents, these results demonstrate an important methodological point that all future research in diversity should incorporate. The difference in the patterns of responses of Asian men and women and Hispanic men and women both from each other and from those of black men and women illustrate the danger of aggregating all minorities into one conceptual category. In fact, many of the responses of Asian and Hispanic men are more similar to those of white men than black men. The different patterns of responses between Asian men and Asian women further illustrates the error of aggregating minorities without taking into account gender differences in experiences.

PERCEPTIONS OF PRIVILEGE

Because I use the concept of organizational privilege to define the orientational categories, I spend the first part of this section discussing the meaning of the concept to the employees in my sample. I argue that access to privilege is the appropriate social reality in the context of diversity strategies. I then use perceptions of access to privilege to create orientational categories within the racioethnic gender groups.

Privilege as a social reality

There are many dimensions of social realities. Because the concepts of fairness, or justice, and privilege are at the heart of what diversity strategies are all about, I use

perceptions of relative access to privileges as the key differentiating variable to develop orientational categories. Dictionaries define privilege as a special right, immunity, or benefit granted to or enjoyed by an individual or a group. Privilege also has a meaning, or a set of meanings, particular to the organizational context. In my questionnaire, I ask the respondents to provide the definition of “privilege” they used to rate the extent to which different racioethnic gender groups have access to privileges that others do not. Table 3.11 summarizes the definitions. In the organizations I study, privilege is associated with opportunities for career advancement. Opportunities for career advancement do not necessarily mean receiving the promotions themselves, but rather having the opportunity to be considered for the promotions. Even definitions that do not directly define privilege as career advancement opportunities are somehow related to opportunities for advancement. For example, access to senior management increases visibility and the likelihood of competent work being noticed by people with the power to make promotion decisions (Kanter, 1977).

TABLE 3.11
Respondents’ Definitions of ‘Privilege’
Percentage of Respondents Giving Each Definition
By Racioethnic and Gender Background¹³

	White Male	White Female	Black Male	Black Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Hispanic Male	Hispanic Female	Total
Career advancement Opportunities	24%	53%	42%	45%	32%	55%	67%	78%	59%
Special treatment	59%	21%	5%	12%	21%	32%	33%	11%	41%
Access to information or networks	6%	35%	49%	30%	25%	14%	27%	22%	34%
Access to senior management or mentors	17%	25%	26%	18%	29%	9%	20%	11%	30%
Burden-free	5%	11%	42%	21%	-	18%	13%	22%	20%
Opportunities	6%	4%	9%	6%	7%	-	13%	-	8%
Access to physical resources	2%	7%	-	3%	4%	5%	7%	22%	6%
Total responding	83	57	43	33	28	22	15	9	210

¹³ The columns do not add up to 100% because many respondents gave several definitions of privilege.

Many respondents, especially white men, define privilege as special treatment that ultimately helps someone get a promotion: “Privileges would be defined as special treatment (favorable) with respect to working environment, job selection, or promotion” [WM:P:353].¹⁴ Other groups also define privilege as receiving special treatment: “Different rules [that] apply to a group that benefits them over me” [AF:W:386]. Common to all definitions of privilege as special treatment is that one or more groups receive special treatment because of their race, and this special treatment helps members of that group advance in their careers.

Many African-Americans, especially African-American men, define privilege as the opportunity to work without one’s race being a burden. Most African-Americans in the sample who define privilege as not having the burden of one’s race define privileges as “having initial acceptance” [BM:P:338], undergoing “less scrutiny” [BM:P:271]; and “not being encumbered with a belief that they have or will be discriminated because of their race” [BM:P:51].

Thus, perceptions of relative access to privileges imply views about what groups in the company have opportunities to move to higher status positions in the organization. Diversity strategies embody the nature of access to privileges, as they are an attempt to create equal opportunities for all. While few would disagree that all groups should have equal access to privileges, perceptions of what equal access means varies across individuals. Individuals who believe the playing field is level to begin with will see diversity strategies as giving the beneficiaries an unfair advantage. Others who believe the playing field is not level will see diversity strategies as creating opportunities where there were none previously. However, equal access to privileges does not mean equal treatment. Some researchers argue that fairness in organizations may mean addressing the different needs of different groups (e.g. Bailyn, 1993). In which case, differential treatment, rather than equal treatment is fair. Differential treatment is often necessary to ensure that all groups have the same access to opportunities. For example, white women

¹⁴ Throughout the rest of the dissertation, I quote various respondents. The bracketed information after each quotation identifies the racioethnic gender group of the respondent (WM=white male, WF=white female, BM=black male, BF=black female, AM=Asian male, AF=Asian female, HM=Hispanic male, HF=Hispanic female), the company for which the respondent works (W=Wireco, P=Pipeco), and the respondents survey number.

and people of color might need a formalized mentoring program to reap the benefits of mentorship, a relationship known to be beneficial for career development. White women and people of color might feel the need to create networks to compensate for being left out of informal information networks in organizations, also known to be important for upward mobility. Some individuals might need flexible hours to balance family responsibilities with work. Because women are still primarily responsible for child care, flexible hours might be seen as a benefit afforded only women, not men. Differential treatment can create additional perceptions of unfairness among individuals who might not fully understand the necessity of differential treatment for creating equal access to privileges. Thus, diversity strategies, which do embody differential treatment to create equal opportunity influence how people think about who has access to privileges. Table 3.12 shows average perceptions of relative access to privileges by racioethnic gender group. To obtain the values shown in Table 3.12, I asked respondents to rate the extent to which they believe each racioethnic gender group has access to privileges that others do not. To give meaning to the ratings, I subtract the ratings for each group from the respondents' ratings of their own groups. Positive scores mean the respondents perceive their own group as having more access to privileges than the other group; negative scores mean the respondents perceive their own group as having less access to privileges than the other group.

There are several ways to interpret the data shown in Table 3.12, and the interpretation depends on the racioethnic gender group being discussed. First, among white men, perceptions of access to privilege indicate perceptions of status stability. The more stable white men perceive their status, the more likely they are to agree that white men have more access to privileges than other groups. The less stable they perceive their status, the more likely they are to agree that members of other racioethnic groups have more access to privileges than white men.

Second, among black respondents, perceptions of access to privilege indicate cognitive beliefs about status boundary permeability. Black respondents who believe status boundaries are permeable for their racial group will agree that black respondents have the same access to privileges as white employees. Black respondents who believe status boundaries are impermeable will rate white employees as having more access to privileges than black employees.

TABLE 3.12
Access To Privilege of Own Group Relative to Other Racioethnic Gender Groups
By Racioethnic gender Group and Company

	Other Racioethnic Gender Group							
	White Male	White Female	Black Male	Black Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Hispanic Male	Hispanic Female
White Male		-.2 (1.3)	-.0 (1.5)	-.2 (1.7)	+.2 (1.3)	+.1 (1.6)	+.4 (1.6)	+.4 (1.7)
Wireco		-.0 (1.4)	+.2 (1.6)	+.1 (1.8)	+.4 (1.0)	+.4 (1.6)	+.4 (1.6)	+.4 (1.7)
Pipeco		-.4 (1.2)	-.2 (1.5)	-.3 (1.7)	-.0 (1.3)	-.1 (1.8)	+.6 (1.5)	+.5 (1.7)
White Female	-1.4 (1.2)		+.1 (.8)	+.3 (.9)	+.2 (.8)	+.4 (.8)	+.3 (1.0)	+.3 (.8)
Wireco	-1.3 (1.1)		-.1 (1.0)	-.1 (1.1)	+.4 (.7)	+.3 (.9)	+.4 (.9)	+.2 (.9)
Pipeco	-1.5 (1.2)		+.1 (.8)	+.4 (.8)	+.2 (.8)	+.4 (.7)	+.2 (.9)	+.3 (.8)
Black Male	-2.5 (1.2)	-2.0 (1.3)		.0 (.7)	-.5 (1.0)	-.3 (.9)	-.1 (.7)	.0 (.7)
Wireco	-2.5 (1.3)	-2.2 (1.3)		.2 (.6)	-.7 (.9)	-.5 (.8)	-.1 (.5)	-.1 (.5)
Pipeco	-2.5 (1.1)	-1.6 (1.3)		.3 (.8)	-.2 (1.1)	.1 (1.0)	-.1 (.9)	.3 (.9)
Black Female	-2.3 (1.3)	-2.1 (1.1)	.1 (.6)		-.5 (1.0)	-.2 (.9)	.0 (.7)	.1 (.6)
Wireco	-2.3 (1.2)	-2.3 (1.1)	.1 (.6)		-.6 (1.1)	-.3 (.9)	-.1 (.7)	.0 (.6)
Pipeco	-2.5 (1.4)	-1.6 (.7)	-.1 (.3)		.0 (.5)	.2 (.4)	.1 (.6)	.2 (.4)

Finally, among white women, perceptions of access to privilege indicate both perceptions of boundary status permeability and race or gender salience. White women who believe status boundaries are permeable for white women will rate white women as having equal access to privileges as white men. White women who believe status boundaries are impermeable for white women will rate white men as having more access to privileges than white women. Further, those white women for whom race is more salient than gender will rate white men and women as having more access to privileges than other

racioethnic gender groups. They focus on the advantages they enjoy because of their race. On the other hand, those white women for whom gender is more salient than race will rate white women as having the same access to privileges as all the other racioethnic gender groups except white men, who they will rate as having more access to privileges.

There are several points to notice from Table 3.12. First, respondents tend to rate almost every other group as having more access to privileges than their own group. White women are an exception. Although white women from Wireco believe black men and women have slightly more access to privileges than white women, white women do tend to rate their own group as having more access to privileges than other groups. Yet they share with black respondents the perception that white men have more access to privileges than other groups. This suggests that there may be a large group of white women who are aware of the privileges afforded to their race, and that for them, gender is more salient than race.

Second, black men and women perceive white employees, regardless of gender, as having more access to privileges than their own racioethnic gender group. At the same time, they do not see members of the opposite gender group within their race as having more access than their own gender group. This suggests that for many black respondents, race is more salient than gender, at least in the context of diversity strategies. This reasoning is consistent with other descriptions of attitudes among Blacks. Ella Bell (1992: 365) writes:

Within the Black community there is a strong norm of putting sexism on the back burner of major concerns while putting racism on the front burner. Racism is declared as the root cause of the precarious conditions among Blacks.

Third, among white men, there are differences in responses between the companies. While white men from Pipeco tend to rate other groups as having more access to privileges, white men from Wireco tend to rate their own group as having more access than other groups. A similar pattern holds true for white women's ratings of black men and women. White women from Pipeco seem to perceive that black employees enjoy more privileges than white women, whereas white women from Wireco perceive that their own group enjoys more privileges than black employees. The different strategies at the two companies may underlie the company differences in white respondents' perceptions of other groups. The visible strategy at Pipeco makes race and gender

differences more salient. Hence, we should expect to find more negative attitudes toward out-group.

In summary, in this organizational context, privilege is associated with opportunity for advancement. Because diversity programs directly address the issue of career opportunities, privilege becomes a relevant dimension of social comparison. There is a wide variation of perceptions of access to privileges, and in the next section I describe how I use these perceptions to define the orientational categories.

ORIENTATIONAL CATEGORIES

I use perceptions of privilege to develop orientational categories. I assume that perceptions of relative access to privileges imply something about how the respondents view the stability of status hierarchies in the organizations. High level positions in organizations are highly correlated with status, and access to promotions that allow employees to attain these positions is viewed as a privilege by most respondents. Career advancement opportunities involve receiving responsibility, exposure, opportunity for advancement, decision-making authority, and high profile, choice assignments. Assumptions about status stability associated with ratings of access to privilege vary with racioethnic and gender group. White men who rate themselves as having more access to privileges than other group see their positions as stable. White men who rate themselves as having less access see their positions as unstable. Other groups who rate themselves as having more, or even equal access to privileges than other groups are likely to view status boundaries as permeable. In the following sections, I describe how I develop orientational categories for each of the racioethnic gender groups.

White Orientational Categories

I define four orientations among white male and female respondents: 1) respondents who believe white men and women have access to privileges that other groups do not; 2) respondents who believe that white men more access to privileges than white women, but that both groups have more access to privileges than the other groups; 2) respondents who believe that all other groups have more access to privileges than their own group; and 3) respondents who believe that all racioethnic gender groups have equal access to

privileges. I designate the four categories, respectively, as White Privilege, White Male Privilege, Other Privilege, and Equal Privilege. White men with either the White Privilege or the White Male Privilege orientation perceive their status to be the most stable of the four groups; they recognize that as white men they have more access to privileges than other groups. Table 3.13 shows the distribution of white respondents in these categories by company.

Most white men have either the Other Privilege or the Equal Privilege orientation. There is a higher percentage of white men at Pipeco than at Wireco who fall into the Other Privilege category. The difference is made up by the higher percentage of white men at Wireco who fall into the Equal Privilege category. White men with the Other Privilege orientation perceive their status to be the least stable of the four groups; they believe that other groups have career advancement opportunities that white men do not.

TABLE 3.13
White Orientational Categories by Company

	Male Respondents ¹⁵			Female Respondents		
	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total</u>
White Privilege	15% (N=5)	10% (N=7)	11% (N=12)	33% (N=5)	43% (N=22)	41% (N=27)
White Male Privilege	6% (N=2)	11% (N=8)	9% (N=10)	27% (N=4)	29% (N=15)	29% (N=29)
Other Privilege	30% (N=10)	44% (N=31)	36% (N=41)	33% (N=5)	10% (N=5)	15% (N=10)
Equal Privilege	49% (N=16)	34% (N=24)	35% (N=40)	7% (N=1)	18% (N=9)	15% (N=10)
Total N	33	70	103	15	51	66

The majority of white female respondents believe that white men have more access to privileges than any other group. All white women in the White Privilege orientational category rate white men as having more access to privileges than white women. In

¹⁵ I was unable to classify one respondent because of lack of data.

addition, of the white females in the Other Privilege category, four rate white men as having more access to privileges than members of the other racioethnic gender groups. Thus, taken as a whole, 90% of white female respondents believe that white men have more access to privileges than any other group.

The subjective orientations of the white women indicate perceptions of status boundary permeability whether race or gender, or both or neither, is salient. Gender is salient for women with the White Male Privilege orientation; they focus on the advantages of white men, rather than the advantages of white employees. On the other hand, race is salient for women with the White Privilege orientation; they are aware of the privileges afforded to white employees. Both race and gender are salient for white women with the Other Privilege orientation; they feel men receive privileges because of their gender and women of color receive privileges because of their race. Finally, neither race nor gender is salient for white women with the Equal Privilege orientation. They believe that neither matters in organizations and advancement is a function of merit alone.

Black Orientational Categories

TABLE 3.13
Black Orientational Categories by Gender and Company

	Male Respondents ¹⁶			Female Respondents		
	Wireco	Pipeco	Total	Wireco	Pipeco	Total
White Privilege	61% (N=17)	68% (N=13)	64% (N=30)	71% (N=17)	89% (N=8)	75% (N=25)
Other Privilege	32% (N=9)	32% (N=6)	32% (N=15)	21% (N=5)	0% (N=0)	15% (N=5)
Equal Privilege	7% (N=2)	0% (N=0)	4% (N=2)	8% (N=2)	11% (N=1)	9% (N=3)
Total N	28	19	47	24	9	33

The data indicate there are three orientations among the black respondents: 1) white employees have more access to privileges than all other employees 2) all other

¹⁶ I was unable to classify five respondents because of lack of data.

racioethnic gender groups have more access to privileges than black employees; 3) all racioethnic gender groups have equal access to privileges. Similar to the white orientational categories, I call these black orientational categories White Privilege, Other Privilege, and Equal Privilege, respectively. Table 3.14 shows the breakdown of these orientations by gender and by company.

Most black respondents, male and female, perceive that white employees have more access to privileges than any other group. A higher percent of women than men fall into the White Privilege orientational category. The difference is made up by the larger percent of men with the Other Privilege orientation; more men than women believe that all other groups have more access to privileges than black employees. Compared to white employees, very few black employees have an Equal Privilege orientation. Black respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation perceive the highest boundary status permeability; they believe they are able to achieve the same career advancement opportunities as all other racioethnic groups. Those with the White Privilege orientation perceive low boundary status permeability; they do not believe that they can achieve the same career advancement opportunities as white employees. Black respondents with the Other Privilege orientation perceive low boundary status permeability; they are prevented from achieving equal career advancement opportunities not only with white employees, but with employees from other racioethnic groups as well.

SUMMARY

Perceptions of access to privileges imply views about perceptions of status stability and boundary permeability. They imply views about what groups in the company have opportunities to move to higher status positions in the organization. The data presented in this chapter demonstrate that there is variation within the racioethnic gender groups in their beliefs about status stability and status boundary permeability. Not all individuals in a racioethnic gender group hold similar views. In the next three chapters, I use the orientational categories to illustrate the variations in reactions to the diversity strategies and the related intergroup attitudes, for white and black respondents.

CHAPTER FOUR

WHITE MEN

In Chapter One, I ask four sets of questions about the responses of white men to diversity strategies. First, I ask whether or not the type of strategy, visible or subtle, makes a difference in the type of response we should expect from white men. Second, I ask what kind of threat white men perceive from diversity strategies and whether there is a relationship between perception of threat and reaction to the diversity strategies. Third, I ask how, among white men, the intergroup attitudes relate to reactions to the different diversity strategies. Finally, I ask how variations in perceptions of status stability among white men are related to variations in intergroup attitudes, and how they moderate the relationship between organizational strategy for change and individual reaction to the strategy. In this chapter, I answer these questions.

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

Table 4.1 compares the average values of the variables of interest for Wireco and Pipeco. We know from Table 3.2 that white men show the least support for diversity strategies among all the racioethnic gender groups, and the trend is more toward resistance than toward support.¹⁷ There is no statistically significant difference between Wireco and Pipeco, suggesting that the type of diversity strategy a company uses, visible or subtle, does not influence the reaction to the diversity strategy. However, this finding is misleading. As I demonstrate later in this chapter, white men with the Other Privilege orientation at Wireco show more resistance to the diversity strategy than do white men with the Other Privilege orientation at Pipeco, and the opposite is true for white men with the White Privilege orientation (see Table 4.3). There is also no difference between Wireco and Pipeco respondents in perceptions of effectiveness of the diversity strategy. However, controlling for orientational category does not surface any further differences.

Perceptions of threat from other groups are higher at Pipeco than at Wireco. The visible strategy may create a stronger perception that other groups are advancing into higher status positions. Even though the data do not indicate that there are actually a large percentage of white women and people of color in high status positions at Pipeco, the

¹⁷ In the remainder of this chapter, in order to reflect this trend, I call this variable "Resistance to Diversity Strategy."

visibility of those who have advanced may create the perception that their numbers in these positions are higher than they are. Alternatively, the fear that white women and people of color will advance into these positions at the expense of white men may be enough to create a threat.

TABLE 4.1
Average Values of Variables and Results of T-Tests for Company Differences
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total</u>
Resistance to Diversity Strategy	2.2 (1.0)	2.5 (1.1)	2.4 (1.1)
Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy	2.0 (.8)	2.0 (.9)	2.0 (.8)
Ethnocentrism	1.8 (1.2)	1.9 (1.0)	1.9 (1.1)
Self-Deprecation	4.0 (1.0)	3.9 (1.0)	3.9 (1.0)
Antagonism	3.1 (1.5)	3.1 (1.5)	3.1 (1.5)
Threat from Other Groups ^{a18}	2.6 (1.4)	3.2 (1.4)	3.0 (1.4)

^a Statistically significant difference between Wireco and Pipeco at $\alpha=.05$.

There are no statistically significant differences between Wireco and Pipeco for the variables representing intergroup attitudes. However, intergroup attitudes are related to reactions to the diversity strategy. Table 4.2 shows the correlations among the variables. Perceptions of threat and antagonistic intergroup attitudes are strongly correlated with resistance to the diversity strategy and perceptions of the effectiveness of the strategy. As perceptions of threat and perceptions that the strategy allows the promotion of unqualified people increase, resistance increases and perceptions of effectiveness decrease. As ethnocentrism and self-deprecation increase, resistance also increases. However, these intergroup variables are not related to perceptions of the effectiveness of the strategy. This result suggests that white men measure the effectiveness of the strategy

¹⁸ This variable also represents a dimension of antagonistic intergroup attitudes. However, to avoid confusing it with the other variable representing antagonism (perceptions that the diversity strategy allows the promotion of unqualified people), I call it "[perceived] threat from other groups."

by noting how many people from other groups actually receive promotions. Ethnocentric and self-deprecatory attitudes do not come into play in this assessment.

TABLE 4.2
Correlations Among Variables^a

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Reaction to Diversity Strategy	-.33**	.35**	.24*	.63**	.52**
Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy (1)		.09	-.09	-.24**	-.22*
Ethnocentrism (2)			-.41**	-.36**	-.43**
Self-Deprecation (3)				-.29**	-.34**
Antagonism (4)					.45**
Threat from Other Groups (5)					

** p<.01.
* p<.05.

By examining the average values of these variables by orientational category, we can gain a more precise understanding of the correlations among the variables. Table 4.3 shows the average values for the variables by orientational category and indicates there are differences among white men in attitudes about the diversity strategy. White men with the Other Privilege orientation are more likely to resist the diversity strategy, perceive a threat from other groups, and harbor antagonistic, ethnocentric, and deprecatory intergroup attitudes than are men with the other two orientations. White men with the White Privilege orientation are the least likely to resist the diversity strategy and harbor antagonistic, ethnocentric, and deprecatory intergroup attitudes than are men with the other two orientations. There are no statistical differences between men in the White Privilege and Equal Privilege orientational categories for $\alpha=.05$. There are, however, substantive differences between the two categories, especially at Wireco. At Wireco, white men with the Equal Privilege orientation are more likely to resist the diversity strategy, more likely to harbor ethnocentric and deprecatory intergroup attitudes, more likely to agree that the strategy allows unqualified people to advance, and more likely to perceive a threat from other groups than are white men with the White Privilege orientation. Later in this chapter, I will explore in more detail the nature of the results for the Equal Privilege Orientation. Meanwhile, it should be apparent that low values on the resistance and the intergroup attitude variables are associated with white men with the Other Privilege orientation, and high values on these variables are associated with white

men with the White Privilege orientation. The bipolar multivariate distributions of these variables accounts for the correlations among the variables.

TABLE 4.3
Average Values of Variables and Results of ANOVA Tests for Orientational Category Differences
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

	White Privilege			Other Privilege			Equal Privilege		
	Wireco	Pipeco	Total	Wireco	Pipeco	Total	Wireco	Pipeco	Total
Resistance to Diversity Strategy ^a	1.6 (.3)	2.2 (.8)	2.0 (.8)	3.4 (1.1)	2.9 (1.1)	3.0 (1.1)	2.0 (.7)	2.1 (1.1)	2.0 (.0)
Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy ^c	2.0 (1.4)	1.7 (1.0)	1.8 (.8)	1.8 (1.1)	1.8 (.8)	1.8 (.9)	2.1 (.8)	2.4 (.9)	2.3 (.8)
Ethnocentrism ^{a,d}	.9 (1.6)	1.5 (.9)	1.9 (1.1)	3.0 (.7)	2.3 (1.0)	2.4 (1.0)	1.4 (1.0)	1.8 (1.0)	1.6 (1.0)
Self-Deprecation ^b	-.3 (1.5)	-.3 (1.2)	-1.3 (1.3)	-1.5 (.6)	-1.1 (.9)	-1.2 (.8)	-.9 (.8)	-1.0 (.8)	-1.0 (.8)
Antagonism ^a	1.80 (1.1)	2.3 (1.4)	2.0 (1.3)	4.4 (1.0)	3.7 (1.4)	3.9 (1.3)	2.8 (1.4)	2.7 (1.3)	2.7 (1.3)
Threat from Other Groups ^{a,e}	1.8 (.6)	2.8 (1.1)	2.5 (1.2)	4.1 (1.1)	3.7 (1.3)	3.8 (1.3)	2.0 (1.0)	2.6 (1.2)	2.4 (1.2)
N	10	16	26	12	31	43	16	24	40

^a ANOVA indicates statistically significant differences among the orientational categories at $\alpha=.001$.

^b ANOVA indicates statistically significant differences among the orientational categories at $\alpha=.01$

^c ANOVA indicates statistically significant differences among orientational categories at $\alpha=.05$.

^d ANOVA indicates an interaction effect between company and orientational category at $\alpha=.05$.

^e ANOVA indicates an interaction effect between company and orientational category at $\alpha=.10$.

The data in Table 4.3 also demonstrate that there is a relationship between perceptions of status stability and intergroup attitudes. White men with the Other Privilege orientation perceive their status in the organization as the least stable of the three orientational groups, and they harbor the most antagonistic, deprecatory, and ethnocentric attitudes; they are the most likely to agree that the strategy allows unqualified people to advance, are the least likely to agree that they will receive a promotion if competing against someone from another racioethnic gender group, and are the least likely to think that the diversity strategy addresses issues concerning white men. White men with the White Privilege orientation perceive their status in the organization as the most stable of the three orientational groups, and their intergroup attitudes are the least antagonistic, deprecatory, and ethnocentric.

Finally, the data in Table 4.3 demonstrate that orientational category moderates the relationship between the diversity strategy and the reactions to the strategy. While resistance to the diversity strategy is higher among white men with the White Privilege and Equal Privilege orientations at Pipeco, resistance is higher among white men with the Other Privilege orientation at Wireco than those at Pipeco. In fact, the perception that the strategy allows unqualified people to advance, the perception of threat from other groups, and the perception that the diversity strategy ignores white men are all higher among white men with the Other Privilege orientation at Wireco than at Pipeco. Thus, white men who perceive their status in the organization as unstable respond less favorably to a visible than to a subtle strategy for change. One interpretation of this finding takes into consideration the ambiguous nature of a subtle strategy. At Wireco, where there is a subtle strategy for change, white men with the White Privilege orientation may not even consider that a real change in their status is possible. They can afford to support a strategy for change because they do not see any real change occurring. However, at Pipeco, because the diversity strategy is more apparent, white men with the White Privilege orientation may start to feel some doubts about their status. A different dynamic accounts for the findings among the Other Privilege orientational category. At Pipeco, white men with this orientation know exactly what to expect. They know the exact nature of the “threat.” However, at Wireco, because the diversity strategy is more ambiguous, the exact nature of the “threat” is unknown. White men with the Other Privilege orientation at Wireco may compensate what they do not know by imagining the situation as worse than it really is. The ambiguity of the strategy exacerbates their fears.

These data indicate that there is a relationship between intergroup attitudes and white men’s reaction to diversity strategy. They also indicate that the relationship between the type of strategy, visible or subtle, and the reaction of white men to the strategy is not simple. Rather the relationship is contingent upon individual orientations with respect to perceptions of access to privilege and status stability. What these data do not tell us, however, is the nature of the relationships. In the remainder of this chapter, I further explore the nature of the relationships and illuminate the assumptions and perceptions that are held by white men with the three orientations at both companies.

OTHER PRIVILEGE ORIENTATION

The highest resistance to the diversity strategy among white men comes from those with the Other Privilege orientation. They perceive the highest threat from white women and

people of color. They are the most likely to harbor ethnocentric and antagonistic intergroup attitudes, for they are the most likely to believe that diversity strategies allow the promotion of unqualified women and minorities, and the least likely to believe that the strategies address issues of concern to white men. In this section, I will explore the nature of the antagonistic and ethnocentric perceptions, as well as perceptions of threat, that characterize the Other Privilege orientational category. Because white men with the Other Privilege orientation comprise the largest group of white men in this sample, their beliefs may represent those of the dominant culture at Pipeco and Wireco. These beliefs are embedded in deeper assumptions that reflect the dominant culture in these organizations. Because they are basic and subconscious, it is very difficult to uncover basic assumptions that define a dominant corporate culture (Schein, 1985). One way to uncover these basic assumptions is to examine not only what the respondents are saying, but also what they are not saying, as well as the unfounded dichotomies that characterize their statements (Martin, 1990). In the next paragraphs, I first examine antagonistic attitudes and the perception that the strategy is bad for the organization because it allows unqualified people to advance. This perception is based on assumptions regarding assessments of competence of white women and people of color. Second, I explore ethnocentric attitudes and the perception that the strategies ignore the concerns of white men. This perception is based on assumptions regarding the fairness of diversity strategies. Finally, I discuss the perception that the strategies present a threat to the job security of white men in the organization.

Antagonistic Intergroup Attitudes

There is a perception among white men with the Other Privilege orientation that diversity strategies allow unqualified people to advance in the organization. Resistance to the diversity strategy may stem from the perception that diversity programs are correlated with quotas and give preferential treatment to some groups, fostering the “promotion of marginally qualified people” [WM:P:92]. Nineteen out of 41 respondents with the Other Privilege orientation who provided written comments allude to this perception, both directly and indirectly. To compare, only five out of 22 respondents with the White Privilege orientation, and four out of 40 respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation make negative references to unqualified people receiving promotions.

The perception that diversity strategies allow unqualified white women and people of color to advance in the organization is based on antagonistic assumptions regarding the

qualifications of white women and people of color. To demonstrate these assumptions, I analyze the comment of a white male from Pipeco who associates achievement of diversity targets with the advancement of unqualified females and non-whites, and sees the advancement of unqualified people as a consequence of filling quotas:

Quotas are not the right method to promote diversity. Quotas concerning promotions, [and] departmental goal of at least 50% promotion to females and non-whites [receives too much attention]. Mix of qualified people in group is approx. 80% white male. White males feel extremely discriminated against at this point. [WM:P:356].

This perception that the diversity strategy allows unqualified people to advance is based on two false assumptions. The first assumption is that it is possible to objectively assess who is qualified, and the second assumption is that women and people of color are unqualified for the promotions they receive. I discuss each of these in turn.

The assumption that it is possible to objectively assess who is qualified and what are the criteria for assessment is apparent when we examine the perceived dichotomy between qualified and unqualified. The distinction between qualified and unqualified is not objective or simple to differentiate. "Qualified" is a subjective concept, difficult to measure, and often based on traditional beliefs about what is necessary for effective performance. While arguing for a need to re-conceptualize what is necessary for career success, Bailyn (1993, p. 94) writes:

Systems designed to award points to various aspects of a job in order to determine its value tend to enshrine in objective measurement differences we think are real (such as the number of subordinates) but that are only presumed to contribute to the actual value of a job.

An objective assessment of qualifications is impossible when the evaluation criteria are not quantifiable, or are based on intangible factors such as "ability to get along," and when the assessors have prejudices of their own. For example, there is evidence that men holding traditional views toward women's roles in society rate women's performances lower than men's performances (Adams, Rice, & Instone, 1984). There is also evidence that among workers with equally high performance measured by one

standard, black workers receive lower evaluations than white workers (Hamner, Kim, Baird, and Bigoness, 1974). If indeed evaluators' attitudes influence evaluations of the competence of women and non-whites, then an objective assessment of qualified or unqualified is not possible. Further, the criteria for evaluation are often based on the assumption that everyone has had equal opportunity to demonstrate competence. Yet, research shows that women and non-white employees often do not get opportunities lower in the organizational hierarchy to develop or demonstrate skills such as decision-making ability (Kanter, 1977; Molm, 1986; O'Leary, 1976; Ragins, 1989; Stamp, 1986).

The second assumption is that white women and people of color are not qualified for the promotions they receive. This assumption is evident when we examine the ideological biases inherent in assessments of competence.¹⁹ The respondent's quote demonstrates the bias inherent in assessing competence of various groups. His distinction between qualified and unqualified is ideologically biased because unqualified is associated with white women and people of color, while qualified is associated with men, especially white men. He does not suggest that there are unqualified white men who are being promoted, only unqualified white women and people of color. Other respondents share this same perception:

[There is too much attention given to] the quantity of African-Americans and women that must be hired. For example, new hires and promotions must include 50% minorities. I do not believe such goals/commitments are good and it distracts from what we are trying to accomplish and that is to hire, train, and promote competent people. [WM:P:45].

Consistent with other research that finds that men have negative conceptions of women as managers (Brenner, et al., 1989; Dubno, 1985), this respondent and others with the Other Privilege orientation associate descriptives such as qualified and good decision-making skills with white men and lack of qualifications and poor decision-making skills with women and people of color:

¹⁹A dichotomy is ideologically biased when certain groups of people are associated with one side of the dichotomy simply because of their social characteristics. One's ideology affects which side of the dichotomy one attributes to an individual based on that individual's social characteristics rather than based on other broader and possibly more relevant criteria.

The female issue is causing major problems with qualifications and decision-making. Women are promoted because of quotas. Their decision making has little basis of experience or work knowledge. Most times they look for consensus which can forever delay decisions. [WM:W:410].

Do not separate diversity from competency. Hire and promote blacks and females and Hispanics vs. whites at same level of competency. [There is too much attention given to] quotas in management. [WM:P:27].

The association of incompetence with non-white groups is reminiscent of stereotypes depicting non-white groups, especially Hispanic and African-American, as lazy. Take for example, the respondent who wrote the following:

Start to remind everyone that hard work, results, dedication, job knowledge, and creativity are also a pre-requisite for advancement. [WM:P:131].

To white men with the Other Privilege orientation, promoting women and people of color only because of quotas, not merit, adversely impacts organizational outcomes. For example, one respondent associates the success of diversity programs with poor quality decision-making, presumably because white women and people of color will be making the decisions:

The diversity program is starting to work and show results. The current (late '92/93) emphasis on hitting specific numerical targets will significantly increase the risk that poor quality decisions will be made" [WM:P:72].²⁰

In summary, the respondents assume a dichotomy between incompetence and competence. They associate diversity with white women and people of color and incompetence with white women and people of color. The dichotomy between

²⁰ An alternate interpretation of this quote is that poor promotion decisions will be made. Either interpretation suggests that the people being hired are not qualified for the job.

competence and incompetence is based on subjective assessments and, because it is based on traditional notions of what makes a good manager, it is ideologically biased. Competence is associated with white male and incompetence is associated with women and people of color. Individuals tend to incorporate stereotypes and sex- and race-based expectations into the evaluations, making it difficult to objectively assess competencies. The assumption of incompetence can have an adverse effect on white women and people of color. When those making decisions rely on ideologically biased perceptions, discrimination results.

Thus, we have seen that white men with the Other Privilege orientation harbor some antagonistic attitudes toward white women and people of color. They do not see white women and people of color as deserving of the promotions they receive because they are incompetent. These antagonistic attitudes are related to resistance to the diversity strategies in that the strategies are seen as having negative organizational consequences. In the next section, I explore other assumptions that characterize the dominant culture at Wireco and Pipeco, and how they represent ethnocentric intergroup attitudes.

Ethnocentric Intergroup Attitudes

Returning to the first quote in the previous section, the respondent says that “white males feel extremely discriminated against at this point” [WM:P:356]. Taken in the context of the whole quote, he is suggesting that quotas are unfair to white men and implies reverse discrimination. Other white men with the Other Privilege orientation are also concerned about reverse discrimination and the focus of diversity attention being on white women and people of color:

The bias against white males must be addressed and corrected.
[WM:P:157].

[The diversity strategy] could be more balanced - now it only addresses non-white and female strictly at the expense of white males. [There is too much attention given to the] need for promotion of females and non-whites. [WM:P:29].

These respondents raise a legitimate criticism of diversity strategies, as the emphasis does tend to be on creating opportunities for white women and people of color without spending too much attention addressing the fears and concerns of white men. At the same time, however, this criticism represents ethnocentric attitudes; it trivializes the concerns and issues white women and people of color face in trying to attain their career goals. For example, a white male from Pipeco says:

We tend to focus on special interest groups not diversity. White males are also diverse. We need to emphasize diversity of people in general and dealing with people. [WM:P:254].

At one level, he is right. It would be nice if we could recognize people as individuals. The reality, though, is that stereotypes and prejudices based on race and gender persist. It is true that white males are diverse. In fact, they see one another as individuals. Deschamps (1982) argues that to members of the dominant group in a society, only members of their group have individuality. They view minority groups as entities composed of undifferentiated elements. To white men with the Other Privilege orientation, members of other groups have no uniqueness or individuality, as evidenced by the tendency to employ stereotypes to characterize the performance of other groups. It is because of this tendency for white men to stereotype and create mobility barriers that companies feel they need to make extra efforts to create opportunities for white women and people of color. In this section, I will show that the perceptions of unfairness and reverse discrimination are based on ethnocentric intergroup attitudes regarding status entitlements.

It is true that, if there is a fixed number of jobs and a limited number of promotion opportunities in an organization, fewer jobs and promotions will go to white men if managers must consider a broader pool of candidates. Thus, a paradox seems to face organizations. How do they encourage the hiring and promotion of white women and people of color without discriminating against white men? At a group level, the organization is not discriminating against white men. Discrimination is "acting on the basis of prejudice" (Random House Dictionary), where prejudice is defined as "a strong feeling for or against something formed before one knows the facts," or "an irrational hostility toward members of a particular group." Discrimination describes past and present behaviors of whites, and white men, as a group toward other groups. Affirmative

action programs were designed to stop discrimination; active recruiting efforts were often necessary since passive attempts to provide equal opportunity did not prevent decision makers from acting on the basis of prejudice, even subconscious prejudice. Thus, there is a difference between discriminating against white men and actively attempting to create a more diverse environment. The former is based on subjective prejudice, the latter on objective data supporting the existence of continuing injustices. That opportunities for white men to obtain scarce social resources are slightly constricted is not reverse discrimination, but rather an “incidental consequence of addressing a compelling societal need” (Kennedy, 1986, p. 49). There is thus no solution to the problem; when you increase the number of people competing for a given position, the chances of any one individual receiving the promotion decrease.

However, although the distinction between reverse discrimination and opening opportunity is an important distinction for organizations to disseminate, it is not the critical point. Rather, the critical point is that men with the Other Privilege orientation fail to distinguish between Affirmative Action and diversity programs. While quotas are an aspect of Affirmative Action programs, they are not part of diversity strategies. The desired result, a balanced workforce, is the same, but the means to the ends are different. Diversity strategies address some of the root problems, such as racism, exclusion from networks, and unequal access to career development opportunities, underlying an unbalanced workforce. Although diversity programs are conceptually distinct from Affirmative Action programs and quota establishment, white men with the Other Privilege orientation continue to perceive that they are being discriminated against and treated unfairly while members of other racioethnic gender groups receive preferential treatment. These men may interpret attempts to generate a balanced workforce as a quota, similar to those determined under Affirmative Action programs. The perception that diversity strategies allow unqualified people to advance in the organization is consistent with a finding by Dovidio (1989) that some of the negative reaction to Affirmative Action is due to the assumption by whites that affirmative action is synonymous with preferential treatment in which less qualified minorities are selected over more qualified white males. One reason for this interpretation is that the companies I study are trying to implement diversity strategies during a time of down-sizing. If job opportunities were instead growing, perhaps these men would perceive diversity strategies differently. However, job opportunities are not increasing and there appears to a lack of distinction between quota-type programs and diversity programs among white

men with the Other Privilege orientation, and these men feel other groups are receiving preferential treatment because of their race and gender:

[There is too much attention paid to] male/female equality issues. I have seen too many unqualified females promoted and receive preferential treatment because of their gender. All people should be judged equally. [WM:P:5].

Everything [about diversity is given too much attention]. Individuals should be judged on performance and ability. Race and gender should not be a consideration. If an individual or organization discriminates then they should be dealt with through some committee or organization. But people should all be treated equally, may the best person succeed. [WM:W:247].

There are two related assumptions implicit in these quotes with respect to preferential treatment and fairness. The first assumption is that equality is the same as fairness, and the second assumption is that it is unfair for women and people of color to receive preferential treatment because of their racioethnicity and gender. The belief that white men are treated unfairly is based on the assumption that it is fair to treat everyone exactly the same, i.e. equally. This assumption is based on another false dichotomy, preferential treatment versus fair treatment. One of the basic tenets of diversity strategies is that different people have different needs that must be addressed and taken into consideration if the companies are going to create an environment to utilize all available talent and to allow everyone to perform to their maximum potential. Different groups of people face different external restraints (see, for example, Bailyn (1993)). For example, some people may need flexible hours to compensate for lengthy commutes or family obligations. Other people may need formal mentoring programs to compensate for members of their racioethnic gender group being ignored in the informal system. Hence, to create equal opportunity for all employees to perform their best, the company may have to treat some people differently from others. "In order to treat some persons equally, we must treat them differently" (Kennedy, 1986). But this is to ensure fair treatment in the long run. Thus, unequal treatment can mean fair treatment.

However, white men with the Other Privilege orientation see diversity actions as unequal treatment that is overcompensation for past injustices rather than as differential treatment to create equal opportunity for all employees in the future. A respondent articulates this perception when he writes:

Make [diversity strategies] more equal. The gender/racial group that has long been dominant (white males, especially young white males) is not treated equally, compared to women and members of non-white ethnic groups. The company is trying to overcompensate for years of domination by white males. [WM:W:97].

The respondent recognizes the past dominance of white males, but expresses discontent at attempts to change the social hierarchy. It may be that diversity strategies present a threat to an economic order that is believed to be just in principle and to work well in providing opportunities for all. Or, it may be that to create an environment of equal opportunity, white men, as a group, need to abdicate some of the monopoly they have over power and promotion opportunities in the organization. There are a limited number of jobs available and to create a balanced workforce, in terms of diversity, more jobs must be available to white women and people of color and fewer to white males. While white men with this orientation may realize this dynamic, they are the most likely group to be affected at an individual level. Consequently, they are going to feel the system is not treating them, as individuals, fairly:

Pipeco is trying to improve diversity by promoting non-white and female candidates at low levels in the organization without seeking qualified members from outside the organization for the higher level opportunities. This approach requires much more leading of diversity candidates at the lower levels to ensure qualified candidates for higher level jobs. This effectively excludes white males from consideration for promotion. ... I am a white male and up to two years ago I felt that I had opportunity at Pipeco. With the diversity goals, I feel that I will not have the opportunity for the next 3 years and I feel I have not had opportunity for the last two. This may be necessary to address the diversity issues within the organization but none the less I feel I will not be recognized for good

effort or achievement until we reach the internal goals for a workforce mirroring the community. [WM:P:77].

The second assumption is that white women and people of color receive preferential treatment because of their racioethnicity and gender, and this is unfair. It is interesting that white men with this orientation never mention the possibility that unqualified white men are promoted or that white men receive preferential treatment because of their race and gender.²¹ None of the respondents with the Other Privilege orientation say: "I have seen many unqualified white males promoted and receive preferential treatment because of their race and gender," or "I have seen many qualified females promoted." To say the first would indicate an awareness of the benefits of being a white male in a white male dominated culture. To say the latter would indicate a belief that women, or at least many women, deserve their promotions. It is possible that some white women and people of color receive preferential treatment because of their racioethnic and gender background, but at the same time, it is not possible that white men never receive or received preferential treatment because of *their* race and gender. To assume that white men never receive preferential treatment based on their race and gender implies not only that they earned their positions, but that all individuals had the same opportunities regardless of race and gender. Yet, it is well documented that not all individuals have the same educational, training, or promotion opportunities. Not only are there societal barriers to the advancement of white women and people of color, but individuals in power, white men, consciously and subconsciously, discriminate against white women and people of color (Baron & Bielby, 1985; Beehr & Juntunen, 1990; Braddock & McPartland, 1987; Catalyst, 1991; DiPrete, 1988; Dovidio, et al., 1989; Edmonson Bell & Nkomo, 1994; Fernandez, 1982; Garland & Price, 1977; McIntyre, Moberg, & Posner, 1980; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1987; Nieva & Gutek, 1980; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987; Ragins, 1989; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974; Stamp, 1986; Thomas & Alderfer, 1989).

²¹ No men with the Equal Privilege orientation mention this possibility. However, only six out of 36 respondents who provided written comments believe that white women and people of color receive undeserved opportunities. As I discuss in the section on men with the Equal Privilege orientation, there are two types of men with this orientation. The men who believe that white women and people of color receive undeserved opportunities have an orientation more along the line of white men with the Other Privilege orientation. On the other hand, four men with the White Privilege orientation allude to the

Not mentioning the possibility that some white men receive unearned promotions or that some members of the other groups receive earned promotions, while at the same time discussing the problems with white women and people of color receiving unearned promotions, suggests the respondents assume that it is normal for white men to be promoted and receive preferential treatment; i.e. that they have earned their current status. Conversely, this implies it is not normal for women and people of color to be promoted and receive preferential treatment; i.e. that they have not earned their current status. It is ironic that white men do not recognize they have been receiving preferential treatment in the United States because of their race and gender since our country was colonized by the Europeans. However, it may be very difficult to recognize this advantage because it is a basic assumption so deeply ingrained into our society and culture. As Peggy McIntosh (1988) points out, the corollary to the unearned disadvantages experienced by some is the unearned privilege experienced by others. The culture in which white men operate, not only in organizations but also in societal interactions, is one in which status is conferred upon them. Because white male status is so deeply ingrained into our society's dominant culture, it may be very difficult for white men to see many of the unearned privileges they enjoy, one of them being the preferential treatment they receive in hiring and promotion decisions just because they tend to look like those making the decisions. Further, in their forthcoming book, Edmonson Bell and Nkomo (forthcoming) discuss how white women do not see themselves as having a race (c.f. also Frankenberg (1993)). It is likely that this phenomenon applies to white men as well. If white men do not see themselves as having a race or gender, then it would be very difficult for them to see the advantages they receive resulting from both.

In summary, white men with the White Privilege orientation assume a dichotomy between preferential treatment and fair treatment. They associate diversity programs with preferential treatment of white women and people of color. This is evidence of the in-group favoritism that characterizes ethnocentric attitudes, and is based on the assumption that, while it is fair for white men to receive preferential treatment because of their race and gender, it is not fair for other groups to receive preferential treatment because of their race and gender. The dichotomy is false because it may be necessary to give preferential

possibility that white men receive opportunities because of their race and gender. I discuss this in the section on men with the White Privilege orientation.

treatment to white women and people of color to create equal access to privileges for these groups. However, the perception that diversity strategies are not fair fuels resistance because it is white men who must give something up to see successful diversity results, and it is these men who will individually feel the affects of the abdication of some of their traditionally held power.

Diversity Strategies Threaten Economic and Political Security in the Organization

Although it is a validation of the construct that white men with the Other Privilege orientation are the most likely to feel threatened by other groups as a result of the diversity strategy, to call the finding tautological because it validates what we would expect to find belittles the fears that white men in this group experience. Perceptions of threat increase resistance to the diversity because white men are concerned that other groups will advance in the organization at the *expense* of white men.

White racism is a reaction to fear (Feagin & Sikes, 1994), and white men in this group fear that other groups present a threat to their economic and political security in the organization. A white male from Pipeco articulates this fear, and associates the fear with diversity when he says that “whites, especially males, feel ostracized/endangered” [WM:P:413]. This respondent conveys the fear that white males are an endangered group in the organization, and his reaction to the fear is to blame the diversity program. Another respondent makes it even more clear that he believes that diversity strategies threaten career opportunities for white men:

I believe there is a perception problem among younger white males that their promotion possibilities are severely limited because of the company’s overemphasis on diversity issues. [WM:P:52].

He uses the phrase “severely limited” to describe promotion opportunities for white men. Because it is part of the dominant culture that white men should not expect to compete with other groups for management positions, the respondent only sees that promotion possibilities among white males are limited. He does not acknowledge that promotion opportunities for other groups have been and continue to be limited. The available data from the companies do not indicate that other groups are being promoted in lieu of white men at a rate that should make white men fear for their jobs, or feel that their career

opportunities are severely limited.²² However, some men may see a few white women or people of color receive a promotion directly as a result of the diversity strategy and exaggerate the results.

It also is possible that diversity strategies provide a scapegoat, or an excuse, to white men who are not promotion material. Julian Bond, the narrator for Parts I and II of the documentary, Eyes on the Prize, in a column for the New York Times (June 26, 1990), writes:

Without having to compete with minorities or women, any white man, no matter what his qualifications, had a head start. All he needed was membership in the favored race and sex.

Perhaps it is true that career opportunities for white men are more limited because they are now competing for promotions with individuals from other groups, and if they are not the very best they do not receive the promotion. Rather than attributing their career paths to their own performance, they look for external attributions for their fate. Diversity programs are a convenient scape-goat, and get blamed even though the organizations' data do not indicate that white women and people of color are receiving a disproportionate number of promotions at the expense of white men.

Whether or not the fear of losing economic and political security in the organization is justified, the fear exists. This group of white men believes that diversity strategies threaten traditional hierarchies and do not feel their status and futures in the organization are stable. Although at the organizational level white men with the Other Privilege orientation might concede the need for a diversity strategy, they comprise the group that has the most to lose. In order for other groups to make inroads into management

²² One document I obtained from Wireco shows that while 44% of white male employees are managers and 33% of white female employees are managers, only 0-5% of the employees of other racioethnic gender groups are managers, with the exception of black females. 10% of black females are black managers. These are not official data, and I did not obtain them through formal channels. At Pipeco, I have all 163 non-white managers (and manager equivalents) and all 126 white female managers (and manager equivalents) in my sample. The company has tens of thousands of employees, so this should give some indication of the inroads white women and people of color are making into management at this company.

positions, white men must abdicate the monopoly they have held on these positions. When they perceive shrinking career opportunities, it is only natural to look elsewhere for blame, and diversity strategies set up white women and people of color well for this role.

Other Privilege Orientation and Intergroup Attitudes

In summary, white men with the Other Privilege orientation harbor antagonistic and ethnocentric intergroup attitudes and feel threatened by the diversity strategy. The qualitative data provide additional support to propositions three and four. Members of this group, which perceives its status in the organization to be unstable, have ethnocentric and antagonistic attitudes with respect to diversity strategies. They exhibit outgroup antagonism when they associate diversity strategies with quotas and the advancement of unqualified women and people of color, and ingroup favoritism when they view diversity strategies as unfair to white men. Rather than seeing diversity strategies as a way of compensating for the current racial and gender imbalance in the workforce they see them as an attempt to punish white men for the past:

Stop bashing White males for the sins of the past. ... [Diversity results in the] promotion of marginally qualified people. [WM:P:92].

Further, white men with the Other Privilege orientation are not empathic about the issues that white women and people of color face and blame their inability to make inroads into management positions on them:

Sometimes I get tired of hearing that some people are not given opportunities when I see that they aren't motivated or don't seize the opportunities they have. ... I believe some people use past injustices as a scapegoat or an excuse. [WM:P:41].

They attribute the inability of white women and people of color to advance in the organization to individual traits, rather than structural barriers:

[Too much attention is given to] past history of the diverse groups; need for respect - demanded by several people; female issues. [These issues] get in the way of [hard work, results, dedication, job knowledge, and

creativity]. Several people have deep rooted problems and use diversity as a tool to get attention. [WM:P:131].

Finally, white men with the Other Privilege orientation expect other groups to act like them. They do not express interest in accepting differences or trying to understand the issues that concern other groups.

Blacks and women spend too much energy focusing on their separateness and not enough in looking for ways to build unity or understanding with the rest of us. I haven't always, but now I try to be careful to be very fair (treat as equals) blacks and women. But I don't feel they try at all to be fair with white males in general. They seem to enjoy wallowing in their misfortunes and forever calling attention to how badly they're mistreated. If you want to be treated like an equal, then act like an equal. Don't spend so much time calling attention to how different you are. White males will respond to logical, purposeful behavior and will treat you like an equal. Until then, no amount of "programs" will result in true harmony. [WM:P:154].

The hostile and unfavorable attitudes these men express toward white women and people of color are examples of sexism and white racism. Wellman (, p. 210)writes :

... racism extends considerably beyond prejudiced beliefs. The essential feature of racism is not hostility or misperception, but rather the defense of a system from which advantage is derived on the basis of race.

White men need to share their high status positions and organizational power with other groups. The advantages they have enjoyed because they are white men are threatened. Since it is not nice to say they do not want to share their status and power, they use sexist and racist assumptions to justify their attempt to maintain the status quo. First, assuming that white women and people of color are not qualified for managerial positions puts the blame on the victim. It removes the burden from white men having to prove that they are not discriminating against other racioethnic gender groups to white women and people of color proving that they are capable. It blames the lack of white women and especially people of color in management on ignorance on the part of these groups, rather than on an

inherently sexist and racist organization structure. This tactic of shifting the burden is neither new nor limited to the career context. As Feagin and Vera (1995, p. 138) write, “Blaming African Americans for their own poverty has been a characteristic of white opinion for decades.” Second, the assumption that white women and people of color receive preferential treatment allows these white men to reduce a societal issue down to an individual issue. The emphasis on reverse discrimination invokes images of behaviors that contradict basic American ideals of equality and equal opportunity, and detracts from the basic reality that not everyone has equal access to educational and occupational opportunities (Feagin & Vera, 1995; Wellman,).

WHITE PRIVILEGE ORIENTATION

White men with the White Privilege orientation perceive their privileged status in the organization as stable. They agree that whites have more access to privileges than any other group. This group shows fewer ethnocentric and antagonistic attitudes than white men with the Other Privilege orientation. They are the least likely group to resist a diversity strategy. Further, they are the least likely to agree that diversity programs allow unqualified people to advance, to feel threatened by other groups, or to believe that they are ignored by the diversity strategy. In this section, I examine in more depth the intergroup attitudes harbored by white men with the White Privilege orientation, and compare their attitudes to those of white men with the Other Privilege orientation.

Diversity Programs Allow Unqualified People to Advance

Eight out of 22 (36%) men in this category express some concern about quotas and the perception of unqualified people receiving promotions. Of the respondents who discuss quotas in their survey comments, two indicate that unqualified personnel may include white men. They recognize the advantages granted to white men:

I think Pipeco is trying to face diversity issue but only for publicity. It's not really dealing with problems. [It is] still a “WASP” organization. I think Pipeco has been trying to deal with diversity issues. They have, I think, overreacted to public opinion and have promoted many unqualified minorities to upper management. It is in my opinion still a “WASP-good

old boy” organization that is trying, and not very successfully, to change its image. [WM:P:18].

While he believes that the organization has “promoted many unqualified minorities to upper management,” he also says that Pipeco is still a “WASP-good old boy” organization that has not made any real change. The ambiguity in his comment may reflect the awareness that while some white men receive unwarranted advantages solely because of their race and gender, some other groups are beginning to receive the same advantages, though for different reasons. He works at Pipeco, and the salience of diversity might be starting to raise doubts in his mind about the strength of the hold white men have on status.

A comment from the other respondent also suggests the possibility that white men receive undeserved promotions:

I get upset when I see anyone of any race or gender get promoted when they haven’t earned it, or turned down for promotion if they earned it.
[WM:P:100].

This respondent does not mention any specific race or gender. “Any race or gender” could include white men as well as members of other racioethnic gender groups. These two comments differ from those given by respondents with the Other Privilege orientation. While respondents with the Other Privilege orientation appear blind to the advantages afforded by their race and gender, these respondents seem to recognize that there are still privileges accessible to white men and not other groups.

Three men with the White Privilege orientation express concern with the image quotas convey. They recognize the negative image projected by the association of diversity strategies with quota systems:

Solidifying in senior and middle management the belief that diversity is valuable and to be sought after for positive reasons rather than to avoid a negative evaluation or to fill a “quota” [could improve the diversity strategy]. Counting numbers in jobs by race and gender. [receives too much attention.] It gives the impression that quantity or number of people

is the goal, not the business results which could occur from a high performance diverse team. [WM:P:164].

Rather than saying that quotas are the goal, as men with the Other Privilege orientation indicate, this respondent says that quotas give “the impression” that numbers are the ultimate goal of diversity programs. He is concerned about quotas, not because of negative organizational effects due to the advancement of certain groups of people, but rather because they have a negative image that detracts from the real goals of diversity programs. Another white man with the White Privilege orientation also expresses concern that the company “treats diversity much like affirmative action programs” [WM:P:237], and another argues that the company could improve the diversity strategy by changing the perception that it is an affirmative action program and is geared only toward white women and people of color:

[The diversity strategy] isn't, [an affirmative action program]. It is strength and competitiveness through diversity of ...background, experiences, perspectives, etc. We are not using the data enough to communicate facts allowing [the perception of the diversity strategy being affirmative action and non-white male to persist]. [WM:P:330].

Some men with the White Privilege orientation do express some antagonistic intergroup attitudes. Yet, even the negative and antagonistic comments made by men with this orientation are more tempered than the comments made by men with the Other Privilege orientation. Three men articulate concern that white females receive undeserved attention. For example, one man writes:

[There is] too much emphasis on white females. Several white females have been promoted to jobs where they are qualified, but may not be the best qualified. [WM:P:23].

White females have been the most successful of any minority group in making inroads into management, especially upper management positions. It may be this phenomenon that prompts the respondent to single out white women as recipients of undeserved promotions. The difference, however, between this respondent's comment and those made by white men with the Other Privilege orientation is that this respondent

acknowledges that the women are qualified, just not the most qualified. The assumptions made by men with the Other Privilege orientation is that the women are unqualified.

In summary, like white men with the Other Privilege orientation, white men with the White Privilege orientation express concern about the promotion of unqualified people. However, unlike white men with the Other Privilege orientation, they are more concerned about the image quotas convey than the possibility of organizational repercussions, and they do not make the same types of antagonistic assumptions regarding the competence of white women and people of color. Further, they are more likely to acknowledge the advantages afforded to white men because of their race and gender, even when they claim that other groups receive special treatment because of *their* race and gender. Finally, although men with the White Privilege orientation do convey some antagonistic intergroup attitudes, their remarks are not as derogatory as those of white men with the Other Privilege orientation.

Attention Given to Diversity

Nine out of 26 (35%) of the respondents with the White Privilege orientation indicate in the written survey responses that they do not believe too much attention is given to diversity. In fact, several respondents would like to see more done in this area. Some respondents, especially from Wireco, would like to see more accountability and action from management, as well as more specific programs. A white male from Wireco believes that “more consistent application” [WM:W:388] would improve the diversity strategy, and another from the same company wants “better access to training and implementation techniques” [WM:W:420].

It is not only Wireco employees, however who would like to see more accountability. Some Pipeco employees would also like to see more commitment, especially from higher level managers, as well as more program availability:

There needs to be more accountability. Some key higher level people do not place a very high priority on diversity. We need to build more on our successes in this area. [WM:P:395].

Educate people through the multicultural workshops. Convince people that improves business efficiency. Diversity is being addressed and people should be educated on the subject via workshops. [WM:P:163].

The difference between the Pipeco and Wireco comments is consistent with what we would expect from a company with a visible versus a subtle strategy. The Pipeco employees focus on tweaking the goals and improving on the existing programs. For example, one man is skeptical about the goals of diversity programs. He does not see his company as utilizing diversity, but rather trying to assimilate different groups:

In principle, we try to use diversity as an advantage (i.e. recognizing and capitalizing on the strengths of the diverse groups). In practice, we try to “average out” the differences to make everyone behave alike.
[WM:P:395].

On the other hand, Wireco employees would like to see any program at all:

There should be a mandatory core of diversity-related programs for all management and supervisory employees. Attendance should be tied to salary. No [issues around diversity receive too much attention]. Race and gender issues are all too volatile to be ignored. [WM:W:109].

As these comments evince, in contrast to those comments by men with the Other Privilege orientation, white men with the White Privilege orientation believe that there needs to be attention, if not more attention, given to race and gender issues. Several indicate concern that other issues obscure race and gender issues, which do not necessarily receive the attention they deserve. For example, where white men with the Other Privilege orientation trivialize race and gender issues and maintain that people use race and gender issues as an excuse for other problems, the following respondent believes that “class issues” obscure race and gender issues:

Class issues - i.e. management vs. non-management, professional vs. non-professional-... obscure the race/gender issues which are the real issues.
[WM:P:184].

Another white man with the White Privilege orientation agrees that other issues detract from increasing diversity in the organization:

White male backlash [receives too much attention]. The statistics do not support mistreatment unless you think of age-related or otherwise peaked personnel. We are not using the data enough to communicate facts allowing [the perception of the diversity strategy being affirmative action and non-white male to persist]. [WM:P:330].

This respondent is concerned about the attention given to white males, possibly because it detracts from other issues. He is aware that the data do not support the perception that other groups are advancing in the organization at the expense of white men. White men with the White Privilege orientation may still believe that some people use race and gender as an excuse for other issues. Unlike white men with the Other Privilege orientation, however, they recognize that the reverse is also true:

There needs to be more accountability. Some key higher level people do not place a very high priority on diversity. We need to build more on our successes in this area. Too often situations are over simplified as race and /or gender. Most of the so called diversity issues are not just race and gender, but involve other components as well. Of course, the reverse is also true in that some people disguise race and gender things as something else. There are often overarching components of societal and cultural values and stereotyping. The biggest diversity issue in my current group is based on educational level (gap between PhDs and others). The pie is not growing at Pipeco. That means when special emphasis is placed on achieving opportunities for one group(s) it is often at the expense of another group(s). However, I strongly support what we are doing. It is the right thing to do for all kinds of reasons. We will have reached our goal only when we achieve a level playing field for all groups. [WM:P:395].

The following respondent is not concerned that other issues detract from race and gender issues, but rather that too much emphasis on past injustices detract from the current evidence that racism exists. Although it is debatable whether or not one can examine

current racism without examining the historical context of race relations, this respondent is still sympathetic to the need for diversity programs.

Pipeco needs to address the issue of the effect of diversity programs on the white male. There is a feeling that the white male is not being rewarded properly because of diversity. While I personally don't hold this belief, it is perceived by others, thus real. The white male is questioning "Is Pipeco a good place to be for a white male?" In programs like "multicultural awareness," too much is put on the fact our ancestors practiced slavery and therefore whites should share the guilt of slavery! This turns whites off. Whites had no control of what happened before they were born. There are plenty of modern occurrences which could be used to demonstrate the prejudices that exist ... (à la Marge Schott) - those could be used ...to get intelligent individuals thinking and making them aware of current day wrongs. [WM:P:174].

At the same time, his statement is evidence that white men with the White Privilege orientation still harbor some ethnocentric attitudes. While it is true that issues concerning white men should be a part of a diversity strategy, his focus on the white male reflects some degree of in-group favoritism. The in-group favoritism is not as severe as that expressed by members of the Other Privilege orientational category, this respondent recognizes that there are, in fact, prejudices and biases that the company needs to address. Further, his concern is not that other groups are replacing white men in the organization, but rather that the perception of other groups replacing white men persists.

White Privilege Orientation and Intergroup Attitudes

In summary, white men with the White Privilege orientation harbor fewer ethnocentric and antagonistic attitudes than those with the Other Privilege orientation. They tend to believe that diversity deserves more attention and see other issues as detracting from the key issues surrounding race and gender. These men would like to see the actual content and implementation of the strategy improve with more accountability and commitment. What we do not know, however, is why white men with the White Privilege orientation recognize the privileges afforded to white men whereas white men with the Other Privilege orientation do not. We have no insight into their histories that could provide us

with clues as to why these men are more accepting of diversity strategies than men with the Other Privilege orientation. However, it is possible that they have not been exposed to diversity groups or to diversity programs. For example, one man with this orientation notes that the population at his work location is primarily white:

I might also note that I have worked primarily at rural mid-western sites where the population is nearly 100% white. Because of this, diversity programs have not been a major issue. [WM:P:353].

Another man acknowledges that he is not familiar with the diversity strategy:

I have missed most of the presentations, so I don't have a good feeling for what Pipeco has done here. [WM:P:100].

What we witness here are a range of attitudes associated with a group of white men who are aware of the sense of privilege associated with the race and gender. In their study of "The Souls of White Folk," Feagan and Vera (1995, p. 145) write:

The taken-for-granted position of white superiority in the social world was accompanied by feelings that ranged from hatred to indifference to guilt (p. 135).

Among these men we do not get a feeling of hatred, but we do get some sense of discomfort with some of the perceived changes. For example, the man who agrees that Pipeco is still a "WASP-good old boy" organization also says that Pipeco has "promoted many unqualified minorities to upper management. The man who wrote that several white women were promoted to jobs where they were not the best qualified has less antagonism toward other groups, but more than the man who gets upset when he sees anyone of any race or gender get promoted when they have not earned it.

Similarly, we do not directly perceive guilt among white men with the White Privilege orientation, although we do get a sense of concern with the status quo. Several men would like to see more attention given to diversity and suggest ways to improve the implementation of the diversity strategy. However, it is difficult to discern whether these

EQUAL PRIVILEGE ORIENTATION

White men with the Equal Privilege orientation believe that all groups have equal access to privileges. The average response of this group tends to be slightly higher than, or equal to, that of men with the White Privilege orientation, and lower than that of men with the Other Privilege orientation. The average resistance to the diversity strategy, the average perception that the diversity strategy allows unqualified people to advance, and the average perception of responsiveness of the strategy to the needs of white men is less than the average responses of white men with the Other Privilege orientation and more than the average responses of men with the White Privilege orientation. The average perception of threat from other groups is about the same as that of men with the White Privilege orientation.

Interpretation of the quantitative findings is difficult without examining the written comments provided by white men with the Equal Privilege orientation. It is easy to compare the White Privilege and Other Privilege orientations because they are so diametrically opposed. The Equal Privilege orientation seems to fall somewhere in-between the other two orientational categories with respect to their attitudes about diversity strategies. What the written comments show is that there are two sets of perceptions about the diversity strategies. One set of white men with the Equal Privilege orientation, the majority of men in the group, have perceptions that are similar to those of the White Privilege orientation in that they view diversity strategies positively.²³ They seem to believe that everyone should have equal access to privileges and that the company needs to take steps to promote diversity. The other set of white men with the Equal Privilege orientation have perceptions about the diversity strategy that are similar to those of white men with the Other Privilege orientation. These men seem to believe that everyone has equal access to privileges and that diversity strategies tip the scales in favor of white women and people of color. The statistical result of having these two sets

²³ A cluster analysis using three variables, resistance to diversity strategy, perception that the diversity strategy allows unqualified people to advance in the organization, and perception that diversity strategy is attentive to the needs of white men, yields two clusters. Comparison of the respondents in the two clusters with the respondents giving positive and negative comments regarding the diversity programs validates the analysis. One cluster, comprising the majority of the respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation (75%), represents respondents with attitudes similar to those of white men with the White Privilege orientation. The other cluster (25%) represents respondents with attitudes similar to those of white men with the Other Privilege orientation.

of perceptions in the same orientation is an average response that falls between the other two orientational categories. Because there are more white men with the Equal Privilege orientation whose attitudes are similar to those with the White Privilege orientation, the averages are slightly closer to the averages of the White Privilege orientational category. In the following paragraphs, I will discuss the perceptions of each of these two groups of white men with the Equal Privilege orientation.

The Equal Privilege orientation and a positive attitude toward diversity

Many of the respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation have a positive attitude toward diversity:

Action items from diversity programs should be a continuous effort all year long. [WM:W:273].

None of the respondents in this category indicate that too much attention is given to race and gender issues. Some of the respondents indicate that since a diverse workforce is a company goal, it cannot receive too much attention. For example, one respondent writes:

A clearer understanding of the goals we are striving to attain, our strategy/approach for reaching these goals and periodic updates on our status, etc. [could improve the diversity strategy]. The whole subject is much higher in profile than it has been in the past and consequently it receives a fair amount of attention. The corporation is sincere about the issue of increasing diversity in the workplace and it is therefore a more paramount concern. Given this concern and strategic intent, I do not think the attention devoted to the topic of diversity is too much! [WM:P:30].

White men with the Other Privilege orientation tend to believe that management gives too much attention to race and gender in promotion decisions. Rather, like the White Privilege group, men with the Equal Privilege would like to see management take the diversity strategy more seriously. Three types of comments support this contention. First, the men in this group indicate they believe the programs are too superficial. For example, one respondent believes that the diversity programs are too simplistic and change too often. He also thinks diversity goals are confused with other goals:

Get honest! Set the goals, policies etc. and attain them. Too much like the “program of the month.” Too technical and simplistic! Totally confused with cost reduction goals. [WM:P:47].

Another respondent agrees that the programs are superficial:

The programs should go to greater depth. I would like to see the effort conclude that better business results will be achieved by a diverse work force than by a non-diverse work group. [WM:P:374].

His comment indicates concern that management is not doing a good enough job convincing everyone that a diverse workforce will produce better business results. It is unclear whether he believes a diverse workforce will produce better business results, but, like respondents with the White Privilege orientation, he wants to see more resources devoted to the effort.

Second, several respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation indicate concern that management does not take the diversity strategies seriously. One respondent complains that lack of results from the diversity strategy is due to a lack of management accountability:

There appears to be very little management accountability for diversity. There are lots of programs and much discussion but little noticeable impact if objectives aren't achieved. The objectives seem to be very soft - very little that management can be held accountable. We have a lot to overcome considering our “old boy white male” network and also considering the demographics we face in the years ahead. [WM:P:26].

The respondent is aware of informal barriers to advancement for white women and people of color, suggesting he recognizes some of the advantages of being a white man in the organizational setting. He is also aware that, given the changing nature of the workforce, the company needs to address diversity issues. Another respondent agrees that management needs to take more responsibility for diversity. He does not see managers taking diversity goals seriously, and indicates this is a problem:

[There are] still many managers in powerful evaluation roles that do not value diversity or see behavior around diversity issues as nonproductive. [WM:P:138].

Third, several respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation indicate they believe the diversity strategy is poorly communicated. For example, one respondent believes the programs do not receive enough publicity:

More publicity [and] more education of all employees [could improve diversity programs]. [WM:P:151].

Similarly, another thinks management needs to more widely disseminate information about the strategy:

More communication on corporate vision, goals, and progress reports to the whole organization (this may exist now but does not “filter” down very low in the management organization!). [WM:P:196].

Another respondent thinks that although his company is committed to diversity goals, it is not doing enough to publicize the goals. The consequence is that nothing has changed; his manager is still more likely to hire or promote a white male than a member of another racioethnic gender group.

[The diversity strategy could be] more widely and regularly publicized. I think that Wireco does a good job with committing to diversity. Naturally, some of it falls on deaf ears. For example, my organization for the past 5 months tends to be on the white male techie track. People brought in, promoted, or recognized tend to resemble my manager who is white, male, and technically oriented. [WM:W:307]

The reaction of these white men with the Equal Privilege orientation is different from that of white men with the Other Privilege orientation, and similar to that of the White Privilege orientation. First, they do not think too much attention is given to diversity. In fact, they do not think enough attention is given to the issue. Second, they are aware that white males still have an advantage when it comes to promotion opportunities. They do

not think that other groups are receiving promotions at the expense of white men. However, there is a group of white men within the Equal Privilege orientation who have a very different perception of the programs. I discuss these men in the next section.

Equal Privilege orientation and a negative attitude toward diversity

Like men with the Other Privilege orientation, some men in the Equal Privilege category may associate diversity strategies with quotas:

[There is too much attention paid to] quotas. In a desperate attempt to meet quotas, often inferior talent is employed; this has a very negative impact on morale. [WM:P:115].

Although the responses indicate antagonistic intergroup attitudes, the antagonism expressed in their comments reflects more moderate attitudes. First, members of this orientational category are the second most likely, on average, to agree that diversity strategies allow unqualified people to advance in the organization. Unlike respondents in the Other Privilege orientational category, this is not seen as an undesirable result of diversity strategies, rather as an issue that needs improving. For example, one Pipeco respondent suggests the company make efforts to ensure that training opportunities are The issue for this respondent is not that unqualified people are being promoted at the expense of white men, but rather that people are not being properly trained for the promotions. He wants to see the most qualified people promoted, but he also wants to see people of all races and genders becoming qualified. He writes:

Numbers - quotas [receive too much attention]. It leads to non-qualified people being promoted and then failing. More broad-based efforts, including the needs of white males[could improve the diversity strategy]. Promoting the most qualified people serves everyone well but we must make sure that people of all races and genders are becoming qualified. [WM:P:326].

This sentiment is different from that of men with the White Privilege orientation. Men with the White Privilege orientation express concern about the negative image quotas convey. This respondent expresses concern about the poor implementation of a quotas

due to its failure to look at the whole system, i.e. the preparation of the people who will benefit from the quotas for their new positions. It is as if quotas per se are not a problem if the people who receive the promotions also receive the proper training.

Second, some men with the Equal Privilege orientation believe that quotas are undesirable because they divert attention from the real issues:

[We need to] focus employees' understanding on issues of qualitative/ training/ development aspects. [I] have gotten much negative feedback on the "numbers" part of the program (how many diverse groups shall get the next promotion). [There is too much attention paid to the] per cent of diverse groups to get promotions. Although its probably good to have a specific number or percent to achieve, it has become the most discussed topic even though that is a small part of the total program. [WM:P:16].

Similarly, another respondent with the Equal Privilege orientation believes that quotas divert from the real diversity issues:

[Pipeco] should get rid of the number goals. [Pipeco] should include diversity as specific performance criteria. Mandatory numbers.[receive too much attention] . A great global company must reward performance or they will fail. Performance should be criteria for all - we can improve performance and diversity together. If we only improve diversity we will fail. [WM:P:60].

Although their reactions to quotas are more tempered than the reactions by white men with the Other Privilege orientation, these men with the Equal Privilege orientation still exhibit antagonistic and ethnocentric intergroup attitudes. First, there is evidence of antagonistic attitudes. The following respondent makes the same assumptions about competence as men with the Other Privilege orientation. He writes:

I view most of Pipeco's efforts in diversity as highly positive. We now have sufficient "diversity" in the workplace to understand that diversity is in general highly additive. But there are a few women and People of Color who are not competent to do the jobs they have. Pipeco, because of

the extreme sensitivity of such issues, does not deal with these cases effectively. The primary strategy for dealing with these problems is to make them someone else's problems. We need better tools to deal with this concern [WM:P:177].

The respondent says that "there are a few women and people of color who are not competent." Like white men with the Other Privilege orientation, he does not mention the fact that there are a few white men who are not competent. This omission suggests an association of competence with white men and incompetence with other groups. He goes on to say that although he thinks we have a moral obligation to embrace diversity, there is a problem in that there is a scarcity of competent black men and women:

Diversity is something we must embrace because we have a moral obligation to allow everyone an opportunity to participate fully in our society. Diversity per se does not necessarily yield competitive advantage (e.g. Japan isn't particularly diverse). A problem I have encountered in staffing my organization with diverse individuals is the scarcity of competent technically trained black men and women. I've heard lots about my obligations and responsibilities to diverse individual. I would be interested in a study of the obligations and responsibilities of diverse individuals to others in the corporation and to the corporation.

To be fair, it is possible that there are societal barriers that prevent black men and women from attaining the same level of training as white men. In fact, other respondents have indicated that more training for non-white men would improve their ability to attain diversity goals. However, it is also possible that his ideologically biased assessment of competence blinds him to the possibility that there are, in fact, competent black men and women.

Second, also like the respondents with the Other Privilege orientation, some members of this Equal Privilege orientational category express ethnocentric intergroup attitudes. For example, the following respondent trivializes diversity issues by not recognizing the need for a safe environment to share issues and concerns:

If Pipeco or any other U.S. company is to remain globally competitive, it must promote based on “the most qualified for the job.” Diversity is being viewed as a male/female and people of color issue versus diverse ideas and culture/approaches that can provide better, more efficient ways to produce and/or lead regardless of race or gender. Pipeco appears to be providing support groups and other kinds of seminars or focal groups that are “for people of color” and the female gender only. These focal groups accentuate separation of the work force versus integration and tends to propagate the idea that the groups have special status and are to be treated as a separate entity. [WM:P:246].

This respondent, like white men with the Other Privilege orientation who fail to distinguish between equal treatment and fair treatment, fails to recognize the need for white women and people of color to develop a social network of their own because they are excluded from white male networks. He does not recognize that the dominant informal networks in the organization tend to be for white men only. Nor does he recognize that these informal networks also accentuate separation of the work force rather than integration and tend to propagate the idea that white men have special status and are to be treated as a separate entity. The white male network is a part of the cultural fabric of the organization. Consequently, it is difficult for the respondent to understand that other groups have the same right as white men to have access to a set of people who provide the same kind of support and access to information as members of the white male network.

As another example of ethnocentric attitudes, the following respondent perceives the promotion of white women and people of color as reverse discrimination:

I didn't think diversity issues were a problem in the past, but now realize they probably were. What I see now, though, based on the most recent promotions around me, are somewhat reverse discrimination in some cases. [WM:W:135].

It is interesting that this man did not think that diversity issues were a problem in the past. In the past, Wireco did not address diversity issues. This lends credence to the interpretation of the negative attitudes harbored by some men with the Equal Privilege

orientation that these men see diversity strategies as creating an unfair system where everyone previously had equal opportunities. These men perceive that now some individuals are given more opportunities than others. This attitude reflects what Wellman (1993, p.162) calls the “if-I-can-make-it-anyone-can” strategy for maintaining privilege. This strategy denies that sexist and racist systems blocks opportunities for the education and career development of white women and people of color, and espouses the American ideology that equal opportunities are available to everyone. Since everyone has equal opportunity, any program that gives differential treatment to different groups is unnecessary. Viewing people as the same regardless of race makes room for charges of reverse discrimination and “allows overlooking the social context for affirmative action programs that seek to remedy years of structured inequality and thereby promote the talents and merits of individuals of color” (Frankenberg, 1993).

Reconciling intragroup differences in the Equal Privilege orientational category

All the men with the Equal Privilege orientational category rate all groups as having equal access to privileges. However, as I have shown, there are strong differences even within this group. While more of the men with the Equal Privilege orientation have positive attitudes toward the diversity strategy, there are many (25%) who do not. This raises two questions. First, how can I justify putting all these men into the same orientational category? Second, do the strong intragroup differences invalidate the construct? To answer the first question, I need to look beyond the intergroup differences and examine the intragroup differences at the orientational category level. Although there are intragroup differences in general attitudes toward diversity strategies within the Equal Privilege group, there are also some striking differences between the Equal Privilege orientation and the other two orientations. First, the expressions of fear and anger that characterize the Other Privilege orientation is not visible among the comments given by respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation. The average perception of threat from other groups by respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation is similar to that of respondents with the White Privilege orientation. Perhaps it is the lack of perceived threat from other groups that diminishes the fear and anger that might otherwise be felt by members of this orientational category. Second, also distinguishing this category from the Other Privilege category, overall respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation seem to think that diversity is at least theoretically good. Even respondents who express negative attitudes seem to believe that, properly implemented, diversity strategies will benefit the company: “diversity is something we must embrace

because we have a moral obligation to allow everyone an opportunity to participate fully in our society” [WM:P:177]. Third, although respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation have similar attitudes as respondents with the White Privilege orientation in that they do not express anger and believe that diversity is a good thing, their concerns about the diversity strategy differ. While respondents with the White Privilege orientation are concerned about the negative image diversity strategies convey, respondents with the Equal privilege orientation are concerned about the actual extent to which management takes the programs seriously and makes serious efforts to propagate information regarding the programs.

To answer the second question, it is possible that the intragroup differences invalidate the construct. However, I do not believe they do. I designed the construct to represent the notion that it is beneficial to examine differences within racioethnic and gender groups. For the purposes of analysis, it is always necessary to ignore some individual differences and aggregate across similarities along some chosen dimension. The dimension I chose is perceptions of access to privileges. The intragroup differences within the Equal Privilege orientational category simply highlight the importance both of not stereotyping based on superficial dimensions, and the necessity of digging deeper to understand multiple perspectives within groups of people.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter examined the reactions of white men to strategies to create an organizational culture that is conducive to the hiring, retention, and promotion of all people. The strategies for change represent a revolutionary change process because they threaten the status hierarchies in the organization. The data in the study support the premise that there is a relationship between the type of strategy a company uses for change and the resistance to this strategy. However, it is not a clear relationship. The nature of the relationship depends on the subjective orientations of the members of the organization with respect to perceptions of status stability. Overall, the more that white men perceive their status in the organization to be stable, the less they will resist a strategy for change, regardless of the type of strategy. However, white men who perceive their status to be stable will demonstrate less resistance to a subtle than a visible strategy for change, and white men who perceive less status stability will resist a visible strategy less than a subtle strategy.

I also demonstrated a relationship between diversity strategies and intergroup attitudes. As with resistance to the strategy, the levels of intergroup attitudes under each of the diversity strategies depend on the subjective orientations of the organizations' members. Overall, the more stable that white men perceive their status, the less they display negative intergroup attitudes. White men who perceive their status to be stable will demonstrate fewer intergroup attitudes in an organization with a subtle strategy; white men who perceive their status to be unstable will demonstrate fewer intergroup attitudes in an organization with a visible strategy.

CHAPTER FIVE

BLACK MEN AND WOMEN

The set of variables of interest facing white men and black men and women are different. First, although black men do perceive some threat from women, black respondents overall tend not to agree that diversity strategies benefit women and non-white employees at the expense of men and white employees. Second, the perception that diversity strategies allow unqualified people to advance in organizations is not a reaction found among black respondents. Finally, rather than use perceptions that the promotion process allows unqualified people to advance in the organization to operationalize antagonistic intergroup attitudes, I use the index indicating antagonism toward white men.

There is no reason to believe that issues of concern to black employees would be the same as those that concern white employees. Black employees face a whole set of career development barriers in the organization that white employees, especially white men, do not. They face subtle and overt racism both from their peers and from their superiors, they must manage the stresses that arise from negotiating through multiple cultural environments, and they must deal with tokenism and stereotypes of incompetence. Further, African-Americans tend to be excluded from informal networks within the organization, to have less access to mentoring, to face biases in job evaluations, and be pushed toward staff, rather than line, positions (see Edmonson Bell and Nkoma (1994) for a thorough review and discussion of these barriers). The reality of these issues fosters self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes that we do not find among white respondents; as the data will demonstrate, black respondents tend to be pessimistic about their career opportunities.

QUANTITATIVE DATA RESULTS

While there are some differences in the variables of interest between white male and black respondents, black respondents do share some variables of interest with white men. For example, their reactions to the diversity strategy are pertinent, as are their perceptions of the effectiveness of the strategy. Further, black respondents exhibit ethnocentric intergroup attitudes. They tend to perceive that the diversity strategy does not address

issues concerning black employees, although this result varies by orientational category. Table 5.1 shows by company the average values for all the variables of interest for the black respondents, namely reaction to diversity strategy, perceptions of effectiveness of strategy, ethnocentrism, self-deprecation, and antagonism

TABLE 5.1
Black Respondents' Average Values of Variables by Company
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total</u>
Reaction to Diversity Strategy ^b	1.2 (.3)	1.3 (.5)	1.2 (.4)
Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy	2.5 (1.0)	2.6 (.8)	2.5 (.9)
Ethnocentrism ^a	.4 (.8)	.0 (.8)	.3 (.8)
Self-Deprecation ^b	3.5 (.6)	3.3 (.6)	3.4 (.6)
Antagonism Toward White Men ^b	4.0 (1.0)	4.3 (.5)	4.1 (.9)

a Statistically significant difference between Wireco and Pipeco at $\alpha=.05$.

b Statistically significant difference between Wireco and Pipeco at $\alpha=.10$.

Question five in Chapter One asks whether black respondents will support a visible strategy more than a subtle strategy. The data in Table 5.1 indicate the opposite: there is more support among Wireco respondents than among Pipeco respondents. Popular literature cited in Chapter One implies that we will find resistance to diversity strategies among black employees because of the fear of being stigmatized as receiving career opportunities only to fill quotas rather than because of their merit. These data tend to support this argument. They suggest that the fear of being stigmatized is greater in the company with the visible strategy, and consequently there is less support for the strategy. This makes sense substantively. At Pipeco, diversity is more salient because of the visible strategy. Hence it follows that black employees will worry more about the reactions of other racioethnic gender groups. As I discuss in later sections of this chapter, comments provided by black respondents do indicate that they resent this stigmatization. However, rather than resist the diversity strategy, as the popular literature would have us to believe, the black respondents seem to support the concept of diversity and would like

to see more action taken to improve the implementation of the strategy.²⁴ One of the actions they would like to see is more effort to dispel the negative stigmatization.

Question six asks what is the relationship between intergroup attitudes and both strategy for change and support of the diversity strategy. The data in Table 5.1 indicate that ethnocentric and self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes are stronger at Wireco than at Pipeco. It appears that at Pipeco, the company with the visible strategy, black employees are more likely to perceive that their group receives attention relative to other groups and consequently are less resentful of the attention other groups do receive. Again, this result makes sense. Because the strategy is more salient, the black employees believe that the company is making a substantive effort to improve the work environment for their group. Further, the visible strategy may give black employees more confidence in their promotion opportunities than does the subtle strategy. Antagonism toward white men, on the other hand, is stronger at Pipeco than at Wireco. This may be due to the impression that the white men in power at Pipeco are not making serious efforts to share high status positions and organizational power. In fact, consistent with the high values at both companies for antagonism toward white men, the qualitative data from black respondents at both companies indicate that they doubt the efficacy of the diversity strategies.

Correlations among the variables (see Table 5.2) indicate there is a relationship between level of support for the diversity strategy and antagonism toward white men; higher levels of antagonism toward white men are related to lower levels of support for the strategy. It may be that the low support stems from a perception that the diversity strategy is not really doing anything to change who has access to the higher status positions traditionally held by white men. In fact, lower antagonism is related to higher perceived effectiveness of the diversity strategy. Further, there is a relationship between perceived effectiveness of the diversity strategy and the other intergroup attitudes. The more effective the respondents perceive the diversity strategy, the fewer negative intergroup attitudes they harbor.²⁵

²⁴ To reflect this trend, in this chapter I refer to the variable representing reactions to the diversity strategy as "Support for Diversity Strategy."

²⁵ This relationship continues to exist when I control for company.

TABLE 5.2
Correlations Among Variables

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Support for Diversity Strategy	-.20	0.0	0.0	.30**
Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy (1)		-.40**	-.30*	-.45**
Ethnocentrism (2)			.10	.18
Self-Deprecation (3)				.25**
Antagonism Toward White Men (4)				

** p<.01.

* p<.05.

Finally, question seven asks about the relationships among diversity strategies, reactions to the diversity strategies, and intergroup attitudes when I introduce orientational category as a moderating variable. To recap a previous discussion, among black respondents perceptions of relative access to privilege indicate perceptions of status boundary permeability. Status boundaries exist when certain groups are relegated to low status positions, because of demographic characteristics of their groups, and other groups have the opportunity to advance to high status positions, also because of demographic characteristics of their groups. Historically, white men have had a monopoly on high status positions, both in the public and in the private sector, in the United States. White women, and especially people of color, have been confined to the lower status positions in our society. In the two organizations I study, white employees occupy the majority of management, especially upper management positions. A small percentage of black employees have been able to make inroads into these positions. Diversity strategies, in theory, strive to increase the flow of black employees, among other groups, from low status to high status positions. In other words, they try to increase the permeability of the status boundaries. I argued in Chapter 3 that black respondents with the Other Privilege orientation perceive the least permeable status boundaries, as they feel that all other employees have more access to privileges than black employees. At the other end of the spectrum, the respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation perceive the most permeable status boundaries. These respondents perceive that they have the same access to privileges as employees from other racial groups. Respondents with the White Privilege orientation perceive impermeable status boundaries, but not as impermeable as respondents with the Other Privilege orientation; they only have to ‘compete’ with white employees.

Table 5.3 shows the average values of the variables by orientational category. The analysis of variance results in Table 5.3 indicate that black respondents tend to support diversity strategies, regardless of their orientation. The lack of variation among the orientational categories for support of the diversity strategy may reflect an overall realization among black employees that some type of intervention is necessary to ensure equal opportunity for all groups.

TABLE 5.3
Black Respondents' Average Values of Variables by Orientational Category
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

	White Privilege			Other Privilege			Equal Privilege		
	Wireco	Pipeco	Total	Wireco	Pipeco	Total	Wireco	Pipeco	Total
Support for Diversity Strategy	1.2 (.3)	1.3 (.5)	1.2 (.5)	1.1 (.3)	1.4 (.5)	1.2 (.4)	1.1 (.1)	1.3 (0.0)	1.1 (.1)
Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy ^b	2.4 (.9)	2.6 (.8)	2.5 (.9)	3.8 (.9)	2.0 (.8)	2.3 (.9)	3.8 (.9)	3.4 (.2)	3.6 (.7)
Ethnocentrism	.3 (.7)	0.0 (.9)	.2 (.8)	.7 (1.0)	.3 (.7)	.6 (.9)	.1 (.7)	0.0 (0.0)	.1 (.6)
Self-Deprecation ^c	3.4 (.5)	3.3 (.5)	3.4 (.5)	3.6 (.7)	3.5 (.6)	3.6 (.7)	3.4 (.4)	2.0 (0.0)	3.1 (.7)
Antagonism Toward White Men ^a	4.0 (.9)	4.3 (.5)	4.1 (.8)	4.3 (.5)	4.3 (.4)	4.3 (.5)	2.1 (.9)	3.3 (0.0)	2.3 (.9)

a Statistically significant differences among the orientational categories at $\alpha=.001$.

b Statistically significant difference among the orientational categories at $\alpha=.01$.

c Statistically significant difference among the orientational categories at $\alpha=.10$.

Black respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation do perceive the strategy as more effective than other black respondents. It may be that respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation perceive more permeable status boundaries because they have benefited from the diversity strategy. Thus, they perceive the strategy to be effective.

While there are statistically significant differences among the orientational categories for the variables indicating self-deprecatory and antagonistic intergroup attitudes, there are no statistically significant differences among the orientational categories for ethnocentric intergroup attitudes. However, the substantive differences among the orientational categories for ethnocentric intergroup attitudes follow the same trend as the statistically significant differences for self-deprecatory and antagonistic intergroup attitudes. Black respondents with the Other Privilege orientation perceive the least permeable status

boundaries and harbor the highest intergroup attitudes. Respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation perceive the most permeable status boundaries and harbor the lowest intergroup attitudes. These data support the premise that those respondents who perceive cognitive alternatives to justify their lower status positions have fewer intergroup attitudes than those who do not perceive cognitive alternatives.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In the remaining sections of this paper, I will discuss three results that stand out in the above analysis. First, there are differences in reactions to the diversity strategy between Wireco and Pipeco, but not among the orientational categories. Written comments provided by black respondents indicate that all are supportive of the concept of a diversity strategy. However, Wireco respondents are less satisfied than Pipeco respondents with the content of the strategy.

TABLE 5.4
Black Respondents' Ethnocentric Intergroup Attitudes With Respect to Particular Racioethnic Gender Groups :
Average Scores By Orientational Category
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

Racioethnic Gender Group	White Privilege (N=55)	Other Privilege (N=20)	Equal Privilege (N=6)	Total (N=81)	ANOVA F-Statistic ^a
White Men	+5 (1.9)	+7 (1.5)	-1.2 (.8)	+4 (1.8)	2.5~
White Women	+1.4 (1.3)	+1.8 (1.2)	+3 (.8)	+1.4 (1.3)	3.0~
Asian Men	-.1 (1.0)	+9 (1.4)	+3 (.8)	+2 (1.2)	5.8**
Asian Women	-.1 (.9)	+5 (1.4)	+3 (.8)	+1 (1.1)	3.1~
Hispanic Men	-.2 (.8)	.0 (.7)	.3 (.8)	-.1 (.8)	1.7
Hispanic Women	-.1 (.7)	.0 (.7)	.3 (.8)	-.1 (.7)	.9

^a There are no statistically significant company or gender differences.

Second, ethnocentric intergroup attitudes are stronger at Wireco than at Pipeco, and there seems to be at best only a mild relationship between perceptions of status boundary permeability and ethnocentric attitudes. If we examine ethnocentric intergroup attitudes for specific racioethnic and gender groups (see Table 5.4), however, there appears to be a stronger relationship between perceptions of status boundary permeability and ethnocentric attitudes. Table 5.4 shows that black respondents believe that the diversity strategies address issues concerning other groups, with the exception of Hispanic men and women, more than issues concerning black employees. There are also substantive differences in these perceptions among the orientational categories. Examining average levels of ethnocentrism harbored by black respondents toward the other six racioethnic gender groups, black respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation, those who perceive the most permeable status boundaries, have the least ethnocentric attitudes toward white employees. Black respondents with the Other Privilege orientation, those who perceive the least permeable status boundaries, harbor the most ethnocentric attitudes.

Third, three findings stand out regarding self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes. One, Wireco respondents are less optimistic about their chances of receiving a promotion than are Pipeco respondents. This may be a reflection of the different types of strategies the companies employ. At Wireco, as I will show in the next section, many black respondents are not aware of the diversity strategy or do not believe any substantial change is taking place. As I discuss in the next section, black respondents from Pipeco would like to see more action in the realm of diversity. Yet, because there is a visible strategy, they may perceive more change is taking place in terms of career opportunities. Two, there is a relationship between perceptions of status boundary permeability and self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes. Black respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation perceive the most permeable status boundaries. Although the small number of respondents with this orientation make it difficult to discern company differences within orientation, overall members of this group tend to have the most confidence in the likelihood of receiving a promotion if competing with a similarly qualified individual from another racioethnic gender group. This finding is consistent with what we would expect to find from a group of individuals who believe all individuals have equal access to privileges. Black respondents with the Other Privilege orientation perceive status boundaries as the least permeable of all orientations, and members of this group, on average, are the least likely to believe they will receive a promotion if competing from an individual from another racioethnic gender group. The respondents with the White

Privilege orientation have slightly less self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes than those with the Other Privilege orientation, but more than those with the Equal Privilege orientation. One interpretation of this finding is that black employees with the Other Privilege orientation feel doubly at a disadvantage. Whereas those employees with the White Privilege orientation feel as if only white employees have more access to privileges, those with the Other Privilege orientation feel as if all other employees have more access to privileges than do black employees.

TABLE 5.5
Perceptions of Likelihood of Receiving a Promotion If Competing With An Equally Qualified Employee From Other Racioethnic Gender Groups

<u>Respondent</u>	Percent of respondents who rate themselves equally or more likely to receive a promotion if competing with:			
	<u>White male</u>	<u>White female</u>	<u>Black male</u>	<u>Black female</u>
White male	97	29	32	28
White female	44	95	56	54
Black male	18	27	98	51
Black female	11	17	81	97

Three, with the exception of the two respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation at Pipeco, black respondents regardless of company or orientation tend to believe they are less likely to receive a promotion than an employee from another racioethnic gender background. Self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes have a negative connotation. They conjure up images of low self-esteem. Although I would argue that black respondents do exhibit self-deprecatory intergroup behaviors as they perceive their career opportunities limited relative to those of other racioethnic gender groups, I would also argue that these behaviors may reflect a degree of reality. Despite cries of reverse discrimination, there are more white respondents who think they will get a promotion if they are competing with a black employee for the promotion than there are black respondents who think they will get a promotion if they are competing with a white employee (see Table 5.5). This finding can not be attributed merely to low self-esteem because when black employees feel they are competing with other black employees they rate their chances of receiving a promotion as much higher. In addition, black men think black women are more likely to receive the promotion and black women think black men are more likely to receive the promotion. When black men and black women are competing for a promotion with

someone from their same racioethnic gender group, they seem to believe the playing field is level and feel they have a fairly good chance of receiving a promotion. Rather, the self-deprecatory responses to this set of questions may reflect the reality that black respondents face barriers to career opportunities because of their race. Three barriers to advancement are lack of opportunities to demonstrate competence, exclusion from key social networks, and aversive discrimination (Braddock & McPartland, 1987; Edmonson Bell & Nkomo, 1994; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Fernandez, 1982; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987). Lack of opportunities to demonstrate competence translates into lack of opportunities for career advancement, and exclusion from key social networks translates into reduced job socialization and information regarding career opportunities (Kanter, 1977).

In the remainder of this chapter, I will discuss these three findings. First, I will discuss the differences between Wireco and Pipeco respondents in their reactions to the diversity strategy. Second, despite these quantitative differences between the companies and the orientational categories, the nature of the comments indicating ethnocentric attitudes are indistinguishable between the two companies, as are the nature of the comments from the different orientations. Respondents across company and orientation indicate that they perceive that the concerns of white employees receive too much attention. At the same time, the respondents express concern that quotas receive too much attention because they create a perception that black employees are hired and promoted not because of merit, but because of their race. The only noticeable difference surfaces among the orientational categories. Consistent with their lower level of ethnocentrism, no respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation express such concerns. I will discuss these two concerns in detail, paying more attention to the similar experiences of respondents in Wireco and Pipeco than to the differences.

Finally, the comments provided by black respondents indicate they face stress and mobility barriers due to the discrimination, albeit subtle, they experience. I will discuss their perceptions of mobility barriers to understand the basis for seemingly self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes.

REACTIONS TO DIVERSITY STRATEGY

The general reaction to the diversity strategy among white male respondents is one of resistance and is highly emotional, mainly because the concept of diversity triggers a number of emotional responses related to fear, perceptions of threat, and misunderstanding of the meaning and implementation of diversity. On the other hand, the general reaction to the diversity strategy among black respondents is more pragmatic. While emotions do surface in the black respondents' comments, they tend to reflect the trials of living corporate life as a black employee. When the black respondents discuss diversity strategies, they are concerned with the details of the actual measures taken to implement the strategies. Many, in fact most, black respondents from both Wireco and Pipeco think the company could do more and could do better. The average score for the index indicating perceptions of effectiveness of the diversity strategy is below the mean for both companies, suggesting that most black respondents do not believe the diversity strategy is very effective. However, perceptions of effectiveness are not related to support for the diversity strategy, implying that black respondents are supportive of the concept of diversity even though they do not believe the existing strategy is very effective.

There are differences among the orientational categories in perceptions of effectiveness. In particular, black respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation tend to agree that the diversity strategy is effective. This finding makes sense substantively. Those respondents with the equal privilege orientation do not see any racioethnic gender group as having more access to privileges than any other group. Thus, it is possible that they believe that diversity programs are working and that the company is doing enough.

At the same time, 94% of the black respondents indicate that other groups still have more access to privileges, defined largely as career advancement opportunities²⁶, and feel it is very difficult to advance in the organization despite Affirmative Action and diversity strategies. It is possibly for this reason that many black employees would like to see more substantive action taken to improve the racial climate in their companies. Out of 89

²⁶ As discussed in Chapter Three and as I will further discuss later in this chapter.

respondents (78 provided written comments), 57 respondents (64%) commented on practical implementation aspects such as the extent and nature of action taken by the company, the communication of the strategy, accountability and goal setting, and the consistency with which the strategy is applied. Table 5.6 shows the implementation concerns of black respondents by orientation and by company.

TABLE 5.6
Implementation Concerns of Black Respondents by Orientation and By Company*

	White Privilege		Other Privilege		Equal Privilege		Total	
	Wireco	Pipeco	Wireco	Pipeco	Wireco	Pipeco	Wireco	Pipeco
More Specific Action	32% (12)	24% (5)	16% (3)	50% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	23% (14)	21% (6)
Accountability	22% (8)	33% (7)	11% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (1)	17% (10)	31% (9)
Better Communication	14% (5)	19% (4)	16% (3)	17% (1)	25% (1)	0% (0)	15% (9)	17% (5)
Consistent Application	3% (1)	10% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (1)	2% (1)	10% (3)
Unimportant Issues Detract From Important Issues	14% (5)	24% (5)	26% (5)	17% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (10)	21% (6)
Unaware of Diversity Strategy	19% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (1)	25% (1)	0% (0)	13% (8)	3% (1)
Total Respondents Providing Comments	89% (33)	90% (19)	89% (17)	83% (5)	75% (3)	50% (1)	88% (53)	86% (25)
Total Respondents	100% (37)	100% (21)	100% (19)	100% (6)	100% (4)	100% (2)	100% (60)	100% (29)

* Columns do not add up to 100% because many respondents provided comments falling into more than one category.

There are at least three notable results in Table 5.6. First, although they would like to see better accountability to and communication of diversity strategies, no black respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation provide comments indicating they would like to see more specific action taken to improve the diversity strategy. This is consistent with the quantitative results indicating that the respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation tend to be satisfied with the amount of attention given to diversity. Second, consistent with what we would expect to find in a company with a subtle strategy versus a company with a visible strategy, more Wireco respondents indicate in their comments that they are not aware of the diversity strategy. Third, there is overlap between the two companies in

the implementation concerns of black respondents. However, there is one difference. Most Wireco employees would like to see management take more specific and substantial action in developing and implementing diversity strategies, while most Pipeco employees would like to see more accountability to the diversity goals. In the remainder of this section, I will focus on this last result, the differences between Wireco and Pipeco.

Implementation Concerns at Wireco

We can see from Table 5.6 that the biggest implementation concern at Wireco, as indicated by the largest response category, is that Wireco needs to take more specific action with respect to diversity. The second largest implementation concerns are accountability and communication.

More Tangible Action Needed in the Right Areas

Respondents from Wireco who are aware of the diversity strategy do not believe the company is taking substantive steps to implement the strategy. Specifically, Wireco respondents would like to see more diversity training be available and mandatory, more emphasis on end results such as recruiting and promoting blacks into management positions, and more integration of diversity into the company culture.

First, at Wireco, diversity workshops are not centralized through one department and are left up to the discretion of the individual business units. Consequently, there is no consistency in their availability or content, which is a source of concern for some respondents:

We have had 1 day workshops to discuss management diversity. In my opinion they are not really doing anything productive. It takes more than one day to handle this problem. Things should be done all during the year, management should get training on how to work and communicate with the different ethnic groups. [BF:W:189].

Open [diversity strategies] up to all management levels. [We] need more variety so that there is more than one class to take. This would allow more

information sharing and knowledge to be gained in the area of diversity.
Keep diversity strategies in the forefront. [BF:W:281].

Other Wireco respondents do not believe that the availability and implementation of programs are consistent with what is necessary to incite change. For example, a woman from Wireco is concerned that resources in the form of time are not available for employees to attend diversity workshops. She says “the programs need to be structured such that time is allotted for the training that is available” [BF:W:373]. Another employee who does not believe that Wireco encourages employees to receive diversity training, thinks it should be required of supervisors:

Encourage employees to receive diversity training; requiring supervisors to receive diversity training; requiring any employee who assigns tasks to receive diversity training; and requiring the use of diversity in promotions, job assignment, and employment recruiting. [BM:W:185].

Another man agrees. He thinks diversity training should be required of all employees:

Training programs should be mandatory. Workforce 2000 should be presented to all employees. [BM:W:203].

Thus, among some black respondents, there is a belief that diversity workshops can foster change. Hence there is a desire to increase both the number of available diversity workshops and the number and types of people required to attend the workshops.

Second, some Wireco respondents would like to see more emphasis on end results. For example, the following man feels too much attention gets directed toward working relationships rather than the end goals:

Working relationships [receive too much attention]. [We] need to focus more on results. Working relationships and touchy feely actions are not the problem. We need more action, results. [BM:W:375].

Another man expresses similar frustration:

Diversity and achieving diversity results at Wireco over the last two years has been just about non-existent. Also, non-white managers who were promoted by Wireco seem to fail at higher levels (director and above). [BM:W:385].

He does not perceive that Wireco is achieving diversity goals. Furthermore, he does not see Wireco following through on what progress is made. It is true that up-front training and social support can facilitate success at higher levels. It is not enough to just promote black employees to management; the organizations needs consistent systems, such as reward and evaluation systems, in place to support their diversity efforts. Because non-white employees have less access to both, they may, in fact, be less successful in managerial positions. This attitude represents a different outlook on a problem with diversity strategies than perceived by many white men. From the previous chapter, it is clear that many white men believe that diversity strategies (which they associate with Affirmative Action programs) allow the promotion of unqualified people. This respondent seems to suggest that it is possible that some people who are promoted cannot handle the higher status job. However, he does not question their qualifications. Rather he implies that the environment is not such that the non-white managers have adequate preparation for their training. As another respondent says, Wireco needs:

more work up front identifying minority/female job candidates and developing potential candidates. [BM:W:233].

Promoting people without adequate training or support structures sets them up for failure. all people, including white men, need to be trained and developed for the positions they are expected to fill. Thus, while white men see failure of non-white employees in managerial positions as proof of incompetence, black men and women see failure as an indication of poor support systems for these people.

Black respondents would like to see Wireco undertake concrete actions to propel a change in culture. One woman believes that to propel such a change, Wireco needs to hire more blacks and females in senior positions:

More emphasis on changing the culture. Hire more blacks and females at senior levels of management. Set an example. [BF:W:348].

Another man agrees:

... more non-whites need to be recruited. There is a small number of African-Americans at the facilities I work. [BM:W:235].

Hiring more white females and people of color at senior levels of management would accomplish two goals that could shift cultural assumptions. First, it would send a message to all employees that Wireco is taking the need for a diverse workforce seriously. Second, it would move some of the power from the hands of white men to the hands of other groups. This shift is necessary for real change to take place because as long as decision-making power remains concentrated in among white men, those with a real vested, personal interest in change stay powerless.

Third, some respondents would like to see more consistency of interest in and the application of diversity. It seems that "some business units are very committed, while others are not committed at all" [BM:W:400]. These respondents would like to see diversity become more integrated into the corporate culture. For example, one woman is concerned that only select affected groups pay attention to diversity issues and would like to see diversity become more main stream:

There is a need to make this issue a company wide (main stream) issue, not an AA [Affirmative Action] issue for the AA committee and special interest groups. [BF:W:303].

Another woman suggests that Wireco would do well to

institutionalize the strategies, approaches, and programs that have been successful in Wireco's most diverse organizations, such as the XYZ organization ... At minimal audit the effectiveness of each organization's diversity programs. [BM:W:401].

In summary, many black Wireco employees are frustrated that the company is not taking substantial action toward making diversity a part of the company culture. They feel there is not enough diversity training and not enough employees are encouraged to attend what training there is. Further, they would like to see more emphasis on outcomes than on

processes and would like to see more consistency in the application of the diversity strategy. However, first, as I discuss in the next section, the black respondents feel that Wireco needs to “articulate strategy and define measurable goals” [BF:W:402].

Articulation of Diversity Strategy

It is of concern to many black Wireco respondents that the diversity strategy is not clearly communicated and that there is a lack of measurable goals to which managers must, or can, be held accountable. Several respondents agree that “communication of objectives [and] goals, promotion of programs, [and] increased awareness of the importance of these to the future of the company and country” [BM:W:245] would improve the diversity strategy. A common perception is that “programs are not advertised by senior management to all employees. Programs are not explained or purpose defined” [BF:W:340]. At Wireco, several respondents indicate that they are not aware of diversity programs at all. For example, a Wireco employee, responding to what Wireco could do to improve the diversity strategy, responds “we don’t have any in this division” [BF:W:248]. Another says “I have never seen an official/ corporate sponsored policy on Wireco’s Diversity Plan” [BF:W:331]. Other employees are uncertain about the contents of the diversity strategy:

“If there’s a corporate program with guidelines, etc., I’m not sure what it is: Each business unit responds differently to the issue. There’s talk around the issue, but little or no genuine activity, encouragement, etc. [BF:W::312].

I don’t know what the strategy is ... only that there is a strategy. [BF:W:339].

Two other women from Wireco write: “I don’t really know what it is” [BF:W:201] and “[I] don’t understand [the] strategy” [BF:W:402]. Another employee believes “the existence of diversity programs within Wireco is not apparent. If Wireco is committed then everyone should be made aware of goals and objectives” [BM:W:313]. Some respondents have heard about diversity programs, but are not certain as to exactly what they are:

The programs should permeate our corporate culture like our quality programs. Pockets of our organization seem to be actively involved with diversity initiatives while others of us are in the dark. Also, Wireco's diversity strategy should be shared throughout the organization. I don't really know what it is. [BF:W:201].

Thus, at Wireco, there is some uncertainty among many black respondents as to exactly what are the diversity strategies, if any exist. It appears to some, as one black female writes, that "Wireco ... needs to understand what diversity means then develop programs" [BF:W:118].

There is also a concern that Wireco management has not articulated what it means by "diversity." As a consequence, the perception that diversity strategies are a form of Affirmative Action persists (this perception is certainly common among many white male respondents, as we saw in Chapter 4).

[We need a] clear understanding of what "diversity" means. Don't confuse it with "affirmative action" which has been distorted. Make certain that senior managers understand and can freely and non-defensively discuss it, i.e. discuss it comfortably and knowledgeably. BM:W:253].

This respondent acknowledges an important point, namely that senior management, those who should be responsible for ensuring that Wireco meets its diversity goals, need to be clear about what it means by diversity. Further, they need to act as role models and show that they are comfortable with the concept. Otherwise, senior management is not demonstrating commitment or that it takes the concept of diversity seriously. One reason given for the apparent lack of commitment on the part of Wireco is the perceived lack of commitment from senior management. There is a perception that senior management is all talk and no action. In fact, 64% of black respondents agree that Wireco is not really addressing diversity issues, and 71% of the respondents agree that Wireco only addresses diversity issues to create a good public image (see Table 5.7).

TABLE 5.7²⁷
Responses to Questions Indicating Perceived Lack of Commitment from Senior Management at Wireco (N=52)

	<u>Do Not Agree</u>	<u>Somewhat to Strongly Agree</u>
Wireco is not really addressing diversity issues	36%	64%
Wireco only addresses diversity issues to create a good public image	26%	74%

One way senior management can demonstrate commitment to the concept of diversity is by allocating resources to diversity programs. As the respondent in the next quote points out, without funding, a diversity strategy is a nonexistent strategy. However, as this respondent also points out, first management must communicate the strategy to the employees. Unless the employees are aware of the strategy, all the commitment and allocation of resources is a moot point.

If there is [a diversity strategy], it needs to be communicated. Then, it would need to be funded. Funding for diversity is so low on the priority list it is practically non-existent. A group of diversity personnel would need to be formed to monitor and initiate diversity so that its value can be retained. [BF:W:265].

Although black respondents would like to see commitment from senior management, they do not have faith in senior management's commitment to diversity:

²⁷ Responses range from 1 to 5. 1=do not agree at all; 3=somewhat agree; 5=strongly agree. The first column, "do not agree," corresponds to a response of 1 or 2. The second column, "somewhat to strongly agree," corresponds to a response of 3, 4, or 5.

[Diversity] needs a “champion” from the senior leadership’s team. As a matter of fact, any real outspoken champion will do. ... Wireco does not walk the talk and lately there’s no talk to walk to. [BM:W:267].

Contributing to the frustration among black respondents, there is doubt as to the seriousness of Wireco with respect to the implementation of its diversity strategy. There is a perception that senior management only gives “lip service” to diversity:

Buy-in at all levels, implementation and tracking, feedback results used to improve strategy and implementation [would improve the diversity strategy]. ... I believe there are great plans in place at Wireco, but until they are implemented and have longevity, I believe it’s lip service. [BF:W:323].

As the following respondent writes, senior management cannot expect others to comply with diversity goals unless they clearly articulate and demonstrate what those goals encompass.

First and foremost, Wireco should communicate what the actual “strategy” is. Wireco expresses in words that we “value” differences, but as for a concrete overall way this is demonstrated and measured we fall short.[BF:W:378].

The lack of a “clear statement and definition of goals” [BM:W:234] makes it difficult to evaluate the performance of managers with respect to behaving in a way consistent with the vision of creating an environment conducive to the hiring, retention, and promotion of all individuals. There is a need for “better definition and linkage to management appraisal” [BM:W:209]. Several respondents suggest that it would improve the implementation of the diversity strategy if managers were held accountable for diversity goals and Wireco made “these goals a part of measurements for managers” [BM:W:53]:

Implementation please. Be committed. Holding middle managers accountable is #1 [importance]. [BM:W:375].

Wireco's diversity programs and policies are sound ones and are achievable. However, there are not any effective incentives in place to motivate/ensure that managers comply with the guidelines of Wireco's diversity programs. [BM:W:385].

If performance appraisals in Wireco provided a section on managers' objectives concerning diversity and diversity was part of all managers' objectives, this would put substance into the diversity programs. [BM:W:347].

Without upper management commitment, it is not even clear who is responsible for evaluation. A woman articulates this dilemma:

If the program has upper management buy in, it should be socialized at lower levels. People should know what programs are available; what goals Wireco has; how those goals are measured; areas for improvement; areas of success; downside of not reaching goal. [BF:W:339].

Unless people are cognizant of the diversity strategy and Wireco's goals with respect to the diversity strategy, it is impossible to measure the goals, determine what programs are successful, and what programs need work. Further, if it is impossible to measure the goals, it is impossible to evaluate performance using the goals as criteria.

Hence, many black Wireco employees do not believe Wireco is truly implementing change, and they base their belief on the lack of substantive and consistent actions. This raises the question of why Wireco would tout diversity and seem to lack substantive actions. Perhaps, as the following male employee indicates, there is a lack of commitment and too much indecision and fear:

Get it [diversity strategy] started in earnest, with tangible objectives. Implement some achievable projects and accomplish something within the near-term (6 months). Establish a track record. "Walk the talk" [There is] conversation and discussion, repeatedly - with no action! [Why] Inability to act? Commitment? Indecision? Fear? Any and/or all of the above. [BM:W:335].

In summary, black Wireco respondents express frustration that Wireco has not clearly articulated a diversity strategy. They feel that Wireco needs to define specific goals and hold managers, especially senior managers, accountable for attaining these goals. One woman summarizes these feelings:

Action plans and owners of plans, accountability, and more variety of topics [would improve the diversity strategy]. They tend to deal with white women issues (as minority issues). They need to discuss Asian females, Blacks, ADA act, value systems, promotions/ glass ceiling. They need respect from upper management to actively support diversity programs and activities; Wireco management is willing to supply financial resources, but not help determine activities or participate. [BF:W:343].

What we are seeing in these comments is a skeptical reaction to Wireco's subtle diversity strategy. The ambiguity of the subtle strategy that creates fear and resistance among the majority of white men, also creates doubts as to its effectiveness, or even existence, among black employees.

Issues of race and gender are not really addressed openly. Wireco would like to think it does not have race and gender issues. [BF:W:360].

Implementation Concerns at Pipeco

At Pipeco, we find many of the same concerns regarding the diversity strategy as we did at Wireco. However, there are two differences. First, consistent with the visible strategy at Pipeco, fewer respondents commented that they did not know what the diversity strategy is or that they were not aware of the diversity strategy. Only 3% of Pipeco respondents, compared to 13% of Wireco respondents, wrote that the diversity strategy is "not truly known or communicated to the work place" [BM:P:65].

Second, while Pipeco respondents, like Wireco respondents, would like to see more "actions to more seriously address diversity issues" [BM:P:78], their suggestions are more specific and build on existing programs. For example, a male respondent is

satisfied that training is available but would like to see emphasis on middle level managers and ensure continued attention to diversity:

[We] need to focus on training the middle level managers and ensuring that the managers continue their development and education in this area. [BM:P:40].

Another respondent would like to see Pipeco bring in people from the outside to teach diversity courses:

Diversity courses should be taught by people professionally trained on the subject, not Pipecoers. [BF:P:140].

Yet another man would like to see an increase in “interracial mentoring. This should, of course, be voluntary but encouraged” [BM:P:111].

Similar to some Wireco respondents, several Pipeco respondents feel that too much effort is placed on addressing values and cultural sensitivity and would like to see more concrete results in terms of actually putting non-whites into positions of power:

Trying to influence people’s core values around race/gender issues. [receives too much attention]. It takes significant events to change people’s core values; just place diverse qualified people into positions. [BM:P:302].

There can be less “value building” and more placement/advancement of capable diverse individuals into positions of responsibility. I think that Pipeco is addressing this issue about as well as it handles most issues. Much could be learned from companies such as Xerox who have successfully transformed their organization and addressed diversity issues head on. [BM:P:302].

As discussed earlier, putting non-whites into positions of power not only sends a message that the company is serious about diversity, but also gives decision-making power to non-white groups. Until many black employees see such significant, if only symbolic,

changes, they likely will continue to see Pipeco management's attention to diversity as "lip service:"

[Pipeco could do a] better job of addressing the concerns of minorities and women when specific concerns are brought to the attention of management. Managers are good at giving you the "corporate line" on diversity, but they find it difficult to face up to real diversity issues in the work place. [BF:P:382].

I don't feel enough attention is being paid [to race and gender]. At this point it is mostly lip service and is viewed as tokenism. [BF:P:12].

If management finds it "difficult to face up to real diversity issues in the workplace," this could send a message to the employees that they are not seriously committed to the concept of diversity. In fact, the issue of accountability is the biggest implementation concern of Pipeco respondents, as indicated by it being the largest response category in Table 5.7. In the next section, I discuss this issue of accountability.

No One Is Being Held Accountable at Pipeco

While the need for more concrete action is the largest implementation concern for Wireco, accountability is the largest implementation concern for Pipeco. There are two related issues with respect to accountability, namely communication of the strategy and its goals, and developing methods for evaluating achievement of the goals. First, several respondents indicate that they do not believe Pipeco has clearly defined or communicated the diversity strategy. A black female writes that "goals should be explicitly stated and well communicated" [BF:P:140], suggesting that she does not believe they are. Another woman agrees. She says that "'diversity' and what it truly means to the company has been poorly communicated and no one is being held accountable. 'Strategy' has not been clearly defined. If it has, it has not been communicated to the company as a whole" [BF:P:12].

Others also worry that Pipeco has not made clear the business rationale for even having a diversity strategy.

Strategic goals should be more widely discussed and benchmarked. I feel a lot of people don't truly understand what a diverse workforce looks like. Many feel it's a black/white or male/female issue. They don't understand that it's not a social issue, it's a business issue -- it makes business sense! [BF:P:12].

Another male respondent would like to see a quantitative report of benefits presented to employees. He would like better "communication of benefits to the company, metrics - time and numbers" [BM:P:186].

The desire for Pipeco making the business rationale for diversity clear to all employees is based on the assumption that to do so might increase the acceptance of the strategy among individuals who might otherwise resist the strategy. If, for example, white men with the Other Privilege orientation understand that for the company to remain economically viable it must embrace the concept of diversity, the presumption is that they will not be as likely to resent black employees who receive promotions.

Better communication of the strategy is only a first step. Black Pipeco respondents also would like to see Pipeco "make people accountable for their actions and for achieving diversity goals" [BF:P:178]. In particular, they believe there is a need for "accountability of management for achieving goals" [BM:P:355]:

Manager evaluations should be directly related to achieving diversity goals; There is currently no accountability. [BF:P:140].

Similarly, another man suggests making:

diversity a part of an individual's performance evaluation. Evaluate and publish position distribution by race and gender indicating if the individual distribution by race and gender are in comparable decision making positions. ... [Diversity] seems to be more lip service than action. [BM:P:11].

Making diversity part of an individual's performance evaluation would be a step toward integrating diversity "into how we work on a daily basis rather than [being] a separate

program only to be thought about during “diversity time” [BF:P:225]. Integrating diversity into everyday organizational life requires adjusting organizational systems, in particular the reward and evaluation systems, so they are consistent with stated diversity goals.

However, because of the lack of “clear goals and time tables, [there is no] accountability of managers” [BM:P:130].

The programs need “public” (internal to Pipeco) accountability and auditing. Rational goals and progress toward those goals needs to be audited. Programs to meet those goals, specifically concerning career planning, development and sponsorship for minorities need to be implemented. [BM:P:165].

Make managers explain why improvements into statistic are not going up for under represented group. Submit a plan of action to change the statistic. Presently there is no cost of failure personally to managers. [BM:P:239].

In summary, like Wireco respondents, Pipeco respondents would like to see more diversity efforts. However, the improvements they suggest are specific, rather than general, changes. Further, accountability is a key concern among black Pipeco respondents. The perceived lack of accountability to diversity efforts, makes black respondents question how seriously committed to diversity senior management really is.

ETHNOCENTRIC INTERGROUP ATTITUDES

Wireco respondents harbor more ethnocentric intergroup attitudes than Pipeco respondents, indicating that black employees may not perceive that they receive enough attention from a subtle strategy. This interpretation is consistent with the analysis of the qualitative data regarding implementation concerns at Wireco and Pipeco. At Wireco, black respondents do not feel that senior management is seriously addressing diversity.

Nineteen respondents (21%) write that they feel other issues detract from the issues that their company really needs to address. Of these respondents, eleven feel that issues concerning other groups, especially white employees, receive too much attention; white men's concern with reverse discrimination and an emphasis on white women as a disenfranchised group receive too much attention. Six respondents feel that the issue of quotas and qualifications receives too much attention, creating additional stresses for black employees.²⁸ In the next paragraphs, I discuss each of these topics in turn.

Although company and orientational category differences appear in the quantitative data, the written comments provided by respondents of the different orientations from Wireco and Pipeco are so similar that it does not make sense to provide separate discussions of the groups. The one exception that is worth mentioning, because it is consistent with the quantitative results, is that all the respondents who provided comments to the effect that other issues detract from the key diversity topics have either the White Privilege or the Other Privilege orientation.

Whites Receive Too Much Attention

Most of the black respondents who feel that concerns of other groups receive too much attention feel that whites are the major recipients of this attention. In particular, they believe that white men are over concerned about reverse discrimination and that diversity programs focus mostly on white females.

A respondent from Wireco writes that white men are "overly concerned with reverse discrimination paranoia" [BM:W:401]. Another woman, from Pipeco, agrees. She believes it is a "smoke screen which diverts attention from real problems that need attention. Given the composition of management in any level within Pipeco, it is clear that 'qualified' white males are doing just fine" [BF:P:382]. This "smoke screen" theory is consistent with my suggestion in the previous chapter that white men use stereotypes of incompetence and arguments of reverse discrimination to justify their stronghold on power and status in organizations. Their stereotypes and attitudes detract from the real issue, the real issue being that white men need to share power and status. Thus, while

²⁸ The other two respondents feel gay awareness receives too much attention. Because I focus on racioethnic gender groups, I do not discuss these comments.

white men view reverse discrimination and incompetent hires as justifying why diversity is a bad idea for the organization, black men and women see these issues as justifying why diversity needs to be incorporated more into the organizational culture.

A woman from Wireco agrees that white men are too worried about reverse discrimination, and also believes that white women receive too much attention. She mentions fear of loss of power as a reason for white men's concerns about reverse discrimination, and suggests that comfort with other members of their race explains why white women receive so much attention as a minority group:

White females receive too much attention as a minority category. Also white males receive too much attention in that their careers are threatened by women and minorities. Since most upper managers are white, they have a comfort zone with white females. So they promote more activities and energies for advancing their careers and diversity programs to deal with their problems. At the same time they fear that they might lose power as the more diverse the population becomes; they have a fear of becoming a "minority," thus almost creating an apartheid attitude or environment. [BF:W:343].

Even a respondent who believes that diversity strategies have been beneficial to women questions whether it has benefited any blacks:

Is it real? Does it focus on Blacks? My opinion is that it's the "in thing" to do and Pipeco is a player. I do see benefits to females, which is good! Pipeco does not (to my knowledge) actively recruit at predominately black colleges. [BM:P:66].

Another male also alludes to the benefits of being female in his organization:

Race issues receive very little attention because of the small numbers. In terms of gender issues, I am not aware of any specific discussion. Women tend to be evaluated on the quality of their work. [BM:W:235].

Both of these men say they have seen benefits to females, but do not specify whether they have seen benefits only to white females, or to black females as well. The first does question whether the strategy focuses on blacks at all and both certainly does not feel that black men as a group have benefited from diversity programs.

A black women from Pipeco, however, does believe that black women are ignored in the diversity strategy. She thinks that “issues and numbers should be broken out separately for black women [because] as a subset of women and people of color, black women are ignored” [BF:P:140]. These last three quotes may give us some insight into some of the gender tensions between black men and women. At Pipeco at least, and possibly at Wireco, there is obviously an awareness that the company is addressing diversity as an issue at some level. In general, the survey responses reflect that black men and women share similar views. At the beginning of this chapter I said that I did not believe this was always the case and that the similar views could be a response to the type of questions I asked on the survey. Here, we see that there may be perceptions by black men that black women are benefiting from diversity programs and by black women that black men are benefiting from the programs. Table 5.8 shows how black men and women view the extent to which diversity strategies address issues concerning the other group relative to their own.

Table 5.8
Perceived Relative Extent to Which Diversity Programs Address Issues of Concern to Black Men and Black Women*

	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total</u>
Black Women’s Rating of Black Men	-.2 (.6) N=24	+.2 (.9) N=8	+.1 (.7) N=32
Black Men’s Rating of Black Women	+.2 (.6) N=29	.0 (.74) N=21	+.1 (.7) N=50

* I use a difference score to calculate the average. I subtract the response for black men or women, depending on the gender of the respondent, from the response for the other gender group. A positive score means the respondent believes the strategy addresses the issues of other group more than it addresses the issues of its own group. A negative score means the respondent believes the strategy addresses the issues of other group less than it addresses the issues of its own group.

Overall, on average, both black men and black women perceive that the diversity strategy addresses issues concerning the other gender group more than its own. However, there are differences in the pattern between Wireco and Pipeco. At Wireco, both men and women believe that the strategy addresses issues concerning black women more than black men. At Pipeco, women believe that the strategy addresses issues concerning black men more than black women, while, men believe that the strategy addresses issues concerning black women and men about the same.

Two respondents, a female from Wireco and a male from Pipeco, mention sexual harassment as an issue that receives too much attention. The woman from Wireco is concerned that "it is sometimes used inappropriately as a weapon and therefore creates unnecessary tension in the workplace" [BF:W:201]. Her comment indicates more concern about gender than race relations. She is one of six black respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation and this comment is consistent with a belief that in the workplace, race is not a critical issue. However, the other respondent, the male from Pipeco, sees sexual harassment discussion as a way for whites to avoid discussion of real issues. He writes that it "seems to be the only thing most whites are willingly to talk about" [BM:P:65].

Regardless, the perceptions that white men are overly concerned with reverse discrimination and that diversity strategies primarily benefit white women are grounded in reality. White men as a social group still control the power in the social, economic, and political realms (Feagin & Vera, 1995). In 1988, black employees made up 11% of the workforce and held only 6% of the managerial positions in the United States. These data, however, are misleading. Blacks are disproportionately concentrated in lower status management positions (Feagin & Sikes, 1994). Further, a recent report presented to the House of Representatives finds that women are the primary beneficiaries of Affirmative Action programs (Congress, 1993).

Quotas Receive Too Much Attention

Six black respondents write that they are concerned about the perception of diversity programs as affirmative action or quota programs and the perception that diversity strategies allow the "promotion of unqualified minorities" [BM:W:372]. For example, a black female from Pipeco writes:

The issues about quotas for management promotions and hiring receive too much attention. Many white men are walking around feeling and stating that they will never be promoted or hired, and that there is preferential treatment of under qualified women and people of color. [BF:P:225].

The reason black employees are concerned about these perceptions is that they then have to deal with the stigma of being hired or promoted to fill a quota, rather than of being the best candidate for the position. "The assumption is that most minorities receive promotions for reasons other than skill" [BM:W:155]. Two other respondents agree that this assumption exists because of the association of diversity with quota programs:

This [the perception of diversity as a quota program] creates an image that promotions of qualified and competent women and minorities are made to satisfy numbers and directives. Therefore, my promotion is not because I'm competent, qualified, or have paid my dues, but because I'm black or female. [BM:P:51].

Implications of "quotas" when discussing race/gender ... [and] questioning "qualifications" of minorities and women [receive too much attention]. The assumption is that women and minorities are either under qualified and are getting special treatment, or that they must be super-qualified to be considered. Issues of qualification are rarely discussed when non-minority males are promoted or assigned. [BM:W:253].

In summary, the data suggest that perceptions of status boundary permeability decrease ethnocentric intergroup attitudes, but that most black respondents perceive impermeable status boundaries. Many black respondents from both Wireco and Pipeco express concern that diversity efforts may be thrown off-track because of misdirected attention. In particular, they feel there is too much attention given to white men and women. They do not see any evidence of reverse discrimination, but do see white women faring well with respect to career advancements. Further, black respondents are concerned about the association of diversity with Affirmative Action programs because it perpetuates the assumption that black employees receive promotions only because of their race, not because of their qualifications. The respondents see these issues as detracting from topics that are of direct concern to black employees

SELF-DEPRECATORY INTERGROUP ATTITUDES

Earlier in this chapter, I argued that self-deprecatory self-ratings may reflect some degree of reality. Prior research demonstrates that black employees face barriers in their careers that white employees, especially white men, do not (Braddock & McPartland, 1987; Edmonson Bell & Nkomo, 1994; Fernandez, 1982; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987). Comments from black respondents at Wireco and Pipeco clearly demonstrate that they perceive career mobility barriers such as lack of opportunities to demonstrate competence, exclusion from key social networks, and subtle discrimination. In this section, I discuss the career mobility barriers that black respondents perceive. Quantitative differences appear between the companies and among the orientations. However, it is difficult to discern any qualitative differences, either due to small numbers in some of the categories, or because the predominately historically subordinate positions of black employees increases the extent of the shared experiences and overrides potential diverse experiences.

Lack of Opportunities to Demonstrate Competence

The first barrier to advancement I discuss is the perceived lack of opportunities for black employees to demonstrate their skills. 22 respondents (25%) define privilege in terms of opportunities for enhancing chances of career advancement. Opportunities for enhancing career advancement means having a visible and challenging job that provides opportunities to demonstrate competence in a range of areas including flexibility and decision-making (Kanter, 1977). All of the respondents defining privilege in these terms have either the White Privilege or Other Privilege orientation, suggesting that they do not perceive blacks as having the same level of access to these opportunities as do other groups.

To many of these respondents, exposure and visibility are privileges. For example, two men at Pipeco define privilege as “information, training, and exposure ...” [BM:P:40;78]. Two other black men at Wireco agree. One defines privileges as “advancement opportunities, exposure, experience” [BM:W:259], and the other defines privileges as “information, training exposure and representation critical to assuring readiness for promotion, ..., special assignments, high profile opportunities” [BM:W:209]. The latter recognizes the importance of special assignments as well as visibility. The opportunity to

demonstrate the ability to handle novel work situations and the ability to “make decisions on one’s own” [BM:W:347] are important elements of demonstrating competence. Another male Wireco employee agrees that visibility is important, and suggests that demonstrating the ability to manage others is also an element necessary for promotion:

[Privileges are] visibility to middle and senior management, [being] lead and sheltered from avoiding mistakes, having easier access to management to present ideas, [and] supervising people (not many black males at Wireco supervise people). [BM:W:315].

The perception that not many black males are in supervisory positions is consistent with the available data showing that disproportionately few black employees are in management positions. The data I have from Wireco indicate that 27% of the black employees hold managerial positions, compared to 82% of the white employees. At Pipeco, although I do not have any actual distributional data, my sample included all 91 black employees in supervisory and managerial positions, a small number relative to the total number of positions. This confirms that there are not many black employees holding these jobs.

The data are thus congruent with the perception that:

at present minority employees (particularly blacks) are channeled into jobs that lack challenge, exposure and growth opportunities. Minorities are often given assignments that are not well staffed and destined to mediocre results at best.” [BM:W:313].

There are consequences for black employees perceiving that their organization channels them into jobs that lack challenge, exposure and growth opportunities. Talented employees experience frustration and stress at not being valued by the organization. One theory suggests they are likely to lack motivation (Kanter, 1977). Uninspired employees will have depressed aspirations leading to low organizational commitment, depressed performance, and increased turnover. Kanter (1977) further suggests that these employees may behave in ways that sabotage organizational goals and aspirations. However, as the responses from these black employees demonstrate, and as other researchers have found (Feagin & Sikes, 1994), black employees do not feel they can afford to sabotage organizational goals because they are extremely visible and watched

carefully. Rather, they overcompensate for their lack of opportunities. Thus, black employees must cope with frustration from not being valued and stress from working hard to overcompensate for their lack of opportunities.

The Old Boy Network

A second barrier to advancement opportunities is exclusion from the informal networks, especially those connected to upper management (Braddock & McPartland, 1987; Brass, 1984; Lincoln & Jon, 1979). 35 black respondents (39%) defined privileges in terms of “being a part of the old boy network, knowing about opportunities, ... getting information on job openings before others” [BF:W:189]. For example, a respondent from Wireco defines privileges as:

easier entrance to informal networks and associated information, and access to influential people. [BM:W:203],

and a respondent from Pipeco defines privileges as

special, sometimes preferential access to information, senior personnel with influence. [BM:P:82].

The most important aspect of the informal network is access to information, especially inside information. First, informal networks perform a socialization function (Tichy, 1973), as they teach junior organizational members “about the informal system of how things happen” [BM:P:51]. There is a perception among black respondents that among white men “the old mind set and club is alive and well” [BM:P:338]. The advantage of being a “part or member of the old boy network that provides access to promotion, career-related information, business support and other related work privileges” [BM:P:11] is that it provides socialization opportunities and a familiarity with senior management. It also opens up avenues for information regarding not only appropriate ways to behave (socialization), but also job opportunities, and other inside information that can facilitate task completion. There is often an exchanging of favors and cutting red-tape that allows members to finish jobs faster than if they had to work through formal channels (Kanter, 1977).

Second, informal networks are a source of “key information for career development” [BM:W:245], and a key career development aspect of the informal network is that of mentoring relationships (Kram, 1988; Ragins, 1989). For a number of reasons, it is more difficult for black employees to find mentoring relationships than white employees. Some of the reasons include racial stereotypes, racism, and cross-race interaction taboos (Thomas, 1986). Comments by several black respondents indicate that they recognize the importance of mentoring relationships (“minority employees need mentoring program and role models” [BM:W:313]), and perceive having a mentor as a privilege. For example, one woman from Wireco says that privileges are “access to mentors and decision makers” [BF:W:340]. Another man, from Pipeco, writes that privileges are “knowledge of promotional opportunities and mentors” [BM:P:65]. Given that these respondents define privileges in terms of access to mentoring and that they rate black employees as having less access to privileges than other groups, especially white employees, it is safe to conclude that they feel excluded from access to mentoring relationships.

Third, the informal network provides “access to pertinent information about work related issues, and access (work and outside work) to decision makers” [BF:W:303]. Often this “information is not generally available” [BM:W:235]. Informal networks also provide access to “social events where business is often conducted, i.e., strategic business focus, [as well as to information about] job openings, opportunities, mentoring, etc.” [BF:W:312]. The networks are a source of “early information that is not commonly available” [BF:W:331], such as “hot job opportunities” [BF:W:402], and this can give “individuals a political edge over others” [BF:W:369].

With only one exception, all the respondents who defined privileges as being part of a social network have either the White Privilege or the Other Privilege orientation. One respondent has the Equal Privilege orientation. This result indicates that most black respondents do not perceive that blacks are part of the informal network connected to senior management. The consequences of exclusion from the informal network include unrecognized talent, poor socialization to company norms, lack of inside information on job openings and other organizational inside information, and slower work progress due to inability to cut through organizational red tape. Thus, black employees are excluded from an important venue for career development, opportunities to demonstrate talents, and promotion knowledge.

Burden of Race

“For most African-American journalists, working in mainstream media entails a daily struggle with this notion of objectivity. Each day we are required to justify ourselves, our community, and our story ideas.” *p. 86*

“That's when my husband said 'You know, there's nothing worse than being wrong around white folks.' Not that there's anything inherently horrible about making a mistake, but when you're a Negro in America it's usually not just you who's making the mistake, it's y'all, the race, black folks in toto..” *p. 149*

“I know that the real, ultimate crime is mine. It is the sin of being less than perfect, of making a mistake, of not watching my back: of being wrong around white folks.” *p. 155*

“But I'm just tired of being here, of justifying myself everyday, of fighting with ignorant Caucasians, of the whole trip.” *p. 238*

Quotes from Volunteer Slavery, by Jill Nelson (1993)

The most poignant theme that surfaced from my data is one that is undoubtedly no surprise to African-Americans and is one that deserves noting by white members of our society. There is an extra burden to being black in most organizations. Although most people face stresses and struggles related to promotions over the course of their careers, “for black employees the normal pressures of seeking a promotion tend to be exacerbated by restrictive racial barriers “(Feagin & Sikes, 1994). This is a burden that most white people, especially white men, do not bear. Understanding this burden is understanding that it is a privilege in United States society to be white. This does not mean that it is better to be white, or that being white makes one superior. It means that the dominant group in our society has constructed a system in which it is easier to be white than black. Jill Nelson was a reporter for the Washington Post. Her book Volunteer Slavery is the story of her struggle with white racism at the Post. A very talented and ambitious journalist, she found herself struggling to be more than a token black woman on the staff. The above quotes reflect some of the discrimination issues she faced and other blacks in

our society continue to face. First, black employees feel they must prove their abilities because of the assumption that they are less competent than their white counterparts. Second, they feel they are unable to make mistakes because their mistakes reflect not only on themselves, but on their whole race. Third, they must deal with aversive discrimination and the stresses of managing in a culture that is often different from the culture in their communities. In the next sections, I will discuss each of these issues.

Assumed incompetence

Ten respondents, five from Wireco and five from Pipeco, write that it is a privilege if you are “automatically assumed to be competent” [BF:178:P], rather than having to prove competence. Black employees see white respondents as having “initial acceptance” without having to prove their value:

Getting the benefit of the doubt; having initial acceptance, respect as potentially valuable member of team [is a privilege]. [BM:338P].

[Privilege] means receiving the benefit more often than the doubt. [BM:355:P].

Black respondents believe that there is an assumption by white employees that black employees are not as competent as white employees. A white counterpart is “not required to ‘pre-prove’ oneself” [BM:253:W]. There is a “...presumption that members of the group are competent” [BF:306:W]. Comments and quantitative data from many white men certainly support the existence of this presumption. The belief that members of a group are competent, “puts that group one leg up without even trying (before we get started)” [BM:267:W]. Consequently, black respondents feel they are at a disadvantage with their white counterparts before they even start working.

Part of receiving the benefit of the doubt is receiving some leeway for novel and creative approaches to work. This requires the confidence of one’s manager in one’s abilities, and many black respondents do not feel they have this confidence. For example, one male respondent implies that his supervisor does not trust his decision-making ability:

[I define privilege as] the right or privilege of making decisions on one's own and not having to run decisions past one's immediate supervisor before getting on it. [BM:347:W].

Another man feels it is not only his decision-making ability, but all his actions that are questioned:

[I define privilege as the ability] to make decisions and not have them viewed negatively; to have actions viewed as correct; failures viewed as unsuccessful attempts and not inabilities. [BM:239:P].

There are two beliefs underlying the assumption that blacks must prove competence. The first is the assumption that black employees are going to make the wrong decisions and take incorrect actions, and the second is that white employees are more competent than black employees. These beliefs create additional stresses for black employees. Black employees feel that to progress in their careers, they need to "work twice as hard to prove themselves" [BF:W:366], and demonstrate abilities above and beyond those demonstrated by their white colleagues. Several black employees said they felt that in order to advance in the organization they had to show superior abilities that white employees did not. For example, one man defines privilege as:

career progress without necessarily demonstrating superior competence. [BM:165:P].

A woman from Wireco also feels that to be considered "high potential" she must always succeed; there is no room for any kind of failure in her work effort. She sees allowances for failure as a privilege for white people:

[It is a privilege to have the] opportunity to not always "succeed" and yet be considered "high potential." [BF:378:W].

There are both individual and organizational consequences of the assumption that black employees are going to make the wrong decisions and take incorrect actions. At an individual level, it is frustrating to have unrecognized talents. At an organizational level, there is evidence that expectations are self-fulfilling (Jussim, 1986). Individuals who are

expected to demonstrate high performance will. Individuals who are not expected to demonstrate high performance will not. When managers harbor low expectations of a whole group of people, it may be that organizational performance will, in fact, be lower. Further, it is likely that what is seen as poor performance is a biased interpretation of behavior. Managers maintain stereotypes by ignoring information that does not fit current expectations (Cantor and Mischel, 1979). By attributing failures to incompetence rather than “unsuccessful attempts,” managers may prevent competent black employees from taking risks and trying new and innovative solutions to problems. Finally, no matter how well black employees perform, as long as supervisors expect poor performance they will never perceive that the black employees have done well enough. This may create feelings of hopelessness and depress career aspirations to the extent that the organization may lose talented individuals.

Fear of Making a Mistake

A second type of discrimination black employees experience is the assumption that they represent their entire race. This creates a burden for black employees that white employees do not experience. Black respondents write that the “extent to which it is ok to make mistakes” [BF:W:281] is a privilege bestowed only upon white people. Black respondents feel they must be careful about what they do or say because white people attribute any mistakes black people make not to individual characteristics, but to characteristics inherent in the race as a whole.

Further, black respondents feel they need to act as if they have been given a right to work that might be revoked at any time for misbehavior, or for stepping out of line. Part of the burden of being black in a white organization is the fear of retribution for one’s actions.

A black woman would like

the ability to step out of “the box” and demand to be seen as a person, then, re-assume your role without consequences e.g. discuss salary with superior. [BF:339:W].

She makes reference to some sort of “consequences” that asserting her individuality will bring. There is an implicit assumption in her statement that it is because of her race that

she is unable to “step out of the box.” She sees herself as caught in a stereotype, as supposed to act in some way. It is unlikely that every white employee will be rewarded for discussing salary with supervisors, or for stating opinions. And it is likely that many white employees, especially women, feel “caught in a box,” and feel their behaviors are repressed by the need to conform to a corporate culture. However, it is likely that white employees, especially white male employees, will not be seen as stepping out of their given place in society when they do engage in such behaviors.

Rather, there is a perception that there will be consequences for behavior that is rewarded, or at least acceptable, in white employees. For example, one man has a “fear of retribution for stating opinions” [BM:66:P]. Whereas speaking one's mind may be valued for a white man, black men who speak their mind may be seen as stepping out of line.

The choice of the word “retribution” is interesting. Retribution implies punishment, the opposite of which is reward. The punishment can be as severe as ending career progression. A black male at Pipeco suggests that white employees have the

ability to discuss their views and thoughts to senior management, without ending their career progression. [BM:56:P].

Or the punishment can be as mild as being criticized or misunderstood:

Opportunities to demonstrate their strengths and talents to senior management without concern or fear of criticism or wrong perception - politics. [BM:313:W].

Thus, there seems to be a perception among some black employees that they cannot be as aggressive in taking risks, stating their opinions, or demonstrating behaviors as their white counterparts. The repercussion of this assumption for the organization is obvious. If individuals are oppressed and are afraid to demonstrate creativity, question authority, present their views and thoughts to their superiors, or assert their individuality, organizations are not allowing them to perform to their full potential, and are losing out on a potentially valuable source of human resource power.

Aversive Discrimination

A third contributor to stress among black employees that white employees do not face is the discrimination they experience as African-Americans. White employees have "... the privilege of not being encumbered with a belief that they have or will be discriminated because of their race" [BM:51:P].

It is not race, but rather the discrimination that black employees are "encumbered" with that is the burden. Discrimination is a battle that black employees have to deal with in their day-to-day operations. A Wireco employee writes:

Wireco does not take the time or make the effort to understand the diverse culture and value that different people might offer to its overall success. Minority (black) men are consistently assigned to low priority projects w/ difficult outputs. Even successes are not given the same attention as white peers with the rare exception of those individuals from the "right schools." Black men are challenged to survive the corporate culture. I must say that the situation appears to be the results of negligence and status quo rather than a concerted effort . [BM:W:313].

The discrimination described by this respondent is not necessarily blatant, but rather subtle, or aversive discrimination. Aversive discrimination, as defined by Dovidio (1989) occurs when individuals do not discriminate overtly, "but can justify or rationalize a negative response on the basis of some factor other than race." The institutional structures that characterize hiring and promotions within organizations provide many of these other factors. For example, the segregation of black people into their own social group decreases their frequency of contact with powerful organization members who can provide information about employment opportunities (Braddock & McPartland, 1987). Granovetter (1974) argues that such contacts are indispensable to individuals' opportunities and to their integration into communities. As a second example, often potential employers request information, recommendations from previous employers, that black applicants are not able to provide with the same ability and credibility as white applicants. Higher unemployment among black youth decreases the likelihood that young black applicants can provide such information (Braddock & McPartland, 1987). Aversive discrimination also comes about from a belief that black people are not worse, it

is just that white people are better (Dovidio, et al., 1989). A black woman from Wireco cites the poor progress of black employees in her organization as evidence that this kind of aversive discrimination persists:

Even though Wireco feels diversity is important, they have made statements that Blacks do not contribute to Wireco goals or bottom line; that we have nothing to offer. Even though the research center tends to recruit the cream of the crop, Blacks do not do well within Wireco in general; thus implying whites or other races are superior to Blacks. And Blacks who do rate highly are not given any recognition awards, promotions, and have to work hard at developing and grooming their own careers. [BF:W:343].

She feels that actions taken by members of Wireco, and their results in terms of the distribution of career development outcomes, reflect a culture in which white is valued over black. Consequently, black employees must work harder to achieve their career goals and put themselves on equal footing with white employees. This is difficult for black employees who perceive a lack of effort to truly integrate diversity into the organization. Through negligence and complacency, the organization allows a culture dominated by white values to persist, and rejects the contributions of an alternative black culture. In the following statement, the respondent depicts a lack of acceptance of her culture by white peers. Such lack of acceptance demonstrates a lack of legitimacy of diverse cultures and acceptance only of those non-white employees who adopt or adapt to the white culture.

One almost feels pressured to talk about the white culture's favorite pop idols (tv shows, comedians, actors, etc.). Yet, if I name a show, artist, or actor that I like but they haven't heard of, my comment is totally dismissed. The issue of diversity is one that is verbalized by upper management. There is no real effort to promote non-white employees, male (especially) or female. This is evident by the rare opportunities to see two non-whites of the same background at the same meeting. [BF:W:359].

The lack of integration of black values into the culture is not limited to Wireco. A respondent from Pipeco agrees that the culture reflects white values:

[Privilege is having] the benefit of a culture whose norms and expectations fit your experience/training. [BM:355:P].

Another Pipeco respondent writes that racial attitudes will persist because those who want to fit in will have to “aspire to white male values:”

There are deep-seated racial and other personal prejudices in American society which will continue to make respect for diversity a difficult issue. I believe racial attitudes in particular are dominant and driven by white males or those who aspire to white male values. [BM:P:82].

It is not only that the white culture does not accept black cultural values, but that blacks are under extreme pressure to assimilate to the white culture (Campbell, 1984). To be accepted by members of and to succeed in the dominant white culture, black employees need to adopt the value systems, belief structures, and expectations that characterize the white culture.

The organizational repercussion of aversive discrimination is that being encumbered with dealing with discrimination takes energy away from organizational work. Dealing with discrimination in the workplace today can be especially draining, as much discrimination is no longer blatant, but rather almost invisible and insidious, and consequently more difficult to battle. Feagan and Vera (1995) view this as societal waste. Resources and energy that could be gainfully employed are wasted on restricting opportunities for black employees' advancement.

In summary, most black respondents perceive lower chances for promotions if competing with an equally qualified individual from another racioethnic gender group than do white respondents. Wireco respondents perceive a lower likelihood of receiving a promotion than do Pipeco respondents. This result may reflect the differences in the diversity strategies; Pipeco respondents may believe that their company is trying to increase the likelihood of their receiving a promotion and Wireco respondents may not be aware of any specific efforts in this direction on the part of management. The self-deprecatory

intergroup attitudes regarding promotion opportunities do reflect a degree of reality, as shown by prior research. The experiences that the black respondents in this study report demonstrate that they perceive barriers to career advancement. They perceive fewer opportunities to demonstrate competence, feel excluded from the informal organizational networks, and face extra stresses due to subtle discrimination.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter examined the reaction of black men and women to diversity strategies. I found that while all black respondents support diversity strategies, there is slightly more support at Wireco than at Pipeco. This indicates that there might be some fear of stigmatization at Pipeco, where the strategy is more apparent. While reaction to the strategy does not vary with orientational category, perceptions of the effectiveness of the strategy do. Black men and women with the Equal Privilege orientation, those who perceive the most status boundary permeability, perceive the strategy to be more effective than other black men and women. This suggests that there may be a group of black employees, however small, who believe that they have been able to benefit from the diversity strategies.

While self-deprecatory and ethnocentric intergroup attitudes are stronger at Wireco than at Pipeco, antagonism toward white men is higher at Pipeco than at Wireco. The higher self-deprecatory and ethnocentric intergroup attitudes at Wireco may reflect the subtle strategy. Black employees at Wireco feel more pessimistic about their chances for a promotion because they do not perceive serious efforts by management to improve the environment. Further, they may see diversity strategies as benefiting white women (see Table 5.4) and not other disenfranchised groups. At the same time, the level of antagonism toward white men may be higher at Pipeco because it is so apparent that very little has changed with respect to white men sharing their power and status with other groups.

Antagonism toward white men is related to reaction to the diversity strategy, and all intergroup attitudes are related to perceptions of the effectiveness of the strategy. Higher levels of perceived effectiveness are associated with lower levels of intergroup attitudes.

The direction the analysis took in this chapter is different from the direction the analysis took for white men. The analysis on white men focused on differences among the orientational categories. The analysis in this chapter focused less on intragroup differences, mainly because they were not as apparent; there seems to be more homogeneity in attitudes among black respondents than among white male respondents. This is consistent with the historical experiences of blacks with Affirmative Action programs. As a group, they tend to perceive impermeable status boundaries and consequently there is less variability in intergroup attitudes. This may be because the dominant white male group treats its own group as a set of individuals with varying characteristics, whereas it treats black employees as a homogeneous group. Consequently, the black employees perceive more similarities than differences in experiences.

Further, although there are some quantitative differences between black respondents from Wireco and Pipeco, the qualitative data did not pick up on these differences. Rather, respondents from both companies support the concept of diversity (although they would like to see improved implementation of the concept), believe that white men's concern with reverse discrimination and the emphasis on white women as a disenfranchised group receive too much attention, and are concerned about the perception of diversity strategies as affirmative action programs. Further, the comments provided by black employees from both companies indicate that institutionalized racism persists in the form of lack of opportunities to demonstrate competence, the old boy network, stereotypes, and aversive racism, despite efforts by the organization to foster change.

CHAPTER SIX

WHITE WOMEN

In Chapter One I ask three sets of questions regarding the reactions of white women to diversity strategies. First, I ask what is the reaction to the two strategies for change among white women, Second, I ask if there is a relationship between the intergroup attitudes and the strategy for change and the reactions to the change. Finally, I ask how perceptions of status boundary permeability moderate the relationships among the diversity strategy, reactions to the diversity strategy, and intergroup attitudes. In this chapter, I answer these questions.

Because white women share commonalities with both white men and black men and women, the variables of interest are a combination of those of interest in an analysis of white men and in an analysis of black men and women. The subjective orientations of the white women indicate perceptions of status boundary permeability and race and gender salience. Gender is salient for women with the White Male Privilege orientation; they focus on the advantages of white men, rather than the advantages of white employees. On the other hand, race is salient for women with the White Privilege orientation; they are aware of the privileges afforded to white employees. Both race and gender are salient for white women with the Other Privilege orientation; they feel men receive privileges because of their gender and women of color receive privileges because of their race. Finally, neither race nor gender is salient for white women with the Equal Privilege orientation. They believe that neither matters in organizations and advancement is a function of merit alone. Perceptions of status boundary permeability are not exactly correlated with race and gender salience. White women with the White Privilege and the Equal Privilege orientations both perceive permeable status boundaries for their group, while white women with the White Male Privilege and Other Privilege orientations perceive impermeable status boundaries. Those women with the White Male Privilege orientation perceive that status boundaries are impermeable because they are not white men, and those women with the Other Privilege orientation perceive that status boundaries are impermeable not only because they are not white men, but also because they are not people of color. Table 6.1 summarizes perceptions of race and gender salience and boundary status permeability for each orientational category.

TABLE 6.1
Perceptions of Race and Gender Salience and Boundary Status Permeability

	<u>Salience</u>	<u>Status Permeability</u>
White Privilege	Race	Permeable
White Male Privilege	Gender	Impermeable
Other Privilege	Both	Impermeable
Equal Privilege	Neither	Permeable

QUANTITATIVE DATA RESULTS

Table 6.2 shows by company the average values for all the variables of interest for white women, namely reaction to diversity strategy, effectiveness of diversity strategy, ethnocentrism, self-deprecation, antagonism toward people of color, threat from non-white employees, and antagonism toward white men.

Table 6.2
White Women's Average Values of Variables by Company
 (Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

	<u>Wireco</u>	<u>Pipeco</u>	<u>Total</u>
Reaction to Diversity Strategy	1.8 (.5)	1.8 (.9)	1.8 (.8)
Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy	3.2 (.6)	2.8 (.9)	2.9 (.8)
Ethnocentrism	0.0 (1.1)	-.4 (.9)	-.3 (1.0)
Self-Deprecation	3.6 (.9)	3.4 (.8)	3.5 (.8)
Diversity Strategy Allows Unqualified People to Advance	2.3 (1.2)	2.1 (1.0)	2.1 (1.1)
Threat from Non-white Employees	1.9 (1.4)	1.8 (1.0)	1.9 (1.1)
Antagonism Toward White Men	3.3 (1.2)	3.7 (1.1)	3.7 (3.6)

^a There are no statistically significant differences between Wireco and Pipeco.

The data in table 6.2 indicate that the type of diversity strategy has little or no relationship to either reactions to the diversity strategy or intergroup attitudes. White women at both companies tend to support, rather than resist the strategy.²⁹ While there is no statistically significant difference in reactions between white women at the two companies, white women from Wireco do tend to perceive the strategy as being slightly more effective than white women from Pipeco. This is a counter-intuitive result. Because white women would benefit from a diversity strategy, one might expect white women to perceive a visible strategy as more effective than a subtle strategy. In the diversity arena, white women should see more action in a company with a visible strategy than one with a subtle strategy.

There are also few differences between Wireco and Pipeco in intergroup attitudes . White women from both companies tend to believe that diversity strategies give more attention to white women than to other groups, indicating low levels of ethnocentrism. Consistent with this result, white women, on average, perceive very little threat from non-white employees and tend not to agree that diversity strategies allow unqualified people to advance. This result indicates low levels of antagonism toward people of color. At the same time, white women tend to harbor antagonistic intergroup attitudes toward white men. Finally, white women tend to rate themselves as less likely to receive a promotion than an individual from another racioethnic gender group, indicating that white women do tend to harbor some level of self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes.

Although there is no relationship among white women between the type of strategy a company uses to foster cultural change and either the reactions to the change or intergroup attitudes, there is a relationship between reactions to the change and intergroup attitudes. Table 6.3 shows the correlations among the variables. Reaction to the diversity strategy, in terms of support or resistance, is positively related to antagonistic intergroup attitudes toward people of color. As antagonism toward people of color increases, white women are more likely to resist, rather than support, a diversity strategy. Although there is no relationship between perceptions of the effectiveness of the strategy and antagonism

²⁹ As in the previous chapter, to reflect the trend toward support for the diversity strategy, I will call the variable representing reaction to the strategy "Support for Diversity Strategy." Remember, however, that high values of this variable indicate resistance and low values indicate support.

toward people of color, perceptions of the effectiveness of the strategy are negatively related to antagonism toward white men. As perceptions of effectiveness decrease, antagonism toward white men increases. These trends indicate that a different set of dynamics occurs for antagonism toward white men and for antagonism toward people of color. White women who are antagonistic toward people of color are not in favor of having a diversity strategy; they feel diversity strategies increase the threat from other groups to their careers. Yet antagonism toward white men does not increase their support of a diversity strategy. Rather, white women who perceive the diversity strategy as working, e.g. more diverse people are moving into higher status positions, are less antagonistic toward white men.

TABLE 6.3
Correlations Among the Variables

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Support for Diversity Strategy	.03	.18	-.09	.49**	.40**	-.24
Effectiveness of Strategy (1)		-.11	.08	-.05	-.08	-.57**
Ethnocentrism (2)			-.34**	.22	.19	.03
Self-Deprecation (3)				-.26*	-.25*	.01
Antagonism Toward People of Color (4)					.52**	-.12
Threat From Non-White Employees (5)						.07
Antagonism Toward White Men (6)						

Although there are not any first-order differences between the companies in either reactions to the diversity strategy or intergroup attitudes, there are differences among the orientations. Further, there are differences between the companies within the orientational categories. Table 6.4 shows the average responses to the variables by orientation and by company.

Four findings stand out in table 6.4. First, there is more support for the diversity strategy among white women with the White Male Privilege and the White Privilege orientations than among white women with the other two orientations.

TABLE 6.4
Reactions to Diversity Strategy and Intergroup Attitudes
Average Values, Standard Deviations, and ANOVA Results
By Orientational Category

	WM Privilege			White Privilege			Other Privilege			Equal Privilege		
	Wireco	Pipeco	Total	Wireco	Pipeco	Total	Wireco	Pipeco	Total	Wireco	Pipeco	Total
Support for Strategy ^{a,d}	2.2 (.6)	1.4 (.5)	1.6 (.6)	1.5 (.4)	1.6 (.8)	1.6 (.7)	1.8 (.4)	3.1 (.9)	2.5 (1.0)	1.3 (0.0)	2.4 (1.0)	2.3 (1.0)
Effectiveness of Strategy	3.3 (1.1)	2.8 (1.0)	2.9 (1.0)	3.1 (.3)	2.8 (.9)	2.9 (.8)	3.2 (.4)	2.4 (.6)	2.8 (.6)	3.8 (.0)	3.2 (.8)	3.3 (.8)
Ethnocentrism ^b	-5 (.2)	-1 (.5)	-2 (.5)	-5 (.8)	-8 (.7)	-8 (.7)	.8 (2.0)	.3 (1.5)	.6 (.7)	0.0 (.0)	-0.6 (.7)	-0.5 (.7)
Self-Deprecation ^a	3.5 (.6)	3.6 (.6)	3.6 (.6)	2.9 (.3)	2.8 (.7)	2.8 (.6)	4.2 (1.0)	4.2 (1.2)	4.2 (.8)	2.9 (.0)	3.4 (.5)	3.3 (.5)
Antagonism Toward People of Color ^c	2.3 (.8)	1.9 (.9)	2.0 (.9)	2.5 (1.7)	1.6 (.6)	1.8 (1.0)	2.6 (1.3)	3.4 (1.1)	3.0 (1.2)	1.0 (2.3)	2.3 (1.2)	2.2 (1.2)
Threat From Non-White Employees ^a	1.6 (.5)	1.6 (.9)	1.6 (.8)	1.5 (1.0)	1.7 (1.0)	1.7 (.9)	3.0 (2.0)	3.4 (1.4)	3.2 (1.5)	1.0 (.0)	1.4 (.9)	1.4 (.8)
Antagonism Toward White Men ^a	3.9 (1.3)	3.9 (.9)	3.9 (1.0)	3.7 (.7)	4.1 (.7)	4.1 (.8)	2.7 (1.1)	3.8 (1.0)	3.2 (1.1)	2.0 (.0)	2.4 (1.1)	2.4 (1.0)

^a Statistically significant differences among the orientations at $\alpha=.001$.

^b Statistically significant differences among the orientations at $\alpha=.01$.

^c Statistically significant differences among the orientations at $\alpha=.05$.

^d Statistically significant interaction effect between company and orientation at $\alpha=.01$.

Understanding this pattern of results requires recollecting that orientations indicate gender and race salience. Translating race and gender salience from orientational category shows that white women for whom neither race nor gender is salient, as well as white women for whom both are salient are the least supportive of the diversity strategy. The most support comes from those women for whom either race or gender is salient.

One interpretation of these results is that white women for whom race is salient will support the diversity strategy because they are aware of the privileges they enjoy due to their race. These women, as I show in subsequent paragraphs, believe that other groups need the attention that diversity strategies strive to give. Further, they are aware of the benefits that they have received from the strategies. At the same time, white women for whom gender is salient will support the diversity strategy because they feel they can benefit from the strategy and break into positions previously held only by white men. White women for whom both race and gender are salient are less supportive of the strategy, and are more likely to resist the strategy, because they feel they are doubly disadvantaged. White men, regardless of the diversity strategy, continue to benefit from their status as the privileged racioethnic gender group, and people of color will be the main beneficiaries of the diversity strategy. White women for whom neither race nor gender is salient are less supportive of the strategy than white women for whom both race and gender are salient. It is possible that they do not see the necessity of a diversity strategy because they do not consciously acknowledge the role race and gender play in promotion decisions.

While support is higher at Pipeco than at Wireco among white women with the White Male Privilege orientation, the opposite is true among white women with the Other Privilege and Equal Privilege orientations. In fact, white women with the Other Privilege orientation at Pipeco lean more toward resistance, rather than support, of the diversity strategy. There is no difference in level of support between Wireco and Pipeco for white women with the White Privilege orientation. One interpretation of these results focuses on both the nature of the diversity strategy and the prevailing culture at the two organizations. Men have a tighter stronghold on high status positions at Wireco; because of the outcome of a discrimination lawsuit, Wireco has taken Affirmative Action very seriously. White women with the White Male Privilege orientation at Pipeco may feel that, despite the visible strategy, much more intense measures need to be taken to improve the fate of women in the organization. At the same time, the explicit nature of the strategy may create the impression among white women with the Other Privilege orientation at Pipeco that specific measures are being taken to help people of color. Their perceptions, especially about minority men, may reflect the male-dominated culture at Pipeco. At Wireco, because of the ambiguous nature of the subtle strategy, white women may perceive less is being done in the diversity arena and support more effort. Finally, among white women with the Equal Privilege orientation, there may be more support at Wireco than at Pipeco because these women believe that diversity strategies give certain

groups more advantages than others. Because Pipeco has a visible strategy, it may be more apparent to women with the Equal Privilege orientation at Pipeco than at Wireco that these groups are receiving these benefits.

Second, white women with the Other Privilege orientation are the only group of white women harboring ethnocentric intergroup attitudes. They are also the only group of white women who are likely to agree that the diversity strategy allows the promotion of unqualified people and who perceive a threat from non-white employees. Further, they rate themselves as the least likely to receive a promotion if competing with an individual from another racioethnic gender group. White women with the Other Privilege orientation perceive status boundaries as the least permeable of the four orientations. Thus, it makes sense that they feel less confident than other white women in their chances for a promotion. Both gender and race are salient for members of this orientational category. Consistent with their ethnocentric and antagonistic intergroup attitudes, they perceive both white men and people of color receiving advantages, because of their gender and race, that white women do not.

Third, white women with the White Male Privilege and the White Privilege orientations at Wireco are more likely than white women with these orientations at Pipeco to agree that the diversity strategy allows the promotion of unqualified people. The opposite is true for white women with the Other Privilege and Equal Privilege orientations; Pipeco respondents are more likely than Wireco respondents to agree that the diversity strategy allows the promotion of unqualified people.

Fourth, while all white women tend to harbor antagonistic attitudes toward white men, those with the White Privilege and White Male Privilege orientations are more antagonistic toward white men than those with the Other Privilege and Equal Privilege orientations. Further, except for white women with the White Male Privilege orientation, women at Pipeco are more antagonistic toward white men than are women at Wireco.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Several results stand out in the analysis of the quantitative data. First, differences between Wireco and Pipeco are negligible. This may be because, as among the black

respondents, shared experiences of discrimination overwhelm other potential differences. On the other hand, the lack of differences may be due to the grass-roots motivation of the diversity strategy at Wireco. Because the diversity strategy was grass-roots driven and because white women were among the primary motivating groups pushing diversity, the strategy may be more visible in their minds, despite the classification of the strategy as subtle. Thus, it may be that from the perspective of management at Wireco and Pipeco, the two strategies are different, while from the perspective of white women in my sample, the strategies are more similar than different.

Second, reaction to the diversity strategy is related to attitudes toward people of color, and perceptions of the effectiveness of the strategy are related to attitudes toward white men. White women who are less supportive of the diversity strategy are more antagonistic toward people of color. This result suggests that, like white men, some white women perceive that the strategies create unfair opportunities for people of color. It is these women who tend to resist the diversity strategies. At the same time, white women who perceive a more effective diversity strategy are less antagonistic toward white men, suggesting that white women who are satisfied with the diversity strategy have less reason to believe that white men will continue to hold the monopoly on positions of power. Further, controlling for orientation, white women at Wireco perceive the strategy to be more effective than white women at Pipeco, and white women at Wireco are less antagonistic toward white men than are white women at Pipeco.

Third, there are differences in level of support for the diversity strategies among the orientational categories. There is more support from white women with the White Privilege and the White Male Privilege orientations than from the other two orientations. This result is counter-intuitive. White women with the White Privilege and the White Male Privilege orientations have different perceptions of boundary status permeability. Women with the White Privilege orientation perceive low status boundaries and women with the White Male Privilege orientation perceive high status boundaries. Similarly, women with the Other Privilege and the Equal Privilege orientations have different perceptions of boundary status permeability; women with the Other Privilege orientation perceive high status boundaries and women with the Equal Privilege orientation perceive low status boundaries. It is curious why groups of white women with such different perceptions of boundary status permeability have similar reactions to the diversity strategy. Consistent with the relationship between the lack of antagonism toward people

of color and support for the diversity strategy, white women with the White Privilege and the White Male orientations harbor low antagonistic intergroup attitudes toward people of color. However, not consistent with this relationship, white women with the Equal Privilege orientation, despite supporting the strategy less than women with the White Privilege and White Male Privilege orientations, have low antagonistic intergroup attitudes toward people of color.

Fourth, white women with the White Male Privilege and the Other Privilege orientations harbor more self-deprecatory and ethnocentric intergroup attitudes than white women with the White Privilege and the Equal Privilege orientations. This result is consistent with theory that predicts a relationship between perceptions of boundary status permeability and intergroup attitudes. The two groups that perceive the most permeable status boundaries, the White Privilege and the Equal Privilege orientational categories, are also those that harbor the fewest self-deprecatory and ethnocentric intergroup attitudes. It should be noted, however, that the levels of ethnocentrism and self-deprecations of women with the White Male Privilege orientation are not much higher than those of women with the White Privilege and Equal Privilege orientations.

In summary, the quantitative data tell us that the reaction to the diversity strategies depends on the orientational categories. Further, white women who have antagonism toward white men tend to support the strategy. Although there is no relationship between antagonism toward people of color and support of the diversity strategy, antagonism toward people of color is related to perceived effectiveness of the strategy. Finally, orientational category moderates the relationships among type of diversity strategy, reaction to the strategy, and intergroup attitudes.

Thus, the quantitative results leave us with two sets of questions to answer. The first set of questions is why white women with two opposite orientations of boundary status permeability, women with the Other Privilege and the Equal Privilege orientations, are both less likely to support the diversity strategy, and is there a link between this finding and the finding that white women with these orientations are the most antagonistic toward people of color. In other words, what exactly is the nature of the relationship between perceptions of status boundary permeability and reactions to the diversity programs? The second question is what is the nature of the relationship between perceptions of status boundary permeability and both ethnocentrism and self-deprecation. To answer these

sets of questions, I draw on the qualitative data provided by these women. Also in exploring the answers to these questions, I illuminate the meanings of the four orientational categories.

SUPPORT FOR THE DIVERSITY STRATEGY

In this section, I examine the different ways white women with different orientations express support for the diversity strategy. What I demonstrate is that, despite quantitative differences in level of support for the strategy, women from all orientations support the concept of a diversity strategy. In following sections, I expand on this section to answer the first set of questions and explore the relationships among level of support for the diversity strategy and intergroup attitudes.

Support for Diversity Strategies: White Male Privilege and White Privilege Orientations

Most of the white female respondents have a White Male Privilege orientation (42%) or a White Privilege orientation (28%). The respondents with these two orientations indicate they are supportive of the concept of diversity strategies, but do not necessarily put a lot of stock in the existing programs. Two types of written comments support this interpretation of the data, and both types of comments address the need to change the corporate culture. The first type indicates skepticism in the ability of the current strategy to change the culture, and the second type of comment indicates skepticism in the commitment of the organization to do so.

Ineffectiveness of Strategy to Change Culture

White women with the White Male Privilege and the White Privilege orientations perceive a “need to develop an environment of respect” [WF:P:39:WMP], but do not necessarily believe the existing diversity strategy addresses the core areas that need changing in order to develop such an environment:

Pipeco has good intentions and people are trying to improve. However, the way they try to implement strategies needs to be improved. [It is] not getting at more strategic issues. [WF:P:39:WMP].³⁰

They [Pipeco management] seem to focus on education and raising awareness. If they also focused on extending that education and awareness into behavior change in the 'real' work environment (as opposed to the classroom) they would be more beneficial. [WF:P:42:WMP].

These comments indicate that the respondents believe the programs need more depth, and the strategy should focus more on making diversity a part of the organizational culture:

We've only scratched the surface on any of these issues. There's not a lot of depth of understanding out there. [WF:P:152:WP].

Diversity strategies attempt to change an organizational culture. Part of organizational culture encompasses values, beliefs, and attitudes that pervade the dominant culture, and many of the women with the White Male Privilege and White Privilege orientations express skepticism at the ability of the existing strategies to change the dominant culture. They would like to see "faster, greater effect to change the environment away from disrespecting people as individuals with rights, responsibility, and accountability" [WF:P:7:WP], and to see diversity made "more of a daily/values driven item, rather than a program" [WF:W:241:WP].

A problem, according to these women, is that white men neither recognize the privileges bestowed upon them because of their race and gender nor change their belief structures to accommodate the needed changes. Consequently, the changes that these white women do see as necessary are insubstantial. For example, a woman writes that the organization is addressing diversity through the eyes of white men:

³⁰ I added another piece of identifying information inside the brackets. WMP reflects having a White male privilege orientation and WP reflects having a White Privilege orientation.

It is dealing with concerns of non-white males through a white-male paradigm and set of rules. Until the white males can see that as the issue, no creative mix of cultures and perspectives will occur. [WF:P:166:WP].

Addressing diversity through the “white-male paradigm” raises the question of how you integrate alternative paradigms. Working within the white male paradigm perpetuates the assumption that the white male culture is the norm, the culture from which other cultures deviate. This implies that other cultures need to assimilate to the white male culture. Rather, these women would like to see white men expand their assumptions regarding normality and adapt to or integrate other cultures. However, some white women question the ability of the organization to change culture without surfacing and making clear existing values, beliefs, and attitudes:

How do you change internal values or attitudes when people may not even know they have an issue or feeling. [WF:P:50:WMP].

The problem with addressing diversity through the “white-male paradigm” is that it becomes difficult for white men to recognize their privileged status or to understand the positions of other racioethnic gender groups. The creation of a truly diverse environment requires that white men share some of their existing power. Yet as long as white men control the design and implementation of a diversity strategy, there is no incentive for them to create a system in which they share their power:

I believe the major issue of ‘diversity’ at Pipeco is one of dominance. I do not believe that white men can share power with women or people of other cultures without significant personal development in which they gain insight to their own conditioning and the sacrifices and rewards they have gained as a result of that conditioning. Since senior managers have benefited most from ‘white male entitlement and dominance’ I can’t imagine anything that could create that incentive. [WF:P:42:WP].

Thus, the consequence of a “white-male paradigm” for addressing diversity is that diversity programs focus on changing women and non-white males, rather than on white males who are the very ones who must change their values, beliefs, and attitudes:

Managers (most are white males) must change their own behavior and attitudes - most give lip service and expect improvement without making changes in themselves. Same is true for most technical white males as well. Training on diversity is given primarily to women and non-white males, instead of to white males. [WF:P:87:WMP].

This attitude is consistent with the position held by Katz (1978) and others that white people created racism in the United States through

the establishment of policies and practices that serve to their advantage and benefit and continue to oppress all minorities... . Racism is perpetuated by Whites through their conscious and/or unconscious support of a culture and institutions that are founded on racist policies and practices. The racial prejudice of White people coupled with the economic, political, and social power to enforce discriminatory practices on every level of life - cultural, institutional, and individual - is the gestalt of White racism. Therefore, the "race problem" in America is essentially a *White* problem in that it is Whites who developed it, perpetuate it, and have the power to resolve it (p. 10).

Applying this logic to organizations, whites, and especially white men, are responsible for the sexism and racism that pervades Wireco and Pipeco. Consciously or subconsciously they support the institutionalized practices, policies, and cultures that perpetuate racism and sexism. They have the power to change these practices, policies, and cultures; white women and, especially, people of color, do not. Thus, according to these women, to focus diversity strategies on changing white women and people of color, rather than on changing white men and their imbedded cultures, will not solve the problem of white racism and sexism in the organizations.

Commitment of Organization to Change the Culture

In addition to skepticism about the effectiveness of the diversity strategy for changing culture, white women with the White Male Privilege and the White Privilege orientations express skepticism about the organization's commitment to changing culture.

Let's try to get Pipeco to spend ONE MOMENT being honest about one program, it would be a miracle if it ever happened (i.e. they don't care about their own goals). [WF:P:49:WMP].

This woman's comment implies she does not believe that Pipeco management makes a sincere commitment to diversity. These women do not see real progress being made. Rather, they see the steps taken to achieve diversity as merely symbolic and for appearances only. They believe management is not taking real action to create a diverse environment and would like to see "greater commitment by management at mid and lower ranges" [WF:P:238:WMP] as well as "more visible participation by high level management" [WF:P:310:WP]. For example, the woman who wrote the following comment does not believe that Pipeco is undertaking any significant efforts to improve the diversity climate:

Pipeco needs to stop studying diversity and take some action. The only way to achieve diversity is to have a diverse organization. Until we seriously and pro-actively move more than just tokens into the power positions, we're just playing around. ... Meetings of the non-powerful are encouraged in "Diversity Teams" Because this is a way of management feeling like they're doing something without really having to do anything or having to achieve measurable goals. [WF:P:161:WMP].

She perceives that the efforts made by management are only token efforts and that the "diverse" people that receive promotions are only tokens. Although tokens benefit from increased visibility (Kanter, 1977), they also face increased stresses from not being taken seriously, from dealing with the implications that they received their position because of gender or race, and from having to be more careful about making mistakes (c.f. Chapter five). However, for the "diverse" people to not be tokens, more need to be promoted, and this requires structural changes in the distribution of high status jobs. The white women with the White Privilege and White Male Privilege orientations write that diverse people who receive promotions are tokens. As a consequence, there is not enough diversity in positions of power for those in decision-making positions to understand what is necessary to inspire real change:

We are still at a stage of tokenism. Don't have enough diversity in the ranks to develop an understanding or appreciation for it. [We] are not seriously addressing any [groups' issues] right now. [WF:P:192:WMP].

For these structural changes to take place, there need to be attitudinal changes as well. As one woman points out, white men feel that diversity programs are at their expense:

Creating an understanding that the true values of improving diversity will help everybody. Managers must learn to manage people as individual and not as stereotypes and that will help all of us. Right now I think too many white males feel that they are in a lose/lose situation. [WF:P:171:WMP].

As long as white men feel they are in a lose/lose situation, as I demonstrated in Chapter 5, they will resist the attempts to diversify the company and continue to create uncomfortable situations for white women and people of color who receive promotions into "positions of power." Thus, another woman would like to see more widespread application of diversity workshops, presumably to assist in fostering attitudinal changes:

A much larger group of folks (if not all) Pipecoers should be exposed to extensive/effective diversity workshops. [WF:P:252:WMP].

The perception that white men avoid diversity training is interesting, given that the perception comes from Pipeco respondents. At Pipeco, 71% of the white male respondents have attended diversity training workshops. A similar comment by a woman from Wireco, who would like to see diversity training mandatory, makes more sense. At Wireco, attendance at diversity workshops is encouraged but not mandatory. Only 48% of the white male respondents from Wireco have attended a diversity workshop. One of the few comments to come from a white female Wireco respondent is a reflection on the non-mandatory nature of their diversity workshops:

Make diversity training mandatory and evaluate managers on their participation and on how well they encouraged their subordinates to participate; also give us more information on how different cultures affect people's styles so we can learn to be more effective in dealing with them. [WF:W:216:WP].

The data suggest two reasons why white women at Pipeco may perceive that white men avoid diversity training. First, management, despite insisting on widespread diversity training, has not clearly communicated diversity goals and results. Comments from two women support to this interpretation. One would like management to “clarify what they [diversity strategies] are and what the goals are” [WF:P:31:WMP]. The other would like to see improved “communication regarding diversity issues and how the businesses sectors, and corporation are doing relative to stated goals” [WF:P:75:WMP].

Second, despite the existence of measurable goals, management may not actually measure outcomes. Ten Pipeco women (four with the White Male Privilege orientation and six with the White Privilege orientation) would like to see more managers held accountable for achieving diversity goals:

Put accountability throughout organization. [WF:P:407:WMP].

[Pipeco needs] more accountability for diversity education and goals.
[WF:P:144:WP].

To do so, management “needs a ‘stick’ not only to measure progress or assess problems but to work at the core of the problem at all levels”[WF:P:76:WMP]. The diversity manager at Pipeco claims that attainment of diversity goals are part of performance reviews, but some of these women would like to see stronger implementation of the policy:

Include in performance objectives diversity goals and HOLD individuals responsible; no one should be excused; there should be no extenuating circumstances. [WF:P:75:WMP].

Measure what is actually happening. Demote people in executive roles who do not really live by the words. Promote people who do take steps and achieve results. [WF:P:46:WP].

But this requires “accountability of people in leadership positions to accept the need for change and to create their own opportunities to learn about diversity” [WF:P:7:WP]. These comments suggest that there are loopholes in the organization’s plan to insist that

managers adhere to diversity requirements. This connects back to the perception that no real change can occur as long as white men control what really happens with respect to diversity. As we saw in the chapter analyzing the data on white men, performance measures tend to be subjective. From one perspective, a white male manager may be seen as doing the best he can, or even doing extremely well, with respect to attaining diversity goals. From another perspective, the same manager may be seen as ignoring diversity goals.

Despite their overall support of the programs, some white women recognize the financial constraints of implementing diversity strategies. Diversity strategies are “expensive and time consuming” [WF:P:43:WMP]. When the organization must cut costs, diversity is no longer a priority:

All parts of the corporation are under extreme financial pressure. Under these conditions, diversity drops off the list. It is considered a luxury we can't afford. [WF:P:192:WMP].

However, if the organization were truly committed to diversity and to changing the culture to create an environment more tolerant of diverse needs and talents, it would continue to “support diversity in times of economic cutback” [WF:P:407:WMP].

Accountability is of concern to Wireco respondents as well as Pipeco respondents. Of the eight Wireco respondents with the White Male Privilege or White Privilege orientations who provided written comments, three emphasize holding individuals responsible for attaining diversity goals. For example, one woman writes that

managers should be evaluated based upon their success and progress reviewed at staff meetings. [WF:W:221:WP].

Attaining diversity goals is seen by these women as more than promoting diverse people. As indicated earlier in the chapter, white women with the White Male Privilege and White Privilege orientations would like to see more substantial changes in the organization culture. In the same vein, they would like to see an increase in “managers’ accountability for fostering and maintaining a work environment in which diversity is valued” [WF:P:306:WP]. Part of this change in the work environment would require a

“change in performance appraisals to reflect and reward people development of all types of people” [WF:W:241:WP]. Another woman agrees. She would like to see the organization

help managers understand that their job is to select qualified employees and develop them to the extent of their capability, appraise them on performance, and be open to ideas regardless of the race/sex/etc. of the individual. [WF:W:223:WP].

To summarize, white women with the White Privilege and White Male Privilege orientations tend to support the concept of diversity strategies, although they might not necessarily be satisfied with the current strategy. They would like to see more substantial changes that represent a true change in organizational culture and a commitment from more senior management.

Support for Diversity Strategies: Other Privilege Orientation

While white women with the White Privilege and White Male Privilege orientations are the most supportive of the diversity strategies, there is low support for the diversity strategy at Pipeco among women with the Other Privilege orientation. Examination of the written comments reveals that these women, like those with the White Privilege and White Male Privilege orientations, actually support the idea of having a strategy. They are just not happy with the content of strategies their company uses. Further, the nature of their dissatisfaction seems to be related to the type of strategy the company employees. At Pipeco, white women would like to see specific changes in the content of the strategy, whereas at Wireco they would like to see the organization clearly define and articulate a specific strategy.

Part of the reason for the low support at Pipeco may come from the way it implements the strategy. According to one woman, “the true value of a diverse organization is not understood and communicated or taught. Few of the leaders really understand” [WF:P:403]. Other women believe that the actions Pipeco takes are not consistent with diversity goals, and, as one respondent writes, “actions speak louder than words or programs” [WF:P:81]. For example, one woman does not see that women are able to take part in the decision-making process. She suggests establishing “a women’s advisory

board comprised of senior women so 'women's voices' could be heard as part of the decision process. Many decisions would be beaten and more effectively implemented" [WF:P:379]. Another woman does not see the reward and punishment system as consistent with creating a culture tolerant of diversity. She writes:

I think the goal is laudable, but the implementation is horrible. Currently, Pipeco tries to rehabilitate sexist/racist people by sending them to re-educating courses and then consider them cured. I don't think that works. The only way to effectively change things is to promote and give raises to people who do the right thing diversity-wise and company-wise, and to demote people who do the wrong thing. For example, I know of a male who made a number of inappropriate advances to women. He was sent to a re-education course and promoted and made a manager. He should have been fired. [WF:P:362].

White women at Wireco also express some dissatisfaction with the existing strategy. One woman writes that Wireco does "not clearly communicate what the goals actually include" [WF:W:137]. Another woman is concerned that Wireco does not distinguish between Affirmative Action programs and diversity strategies:

True understanding of diversity is limited - people think it means promoting minorities and females only and is just a "new speak" term for Affirmative Action. [WF:W:272].

Another woman comments on the lack of consistency with which the business units implement diversity policies:

Implementation is spotty. [There is] much awareness in some organizations and none in others. [WF:W:272].

These responses, which focus on the overall design of the strategy, are consistent with what we would expect to find from employees in an organization with an subtle strategy. The organization does not have a clearly articulated diversity plan and it allows the subunits more control over what type of diversity strategy they wish to employ. The responses from the Pipeco employees, on the other hand, focus on the actual content of

the strategy. They would like to see specific changes in the way the strategy is implemented. The statistical data also indicate more support for the diversity strategy among the Wireco women than among the Pipeco women. This differs from what we observed among white men with the Other Privilege orientation. White men with the Other Privilege orientation resist both the concept of diversity and the existing diversity strategies. Further, among these men, I argue, the ambiguity that a subtle strategy creates also increases resistance to the strategy because of fear of the unknown. However it may be that among white women at Wireco, the ambiguity of the subtle strategy is not an issue. Because of their past experiences of gender discrimination, any effort, no matter how ambiguous, is better than no effort. In fact, other comments from white women at Wireco indicate support for the concept of diversity:

Wireco - like contemporary American society - emphasizes "diversity" in the exclusionary, tribal sense, focusing on and reinforcing racial and gender differences and identities. Ultimately, I believe, this is a racist and sexist approach that fails to integrate groups. I believe Wireco needs to give equal time to issues that teach us to identify with human beings who may not be the same color, race, gender, et al as we. [WF:W:199].

Their support, however, is limited to the concept of diversity, rather than to the actual design of the existing strategy. They would like to see more effort directed toward teaching understanding and tolerance of diversity, rather than perpetuating the perception of diversity as a quota system:

It needs more attention. Instead of making a "goal" of numbers, it needs to look at the ability to teach tolerance of fellow humans. [WF:W:204].

Similar to those women with the White Male Privilege and White Privilege orientations, white women with the Other Privilege orientation feel that a change in the culture is necessary for real change to occur:

Promotions [receive too much attention]. There is more to diversity than merely statistical representation of certain groups in our demographics. It needs to be accompanied by true cultural change. [WF:W:272].

In summary, like the comments from white women with the White Male Privilege and the White Privilege orientations, the comments white women with the Other Privilege orientation indicate support for the concept of diversity, just not the existing strategies Wireco and Pipeco employ. Among these women, we see a few differences between the responses from Wireco and Pipeco. The women from Wireco would like to see management more clearly articulate exactly what is the diversity strategy. The women from Pipeco would like to see specific changes, such as increased accountability, made to the strategy. Unlike the women with the White Male Privilege and White Privilege orientations, the quantitative data indicate low support for the existing diversity strategies. Thus, it seems that their responses are a more direct reflection of the specific strategies their companies are using, whereas the responses of the women with the White Male Privilege and the White Privilege orientations reflect their attitudes toward the concept of diversity in general.

Support for Diversity Strategies: Equal Privilege Orientation

White women with the Equal Privilege orientation are less supportive of the diversity strategy than are white women with the White Male Privilege or White Privilege orientations, and only slightly more supportive of the strategy than those with the Other Privilege orientations. Like white women with the other three orientations, it appears that their low support for the diversity strategies focus on the content of the existing strategy rather than the concept of diversity. All except one of the white women with this orientation are from Pipeco, and the nature of the dissatisfaction with the content is similar to that of other Pipeco employees. These women would like to see more substantial effort made to improve the diversity climate, and more commitment to the concept from above. For example, one woman would like to see an increase in the “speed at which we’re educating individuals and implementing diversity throughout the corporation”[WF:P:176], and another laments about the quality of diversity program she attended:

The diversity program I attended was terrible - poorly organized, uninteresting, inappropriate, insulting, stupid, and very expensive. Diversity programs should address situations we meet on a routine basis, encourage cross gender and cross-race interactions, and be intellectually stimulating and fun (reasonably inexpensive, too). [WF:P:167].

Another woman is concerned that the emphasis on valuing diversity shifts with the financial climate of the organization. She does not see the kinds of results that indicate long-term commitment to the concept of diversity:

Management could “walk the talk”! Diversity and/or valuing people is okay when financial objectives are being met. But are lost when they are not. There is not long term consistent commitment. People are still being placed in high level positions who do not value people/individuals. They manage through intimidation and fear. [WF:P:179].

In summary, white women with all orientations support the concept of diversity and seem dissatisfied with the actual content of the diversity strategy at their company. The nature of the dissatisfaction varies with the type of strategy in place. At Pipeco, where there is a visible strategy, the respondents express concern that the strategy does not foster substantial organizational change and that there is not enough accountability or management commitment to diversity. At Wireco, where there is a subtle strategy, the respondents would like to see the strategy better defined and more clearly articulated. However, there is not much difference in reactions of white women to a visible versus a subtle strategy, as indicated by the qualitative data. Given these similarities across the orientational categories, the pressing question, then, is why are there quantitative differences among the orientations in level of support for the strategies? In the next section, I examine the relationship between antagonism and reactions to the diversity strategy to answer this question.

ANTAGONISM AND REACTION TO THE DIVERSITY STRATEGY

One explanation for the differences in levels of support for the diversity strategies lies in the different levels of antagonism and perceived threat. Table 6.3 shows that there is a relationship between reaction to the diversity strategy and antagonism toward people of color. While white women with the White Privilege and the White Male Privilege orientations harbor relatively little antagonism toward and perceive relatively little threat from people of color, white women with the Other Privilege orientation harbor higher antagonism and perceive more threat from other racioethnic groups. However, the relationship between reaction to the diversity strategy and antagonism toward people of color does not entirely explain the different levels of support for the diversity strategy

among white women. Even though white women with the Equal Privilege orientation indicate low antagonism toward people of color, they tend toward resistance, rather than support, of the strategy. In this section, I will discuss how different levels of antagonism toward people of color are related to reactions to the diversity strategy.

Antagonism and Reaction to Strategy: White Male Privilege and White Privilege Orientations

White women with the White Male Privilege and White Privilege orientations do not harbor extreme antagonistic intergroup attitudes toward non-white groups as indicated by the tendency to disagree with the statement that “diversity strategies allow unqualified people to advance in the organization.” Nor do they feel threatened by non-white groups, as indicated by the tendency to disagree with the statement that “diversity strategies benefit non-white employees at the expense of white employees.”

However, like the majority of white men, some white women with the White Male Privilege and White Privilege orientations associate diversity strategies with quotas and feel that this does result in the promotion of unqualified people:

[We need] more emphasis on promoting qualified individuals, not just gender or racially qualified people. [WF:P:50:WMP].

There is a contradiction in this statement. This woman’s ratings of relative access implies that she believes that white men have more access to privileges than other racioethnic gender groups, and white women have the same access as other racioethnic gender groups. Yet she seems to make an association between qualifications and race or gender. Her comment suggests that people are receiving promotions based on gender or race, and that they are not qualified for their promotions. I argued in chapter four that this assumption is indicative of white racist attitudes that maintain the status quo. This woman is not alone in her assumption. Another woman also writes that her company is hiring and promoting people to fill quotas and that these are not necessarily the most qualified people:

Goals/targets - getting numbers right for the sake of numbers and not interesting in selecting and developing the right people for the job.[WF:W:223:WP].

However, most women with these orientations who associate diversity strategies with quotas do not make assumptions regarding inherent lack of qualifications, as do the white men. Rather, they perceive a lack of training for some racioethnic gender groups, and they would like to see more emphasis on training and less on quotas:

A shift from quota mentality to developing people [would improve the diversity strategy]. [Because] team composition is forced to be diverse, [we] don't always end up with the most qualified [team].
[WF:P:28:WMP].

There are two implications of this woman's comment. One implication is that by forcing teams to be diverse, i.e. requiring a race and gender balance on the teams, the quality of the team is not as good as if there were a natural selection process. This implication is based on the woman associating diversity with incompetence and suggests that she does not recognize the biases inherent in the natural selection process. However, she also would like to see "a shift from quota mentality to developing people." This implies that she recognizes the potential for groups other than white men and that they may not have had the career development opportunities available to them that white men have had. Others with the White Male Privilege orientation agree:

Cease and desist from the "here's your new job - catch!" approach.
Diverse candidates (and others) are often not appropriately trained for new assignments making a high risk situation for the individual and company.
[WF:P:75:WMP].

This comment also suggests that groups other than white men may not have the same access to training opportunities as white men. The attitude is distinct from the attitude associating diversity with incompetence. The latter attitude assumes that white women and people of color are inherently incompetent; the former assumes that white women and people of color have the same potential as white men and that the organization needs to develop the potential. This woman's comment indicates concern not only for the

organizational repercussions of promoting people who may not have adequate preparation for their new jobs, but also for the individual consequences for these people. To promote inadequately prepared individuals sets them up for failure. White women and people of color cannot afford failure. As I discuss in chapter five, failure reflects not only on the individual, but on the whole race or gender and serves only to confirm negative race and gender stereotypes.

Another reason these women are concerned about the emphasis on quotas rather than training is the potential for white male backlash; quotas “sometimes can backfire creating a backlash in the work environment” [WF:P:43:WMP]. The respondent who would like to see Pipeco “cease and desist from the ‘here’s your new job-catch’ approach” goes on to say:

Making the “numbers” [receives too much attention]. This approach smacks of quotas. Whenever a quota is suspected backlash will be guaranteed. [WF:P:75:WMP].

A third reason these women are concerned about the emphasis on quotas is that they detract from the key issue at hand, namely changing the organizational culture to create a truly diverse environment.

Quotas and numbers are merely “legalistic” solutions. We need to get at “respect for people” in the organization. [WF:P:39:WMP].

According to the following respondent, quotas encourage cultural assimilation, rather than cultural diversity:

We need somehow to get “diversity” beyond easily/visibly statistically measurable items such as age, race, and gender. If we wind up with a workforce of 50% black females who all think/act/react like white males, what have we accomplished? [WF:P:262:WMP].

Cultural assimilation rather than cultural diversity does not create an environment valuing all people, styles of work, and diversity of thought. Although it is a first step, changing the organization culture to value diversity requires more than the physical act of

promoting diverse people. The organization must put in place systems to support the emotional transition of power. Diverse people need access to training and support from management. Further, they must hold positions of power, not puppet positions:

I believe there's a perception that our success in implementing cultural diversity should be measured only by the number of women and people of color in management positions. I don't think that's the only measure of success because: 1) we must be sure they get assignments which develop the skills needed for management positions so that they're well-prepared; 2) the management positions must be visible and impact the business; 3) their superiors must demonstrate ongoing support and acceptance so that they can be themselves; 4) advancing into higher level professional (not only management) positions is important too; and 5) there should also be emphasis on creating a work environment in which all people are valued. [WF:P:306:WP].

Thus, white women with the White Privilege and White Male Privilege orientations do not perceive a threat from people of color. Those with the White Privilege orientation recognize that they have advantages because they are white, and those with the White Male Privilege orientation are more concerned about competition from white men than from people of color. Rather than being antagonistic toward other groups, they would like to see the organizations do more for people of color as well as for white men. Because they worry about the negative images attached to quotas, would like to see support systems for white women and people of color who receive promotions, and want to see more efforts toward real cultural change, these white women are supportive of a diversity strategy..

Antagonism and Reaction to the Diversity Strategy: Other Privilege Orientation

At both companies, but especially at Pipeco where support for the diversity strategy is lower than at Wireco, several women with the Other Privilege orientation indicate that they believe that individuals from other racioethnic gender groups receive promotions they do not deserve and are being promoted at the expense of whites. For example, the following woman agrees that promotions are going to unqualified white women and people of color.

I think there is a problem with promotion of unqualified minorities and women, which does more harm than good. The message is that “_” are unqualified per se. Therefore, to promote a minority or woman, you must accept a sub-qualified person. [WF:P:362].

This comment is interesting in that she seems to include white women in the group of individuals who are unqualified for the promotions they receive. Perhaps she sees herself as an exception. Although she seems to make the same assumptions that many white men make regarding the objectivity of evaluations and the association of qualifications with race and gender, her message is not as antagonistic as that of the white men. She seems to believe that it is possible to promote a qualified white woman or person of color. It is just that the current system encourages the promotion of unqualified people and sends a negative message that all are unqualified, rather than the occasional one who gets promoted. However, similar to many white men, she does not mention the fact that unqualified white men receive promotions. There are two possible reasons for this system of beliefs. First, she may be indoctrinated into the value system of the dominant culture, and unquestioningly accept the assumptions underlying the beliefs and behaviors of the dominant culture. The close intermingling of the lives and cultural experiences of white women with those of white men could create an environment in which some white women adopt the attitudes of the white men around them. At Wireco, where white women have done well relative to other non-white groups, the white women may begin to feel their opportunities threatened by the attention now being given to the other groups. The following respondent writes that she cannot hire whites and that as a consequence, the quality of work is declining:

Implementing diversity values in promotion situations [receives too much attention]. We have been told, “no matter how good he is, you may not hire or promote any white males until we’ve ‘fixed’ our diversity profile.” The caliber of work and quality of life suffers. Many groups work understaffed (at great pain) because we aren’t allowed to move whites into jobs. Since our division is majority female, this often applies to white women as well as white men. [WF:W:199].

Second, white women are in an interesting position. On one hand, they might want to fight gender discrimination. On the other hand, they must co-exist with the very group of individuals responsible for their subordination. They are often the mothers, sisters,

daughters, and wives of white men, and often even benefit indirectly from the privileges afforded to white men because of their race and gender. It is perhaps this latter reason that makes them more sympathetic to the perceptions of reverse discrimination experiences among many white men:

[More attention should be given to] backlash to the numbers and white males feeling “passed over” in favor of a diversity candidate. [White men] do not understand why this may be necessary. [It] needs to be addressed but not be the focal point of diversity discussion. [WF:P:403].

Other reasons for antagonistic intergroup attitudes might come from personal experiences. A woman from Pipeco believes a black woman usurped her promotion to a management position:

My responses reflect my personal experience of having a black female, with no Pipeco management experience and from an unrelated work group, being promoted around me to the management position I had been groomed for. This individual squeezed me out of my supervisory position. Now I’m off the management track altogether. All of the recent promotions to management in my function have been minority females. [WF:P:240].

There are at least two interpretations of this statement. On the one hand, it may be possible that a woman with no experience and from another work group received a promotion that the respondent should have received. Given that Pipeco’s diversity strategy puts a lot of pressure on managers to meet diversity goals, it may be possible that the manager was trying to fulfill some sort of diversity requirement because of the pressure from an explicit diversity strategy.³¹ However, the numbers show that this is not the case in general. There are only 28 black females in managerial positions in the entire Pipeco organization, which is very large. In fact, another woman, also from Pipeco,

³¹ The diversity manager told me that if the divisions did not meet their diversity goals, the vice-president would lose his job.

laments that minority women are not receiving promotions. Rather, minority men benefit from diversity strategies:

[We] need to select and/or train more minorities for upper management. In particular, women! Race is given more priority than sex (e.g. women in upper level jobs). During the recent 1992 reorganizations, Pipeco management has had ample opportunity to place highly experienced competent women professionals into newly created strategic positions, but has not. Women professionals in Pipeco went so far as to develop a table of women professionals that could be considered for some of these newly developed positions. Unfortunately none of these women were chosen. [WF:P:129].

Another woman agrees:

I did not realize until completing this form that male no matter what race or culture is respected and honored more than females in Pipeco [WF:P:81].

Another interpretation of the situation in which the woman found herself “squeezed ... out of my supervisory position” [WF:P:240] brings to mind the novel, Disclosure, by Michael Crichton (1993), a story based on a true event. The story starts out on Monday morning with Tom Sanders expecting to go to work and receive a promotion to upper management. He, and everyone he works with, believes he has been “groomed” for the promotion. When Tom gets to work, he finds out that a woman, who, to make the story interesting, is an ex-girlfriend, received the promotion. The woman is from another division and does not possess the technical skills that Tom possesses. However, the owner of the company is committed to seeing women attain more top management positions. The woman sexually harasses Tom, Tom brings a lawsuit against the firm, discovers what it is like to be a victim of sexual harassment, and wins the lawsuit. The company fires the woman. However, Tom still does not receive the promotion. In fact, another woman receives the position. What becomes apparent during the story is that although Tom is very good at what he does, he is not well-suited for upper management, and the woman who ultimately receives the promotion is the perfect candidate for the position. Thus, it may be that the respondent in discussion is not upper-management

material. It is common for people to attribute failure to external events. Rather than admitting that she did not shine, she finds it easier to place the blame elsewhere, and a black woman who took what she thinks of as 'her job' is a convenient scapegoat. What is interesting is her use of race. Because the woman who took what she thinks of as 'her job' was black, her attitudes toward all black people in the organization now reflect this one experience. If the woman who took 'her job' had been white, it is unlikely that her attitudes toward all white people in Pipeco would reflect this one experience. This is another example of the subtle racism that persists in organizations. An individual level issue, in which race may not even be a factor, is transposed into a race issue.

Thus, the quantitatively low support of the diversity strategy among white women with the Other Privilege orientation is not because they are opposed to the diversity strategy, but rather because they are dissatisfied with the outcomes of the diversity strategy. White women have been the primary beneficiaries of Affirmative Action (Congress, 1993). Like white men, some white women view diversity strategies as a threat to the gains they have made in status. While white women with the White Male Privilege and White Privilege orientations feel that the emphasis on quotas detracts from the need for improved access to training among non-white employees, those with the Other Privilege orientation feel that non-white employees are taking their jobs.

Antagonism and Reaction to Diversity Strategy: Equal Privilege Orientation

Although white women with the Equal Privilege orientation tend to resist the strategy, they do not harbor more antagonistic feelings toward people of color than white women with the White Male Privilege or White Privilege orientations. The question I answer in this section is why, given the relationship between antagonism toward people of color and reaction to the diversity strategy, there is low support for the strategy among white women with the Equal Privilege orientation when they also indicate low antagonism toward people of color?

First, like the women with the Other Privilege orientation, white women with the Equal Privilege orientation indicate concern that because of the diversity strategy race and gender, not merit, drive recruitment and promotions:

We are promoting and hiring people for numbers, not necessarily qualifications. There are different standards/measures used for hiring and promoting. I believe that currently white males must perform at a higher level to receive the same benefits. [WF:P:179].

Unlike black respondents who think that black employees must work harder to reap the same benefits, she thinks that white men must perform to higher standards. However, it seems that unlike white women with the Other Privilege orientation, and like white women with the White Male Privilege and White Privilege orientations, these women worry that hiring and promoting based on race leads both to the perception that the people receiving the jobs are not qualified, and to feelings of reverse discrimination. This link is apparent in the following quotes by white women who believe that non-white employees are harmed by people interpreting the diversity strategy in terms of fulfilling quotas:

People generally believe they should hire and promote folks to improve these goals. This is and should not be the case (versus merit). This needs to be emphasized to eliminate misconceptions. It hurts the minority more than it is perceived to help it. [WF:P:107].

That is not to say we should stop promoting/pushing diversity, including moving people upward but we need to insure the individual is qualified. Everyone gets hurt when we promote for numbers only [WF:P:179].

Most of these women do not associate non-white employees with incompetence or lack of qualifications. Rather they are concerned that managers are not looking at the qualifications of the people they hire and promote, and increasing the likelihood that an unqualified person will fill the position. If the person they hire or promote is not qualified for the job, not only does the organization suffer repercussions, but other non-white employees must face the stigma of incompetence perpetuated by the poor decision. Further, as the following respondent also points out, it increases the likelihood that whites will perceive reverse discrimination in the hiring and promotion process:

Hiring and promotion should be based primarily on competence (e.g. technical competence and qualifications, in the case of my group's needs). Race and gender issues should be secondary considerations. If a person is

hired or promoted based primarily on gender or race issues, but is not qualified based on technical considerations, this situation hurts the person hired/promoted, other members of his/her race or gender, and the entire organization. Beyond increasing the probability of technical errors being made, this practice can cause hard feelings due to reverse discrimination. [WF:P:167].

One woman suggests that the solution to the problem created by hiring and promoting based only on race or gender is not to stop hiring and promoting non-white employees, but rather to have “more time spent on training [and put] more emphasis on mentoring programs for individuals from diversity groups” [WF:P:108].

While women from this group express concern that hiring based on race or gender creates individual and organizational problems, they do not seem aware of the necessity for organizations to take race and gender into account to compensate for individual and institutional biases that prevent the natural advancement of white women and, especially, people of color into management positions. For these women, the issue is not an association of diversity with incompetence, but rather that they believe that decisions regarding promotions are “color-blind.” They are blind to the privileges that white people enjoy simply because of their race, and they are blind to the fact that it is impossible to make objective evaluations of merit. This perspective is apparent in the following comment:

If you’re competent, it’s (race/gender) not an issue; your contributions are well-known. If you’re not competent, you need to fix that before you should expect recognition. [WF:P:107].

In a “color-blind” world, in which achievements are associated with merit, this would be true. However, this is not a “color-blind” world, and research and experience (as I have indicated elsewhere) show that non-white employees face discrimination in organizations in the United States. Yet these women with the Equal Privilege orientation believe that race is not an issue:

I’m offended by your prescription of diversity - related discrimination at the workplace ... either bad or good. My experience shows roughly equal

expectation for promotion etc. of incompetent folks of all groups.
Likewise with the promotion, etc. of competent folks. [WF:P:107].³²

I don't believe any one group has exclusive access to "privileges" (i.e. - incentive compensation, etc.). It's just not distributed equally through-out each group (i.e. privileges are extended according to your level).
[WF:P:176].

Thus, white women with the Equal Privilege orientation share with white women with the White Privilege and White Male Privilege orientations both a desire for less emphasis on quotas and more emphasis on training, and a concern regarding the backlash of quotas. This attitude explains the low antagonism toward people of color. Yet they also believe that quotas are fundamentally unnecessary because they do not perceive that discrimination exists. Because they do not perceive that discrimination exists, they view any program to compensate for discrimination as an advantage for some groups at the expense of others. Despite sharing some perspectives with the White Privilege and White Male Privilege orientations, they are less supportive of diversity strategies, which do attempt to compensate for discrimination.

ETHNOCENTRIC AND SELF-DEPRECATORY INTERGROUP ATTITUDES

The quantitative data indicate a relationship between perceptions of boundary status permeability and ethnocentric and self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes. White women who perceive the most permeable status boundaries, those with the White Privilege and Equal Privilege orientations, perceive higher chances for receiving a promotion than do the white women who perceive less permeable status boundaries, those with the Other Privilege and White Male Privilege orientation. We find a similar pattern among responses indicating ethnocentrism; women with the White Privilege and Equal Privilege orientations are less ethnocentric than are women with the Other Privilege and White Male Privilege orientation. In this section, I will explore why groups of white women

³² Rest of quote reads: I have seen/participated in several of these kinds of studies. They were all designed by women. I personally don't think this topic is worthy of a PhD. dissertation. I guess the men candidates and their professors agree.

with similar antagonistic intergroup attitudes have different ethnocentric and self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes. Specifically, I will explore why white women with the White Privilege and White Male Privilege orientations have different ethnocentric and self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes, and why white women with the Other Privilege and Equal Privilege orientations have different ethnocentric and self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes. To foreshadow the answer, it has to do with the interaction between perceptions of boundary status permeability and whether race or gender, both, or neither is more salient.

Ethnocentrism and Self-Deprecation: White Male Privilege and White Privilege Orientations

The ratings of relative access to privilege suggest that race and gender have different degrees of salience for white women with the White Privilege and the White Male Privilege orientations. White women with the White Privilege orientation are more aware of the privileges they enjoy because of their race, while women with the White Male Privilege orientation tend to focus on the disadvantages they experience because of their gender. While no white women with the White Privilege orientation make any references to gender discrimination in the organization, five women with the White Male orientation do make such references. For example, one woman with the white male privilege orientation writes that although a woman might have an advantage in a promotion decision if she is perceived as equally qualified, it is unlikely that she will be considered equally qualified because of prejudice on the part of men:

In promotional opportunities with men and women perceived equal, the women probably has the edge. However women are generally perceived as worse than men doing the same behaviors. Thus men have the overall edge. For management positions, a man who has less “work-related” ability than a female will get the job based on the perception that the man has better people skills. This is based on the fact that 75-100% of the peers are male. And the man might get along well with 99% of them and the female only 90%. Just having 1-2 men (of any level) working against reflects negatively against the women ... management never considers that the men may be bigots. [WF:P:252:WMP].

The respondent focuses on men versus women. There is no mention of race dynamics, which is not surprising since women with the White Male Privilege orientation rate white women as having the same access to privileges as all groups other than white male. In another example, a woman does not mention that at Pipeco people of color are underrepresented in the higher-level technical positions. Her lack of attention to this fact while highlighting the paucity of women in the same positions suggests that gender, rather than race, is foremost in her mind when she thinks about diversity and discrimination:

Women are especially underrepresented in the higher-level technical positions in Pipeco, and barriers in working relationships that involve teams of people at that level are especially great. There is demonstration of lack of respect for a women's technical expertise at higher professional levels. [WF:P:87:WMP].

Other comments also suggest that gender is more salient than race among white women with the White Male Privilege orientation:

Right brain/ left brain theories are overapplied to male/female thoughts patterns. [This is] another “labeling” problem and oversimplification of male/female dissimilarities. Pseudo-science, interfering with understanding. [WF:P:211:WMP].

The mommy track [receives too much attention]. It brushes all women with “they are not serious” paint. [WF:P:238:WMP].

Again, the focus in these comments is on gender and not on race, suggesting that gender is more salient than race for these women. Because gender is more salient, these women ignore race dynamics almost to the point of excluding people of color from consideration. The deprecatory and ethnocentric intergroup attitudes come from the perception that white men have advantages that white women do not. Because they focus on white men versus white women, these women perceive that they are unlikely to receive a promotion when they compete with other racioethnic groups, in particular white men. Hence, they have high levels of self-deprecation. Similarly, because they focus on their disadvantage

relative to white men, they perceive a need to improve their own status before they are able to focus on other groups. Hence, they have high levels of ethnocentrism.

Another woman agrees with Kanter's (1977) theory of homosocial reproduction. Kanter maintains that managers want to promote someone with whom they are comfortable. Because people are comfortable with other people who look and act like themselves, and because most managers are white male, white men are more likely than other groups to receive promotions:

Pipeco is long on lip service and short on action. If you ask a male high level manager what kind of employees he would promote (which a group of Pipeco women did recently), the most likely answer is "someone who looks and thinks like me." In our case, the answer was "Someone I'm comfortable with" -- comfort being maleness, some education, white, etc. I'm considering leaving Pipeco because I don't believe there are further career opportunities for me. I do not possess the attributes of the "typical" Pipeco manager -- i.e., white male, chemical engineer, with the company 15-20 years. At the next supervisory level that I could go to, all of the incumbents have those attributes. [WF:P:79:WMP].

The organizational consequences of this pessimism regarding career opportunities are clear from this woman's statement. It increases the risk of losing talented individuals merely because they look different from the "typical" manager.

The few non-whites and women who are promoted to mid- or high-level management positions receive too much attention. It makes it appear like a large number, when in fact the numbers are disproportionately small. [Pipeco does this for] public relations - to appear to be achieving diversity goals when in fact progress is minimal. [WF:P:87:WMP].

On the other hand, while eight women with the White Privilege orientation write comments suggesting that they believe other groups need more attention from the diversity strategies, no women with the White Male Privilege provide any such comments. Representative of a statement reflecting these low ethnocentric attitudes

among white women with the White Privilege orientation is a comment from a woman who expresses interest in individuals from racioethnic groups other than her own:

I have worked very hard to find good role models and mentors and have spent several years learning about and reflecting on being a woman at Pipeco. I have also begun to explore issues affecting people of races other than my own. I have been actively involved in "leveling the playing field" - usually with support from my direct supervision. [WF:P:144].

This woman does think about gender issues, but she is also interested in people of other races. She does not erect barriers to learning about other groups. The other groups to which women with the White Privilege orientation would like to see attention directed vary widely among the respondents. For example, at one extreme, a woman thinks that white men need more attention. She writes that "we should deal with, somehow, the anger white men feel towards diversity programs" [WF:P:306]. At the other extreme, another woman believe that blacks need more attention. She says that "women/black issues get sidelined while we address the concerns of white males. I believe this perpetuates white males' beliefs that they are the center of the universe" [WF:P:310]. Yet another woman feels that diversity programs are "too centered on blacks and females, and not accommodating Hispanics and Asians" [WF:P:38]. She goes on to say that there is "no recognition of a problem with older people." Other women would also like to see the strategies "focus on a broader definition of diversity than race and sex" [WF:W:223]. Another woman agrees with her and adds physically disadvantaged employees to the list of groups that diversity strategies should target:

Age should be added to the diversity focus. I see very little emphasis on handicapped inclusion in the diversity program. [WF:W:221].

Common to all these statements is attention to other groups and a focus on race. There is some focus on gender where they mention white men suggesting some gender salience. However, they see being white as an advantage more so than being male. Otherwise they would include non-white men in the same category as white men.

A reason for the low self-deprecation and ethnocentrism exhibited by members of the White Privilege orientational group is the ability of these women to recognize that they

have advantages because of their race. Supporting this interpretation is a comment from a woman who believes that white women have begun to progress into higher organizational positions, whereas non-white employees have not:

I just don't see minorities progressing as one who expect. Women seem to have done better - particularly white women. [WF:W:221].

Thus, the relevant reference groups dictate levels of ethnocentrism and self-deprecation, but not antagonism. White women with the White Privilege orientation compare themselves to members of other racioethnic groups, so they perceive that white women are faring well in the organization. They have no reason to have low self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes. Further, because they perceive that white women have advantages because of their race, they can afford to give attention to the issues and needs of other racioethnic groups. Hence, they have low ethnocentric intergroup attitudes. On the other hand, white women with the White Male Privilege orientation compare themselves to white men. Because they focus on gender discrimination, their antagonism is directed toward white men rather than people of color. Also because they focus on gender, rather than race, discrimination, they perceive that white women are not advancing in the organization. They do not have a lot of confidence in their ability to receive promotions, and they feel that the organization should give more attention to the issues and needs of white women.

Ethnocentrism and Self-Deprecation: Other Privilege and Equal Privilege Orientations

In the previous section I argue that different degrees of gender and race salience explain why groups of white women with similar antagonistic intergroup attitudes have different deprecatory and ethnocentric intergroup attitudes. In this section, I will show that different degrees of gender and race salience also explain why white women with the Other Privilege and Equal Privilege orientations have different deprecatory and ethnocentric intergroup attitudes. However, it is not the salience of race or the salience of gender that explains the difference. Rather, it is the presence of both race and gender salience or the absence of both race and gender salience that explains the difference.

For white women with the Other Privilege orientation, both race and gender are salient. They rate all other ethnocentric groups as having more access to privileges than white women. This suggests that, although the reasons for the different groups having more access to privileges may differ, they perceive that white women are at a disadvantage relative both to men and to people of color. As already indicated, a woman writes:

I did not realize until completing this form that male, no matter what race or culture, is respected and honored more than females in Pipeco.
[WF:P:81].

Her comment suggests that gender is salient in her responses. However, she still rates people of color as having more access to privileges than white women, indicating that gender is not the only indicator of privilege. Similarly, another woman writes that Pipeco “needs to select and/or train more minorities for upper management. In particular, women!” [WF:P:129]. That she believes that Pipeco needs to train more minorities seems to be a contradiction, as she rates people of color as having more access to privileges than white women. However, she goes on to say that “race is given more priority than sex (e.g. women in upper level jobs).” The latter statement suggests she believes that diversity strategies benefit people of color, rather than white women. The former statement suggests that she believes that white men still have advantages because they are white men. The two comments by this white woman demonstrate that there are different reasons for rating white men and people of color as having more access to privileges than white women. White men have more access to privileges because of their historically more powerful positions in the organization. People of color have more access to privileges because they receive advantages as a result of strategies to increase diversity. Thus, race is a salient factor in her mind; so is gender as indicated by her emphasis on the need for more women.

Thus, the high deprecatory and ethnocentric intergroup attitudes among white women with the Other Privilege orientation may stem from feeling that all other groups have more advantages than white women. They feel that white women are less likely to receive a promotion than white men because of “homosocial reproduction of management” (Kanter, 1977):

During the recent 1992 reorganizations, Pipeco management has had ample opportunity to place highly experienced competent women professionals into newly created strategic positions, but has not. Women professionals in Pipeco went far as to develop a table of women professionals that could be considered for some of these newly developed positions. Unfortunately, none of these women were chosen. [WF:P:129].

And white women with the Other Privilege orientation believe that people of color are more likely to receive a promotion than white women because of the advantages diversity programs create for them. Recall the woman who wrote:

My responses reflect my personal experience of having a black female, with no Pipeco management experience and from an unrelated work group being promoted around me to the management position I had been groomed for. This individual squeezed me out of my supervisory position. Now I'm off the management track altogether. All of the recent promotions to management in my function have been minority females. [WF:P:240].

On the other hand, white women with the Equal Privilege orientation see neither race nor gender as an issue in promotion decisions or as determinant of access to organizational privileges. They rate all groups as having equal access to privileges. One may argue that this does not indicate a lack of race or gender salience, as ignoring privilege is as important to understanding views regarding race and gender relations as is recognizing privilege. In fact, as indicated earlier, I agree with this perspective. However, I am examining why certain groups of white women perceive other groups as more likely to receive a promotion. Ignoring race and gender as critical elements in determining who receives promotions and privileges suggests that these women do not acknowledge the importance of either in their other responses. The same woman who said she was "offended by [my] prescription of diversity-related discrimination at the workplace" writes:

Everything [about race and gender receives too much attention]. If you're competent, race and gender are not an issue; your contributions are well-

known. If you're not competent, you need to fix that before you should expect recognition. [WF:P:107].

Her comments demonstrate the lack of recognition that race and gender are issues. Further, she makes the same false assumptions about the competence of other race/ethnicity/gender groups as many white men who are in positions of power.

Thus, white women with the Equal Privilege orientation may not harbor self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes because they perceive that they have as much of a chance as the next person, regardless of race/ethnicity/gender background, as receiving a promotion. At the same time, they may not consciously foster ethnocentric intergroup attitudes because, they are not consciously aware of, or do not consciously acknowledge different advantages afforded to different groups. This reason is different from the reasons white women with the White Privilege and White Male privilege have low ethnocentric intergroup attitudes. White women with the White Privilege orientation recognize that they have advantages because of their race and would like to see more attention given to other groups. White women with the White Male Privilege orientation focus only on the advantages white men have because of their race and gender. Consequently, they have negative ethnocentric attitudes only for this group; because they would like to see more attention given to the other groups, on average, they have relatively low ethnocentric intergroup attitudes.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

There are four points to take away from this chapter. First, among white women, there are no differences either in reactions to the diversity strategies or in intergroup attitudes between Wireco and Pipeco. There are at least two explanations for the lack of differences between the companies. One, as with black respondents, the shared experiences of white women due to gender discrimination may overpower other potential differences. Two, because the diversity strategy at Wireco was grass-roots motivated, even though the strategy is subtle from the perspective of management, it may be visible from the perspective of the white women who responded to the survey.

Second, among white women there is a relationship between intergroup attitudes and the reaction to the diversity strategy. As with white men, resistance to the diversity strategy

increases with antagonism toward people of color. Further, antagonism toward white men decreases with perceptions of increased effectiveness of the strategy.

Third, there are differences in level of support for diversity strategies among the orientational categories. Although they are skeptical about the effectiveness of the existing strategy and about management's commitment to diversity, there is more support for the idea of diversity from white women with the White Privilege and the White Male Privilege orientations than from the other two orientations. Women with the White Privilege and White Male Privilege orientations would like to see more done to help people of color, as well as white women, get promoted and are concerned about the "quota" stigma attached to diversity programs. At the beginning of the analysis of the qualitative data, I ask why white women with such different perceptions of boundary status permeability would have similar reactions to the diversity strategies. At first, the similarity in these attitudes between the White Privilege and the White Male Privilege orientations seems odd because white women with the White Privilege orientation perceive low status boundaries and women with the White Male Privilege orientation perceive high status boundaries. Yet, this result makes sense given the relationship between antagonism and reaction to the diversity strategy: both groups have low antagonism toward people of color. There seems to be an exception to this interpretation. White women with the Equal Privilege orientation, like those with the Other Privilege orientation, tend to resist the diversity strategy. However, while women with the Other Privilege orientation have high antagonism toward people of color, women with the Equal Privilege orientation have low antagonism toward people of color. It appears that the resistance from the latter group stems from a belief that diversity strategies are unnecessary, and resistance from the former group stems from a resentment toward the other groups they perceive the strategies are helping.

Fourth, there is a relationship between perceptions of status boundary permeability and ethnocentrism and self-deprecation. In the beginning of the qualitative data analysis, I also ask what is the nature of the relationship between perceptions of status boundary permeability and both ethnocentrism and self-deprecation. White women with the White Privilege and the Equal Privilege orientations both perceive high status boundary permeability, and both have low ethnocentric and self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes. Women with the White Male Privilege and Other Privilege orientations perceive low status boundary permeability and have high ethnocentric and self-deprecatory intergroup

attitudes. To understand the dynamics underlying the relationship, I examined whether race or gender, both, or neither is more salient. I found that the reason for the low self-deprecation and ethnocentrism among white women with the White Privilege orientational group is the ability of these women to recognize that they have advantages because of their race; they compare themselves to people from other racioethnic groups. On the other hand, white women with the White Male Privilege orientation compare themselves to white men. Thus, their comparison to white men leaves them pessimistic about their chances for promotion and feeling that their concerns are ignored by the organization as a whole. White women with the Other Privilege orientation feel that all other groups have more advantages than white women. Their high levels of self-deprecation and ethnocentrism come from comparing themselves to both white men and people of color; they believe that individuals from both these groups are more likely to receive promotions and that the organization is more likely to address the needs of these groups. On the other hand, women with the Equal Privilege orientation do not acknowledge different advantages afforded to different groups, so they do not consciously foster ethnocentric or self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes.

In summary, returning to the three questions at the beginning of the chapter, white women tend to support at least the concept of diversity strategies, if not the strategy their company has in place. Although there are no first-order differences between the companies in reactions to the strategies, there are differences between the companies when I control for orientational category. Further, there is a relationship between support for the diversity strategy and intergroup attitudes, in particular antagonistic intergroup attitudes. Moreover, the orientational category of the respondent moderates the nature of the relationship.

CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the conclusions I draw from my research on diversity in organizations. I first discuss the research implications of the study, focusing on what we can learn from my experiences with the research process. Second, I discuss implications for organizations desiring to manage diversity. Third, I suggest several areas for future research. Finally, I return to the strategies to change culture and ponder whether they are really changing culture.

RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

I find that intergroup attitudes and reaction to efforts to improve the diversity climate depend not only on the type of strategy a company employs, but also on the subjective orientation of the individual. Rather than recap the details of my analysis, I am going to focus on the research implications of the process of coming to this conclusion. There are three implications I wish to discuss: separate analyses for separate racioethnic gender groups; the moderating effect of orientational category; and the role I played in coming to this conclusion.

Separate Analyses for Separate Groups

In Chapter Three I compare reactions to the diversity strategy and intergroup attitudes across racioethnic gender group and find differences among the groups. This finding demonstrates the necessity of analyzing the racioethnic gender groups separately and avoiding the tendency to combine white women and people of color, or all people of color, into one analytical category. It is not possible to assume that white women have the same attitudes as people of color, and it is not possible to assume that all people of color have the same attitudes. Not only are there differences among the racioethnic groups, but there are gender differences within the groups. In my analysis, I do combine black men and women into one analytical category. It appears that among black employees in predominately white organizations race is more salient than gender in the context of diversity strategies. This is consistent with Bell's (1992) assertion that within the black community, racism takes precedence over sexism in an attempt to present a united front to the white community. If I had worded the survey instrument differently I

might have been able to surface some of the tensions between black men and black women. Regardless, the differences among racioethnic groups and between genders shown in Chapter Three indicate that a rigorous analysis including diverse groups must look at each group separately.

In addition to conducting separate analyses of the racioethnic gender groups, one must be sensitive to the different directions the analyses might take. Initially, I tried to use the same structure to analyze all the groups. I found it frustrating because not all the variables and concepts were pertinent to all the groups. And when groups did share variables and concepts of interest, the meanings of the variables and their relative emphases differed. Once I let the analyses guide me, rather than me guide them, I found that the process flowed much more smoothly. For example, while orientational category is a key construct for the white men in my sample, it is less important for the black men and women. Similarly, while self-deprecatory intergroup attitudes seem to be an important element of the analysis of the black respondents, they are not as significant in the analysis of the white men.

Moderating Effect of Orientational Category

As researchers of human behavior, we find it convenient to rely on broad analytical categories that represent some type of social group. In doing so, however, we can overlook important differences in attitudes within a social group. My dissertation demonstrates this point clearly. In Chapter Three, I compare reactions to the diversity strategy and intergroup attitudes between the two companies and find very little difference. However, organizational differences become apparent when I control for orientational category. It seems that it is not possible to make general conclusions about reactions to diversity strategies. Rather, one must take into account the intragroup variations in subjective interpretations of reality, both within company and within racioethnic gender groups, when trying to understand the phenomena of organizational change strategies. For example, while white men with the Other Privilege orientation tend to resist a subtle strategy for change more than a visible strategy, white men with the White Privilege orientation tend to resist a visible strategy for change more than a subtle strategy.

Thus, as I indicate in the previous paragraph, it is presumptuous to assume homogeneity within racioethnic gender groups. I have demonstrated that for almost every variable there is variation within the groups based upon subjective perceptions of relative access to privileges. In the previous chapters, I examine differences among orientational categories within each racioethnic gender group. The chapters demonstrate not only the importance of avoiding general conclusions based on social groups, but also the differences in reactions to the diversity strategies among the racioethnic gender groups. Moreover, as I demonstrate in the following paragraphs, when we control for orientational category and examine attitudes across the racioethnic gender groups, we find surprisingly similar attitudes that span racioethnicity and gender.

Reaction to the Diversity Strategy

White men are the least likely to support a diversity strategy and black men and women are the most likely to support a strategy. White women are between the two in level of support. Further, the data in Table 7.1 show that for white men and white women, respondents with the Other Privilege orientation are more likely than respondents with the other orientations to resist than support the strategy. However, among black respondents there is little difference in scores among the orientational categories.

TABLE 7.1
Reactions to the Diversity Strategy
By Racioethnic Gender Group and Orientational Category

	White Privilege	Other Privilege	Equal Privilege	Total
White Men	2.0 (.8)	3.0 (1.1)	2.0 (.0)	2.4 1.1)
Black Men and Women	1.2 (.5)	1.2 (.4)	1.1 (.1)	1.2 (.4)
White Women	1.6 (.6)	2.6 (1.0)	2.3 (1.0)	1.8 (.8)

The nature of resistance among white men and women with the Other Privilege orientation differs. White men with the Other Privilege orientation resist diversity strategies in general because they confound diversity strategies with Affirmative Action

programs. They associate 'unqualified' with white women and people of color and believe that these unqualified people are taking away their jobs. White women with the Other Privilege orientation do not really resist the concept of diversity strategies; rather, they are dissatisfied with the type of strategy their company uses. In fact, this is true for white women and black respondents in general. While these groups tend to support the concept of diversity strategies, they do not put a lot of stock in the existing programs.

White men with the White Privilege orientation share with white women and black men and women a desire for the company to give more attention to diversity. Similar to white women and black men and women with the White Privilege and Other Privilege orientations, they would like to see more accountability and specific actions taken by management.

White men with the Equal Privilege orientation are divided: some agree with the men with the Other Privilege orientation that diversity programs allow incompetent people to advance at their expense, and others agree with the men with the White Privilege orientation, and white women and black men and women, that the organizations need to undertake better efforts to improve the diversity climate.

Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy

TABLE 7.2
Effectiveness of Diversity Strategy
By Racioethnic Gender Group and Orientational Category

	White Privilege	Other Privilege	Equal Privilege	Total
White Men	1.8 (.8)	1.8 (.9)	2.3 (.8)	2.0 (.8)
Black Men and Women	2.5 (.9)	2.3 (.9)	3.6 (.7)	2.5 (.9)
White Women	2.9 (1.0)	2.8 (.6)	3.3 (.8)	2.9 (.8)

Perceptions of the effectiveness of the diversity strategy also differ by racioethnic gender group and orientational category (see Table 7.2). On average white women perceive the

strategy to be more effective than the other groups, and white men perceive the strategy to be less effective than the other groups. Across racioethnic gender groups, however, respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation perceive the diversity strategy as more effective than the other groups. In fact, although overall black men and women perceive the strategy as less effective than white women, black men and women with the Equal Privilege orientation perceive the strategy to be more effective than white women with any of the orientations. That respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation perceive the strategy as more effective than other groups may reflect a belief that the culture has changed so that previously disenfranchised groups are no longer discriminated against in the organizational context.

Ethnocentrism

White men are the most ethnocentric by far of the four racioethnic gender groups. While white women are overall not very ethnocentric, white women with the Other Privilege orientation are more ethnocentric than most black respondents (see Table 7.3). In fact, across racioethnic gender groups, respondents with the Other Privilege orientation are the most ethnocentric.

TABLE 7.3
Ethnocentrism
By Racioethnic Gender Group and Orientational Category

	White Privilege	Other Privilege	Equal Privilege	Total
White Men	1.9 (1.1)	2.4 (1.0)	1.6 (1.0)	1.9 (1.1)
Black Men and Women	.2 (.8)	.6 (.9)	.1 (.6)	.3 (.8)
White Women	-.2 (.5)	.3 (1.5)	-.5 (.7)	-.3 (1.0)

White men with the Other Privilege orientation associate diversity strategies with the preferential treatment of white women and people of color. This is evidence of the in-group favoritism that characterizes ethnocentric attitudes, and is based on the assumption that it is not fair for other groups to receive preferential treatment because of their race

and gender. They do not recognize that white men receive preferential treatment because of their race and gender; rather, they seem to believe that white men receive promotions based on merit. The ethnocentric attitudes that characterize black men and women also focus on preferential treatment of other groups. However, in this case, they focus on the preferential treatment of white women. They believe that white women receive too much attention as a minority category. Further, they believe that issues of reverse discrimination receive too much attention. White women with the Other Privilege orientation harbor more ethnocentric attitudes than other women because, for them, both race and gender are salient. Therefore, they believe that not only white men receive more benefits than white women, but also people of color receive more benefits than white women. White men have advantages because they are the traditionally dominant group in the organization, and black employees have advantages because they benefit from the diversity strategies.

Self-Deprecation

Although the variation among black respondents is relatively small, respondents with the Other Privilege orientation tend to be more pessimistic about their chances for a promotion than respondents with the other orientations (see Table 7.4).

TABLE 7.4
Self-deprecation
By Racioethnic Gender Group and Orientational Category

	White Privilege	Other Privilege	Equal Privilege	Total
White Men	3.3 (1.3)	4.2 (.8)	4.0 (.8)	3.9 (1.0)
Black Men and Women	3.4 (.5)	3.6 (.7)	3.1 (.7)	3.4 (.6)
White Women	2.8 (.7)	4.2 (.8)	3.3 (.5)	3.5 (.8)

While white men tend to feel their promotion opportunities are limited because of the organizations need to increase the presence of white women and people of color in management, black men and women feel that there are institutional barriers that prevent

their advancement. These barriers include exclusion from networks, lack of opportunities to demonstrate competence, persisting stereotypes of black people, and aversive discrimination. White women, especially those with the Other Privilege orientation, believe that white men are more likely to receive promotions because of the tendency toward homosocial reproduction in management, and they believe black men and women are more likely to receive promotions because they are the primary beneficiaries of diversity strategies. It is interesting that black men and women with the Equal Privilege orientation are the least self-deprecatory of all groups. They believe that, on average, they are about as likely as anyone to receive a promotion. This result is consistent with their belief structure around access to privileges. They do not acknowledge that certain groups are discriminated against. Therefore, they believe equally qualified individuals have equal opportunities for promotions, regardless of race or gender.

Antagonism

TABLE 7.5
Antagonism Toward People of Color
By Racioethnic Gender Group and Orientational Category

	White Privilege	Other Privilege	Equal Privilege	Total
White Men*	2.0 (1.3)	3.9 (1.3)	2.7 (1.3)	3.1 (1.5)
White Women	2.0 (.9)	3.2 (1.2)	2.2 (1.2)	2.1 (1.1)

* Rating includes antagonism toward white women as well as toward people of color.

It is not surprising that people with the Other Privilege orientation are more antagonistic toward other groups than are people with the other orientations. It is also not surprising that white men and women with the White Privilege and the Equal Privilege orientations have relatively low levels of antagonism (see Table 7.5). The average level of antagonism for white men with the Equal Privilege orientation is somewhat higher than the average level for those with the White Privilege orientation because, as I discussed in Chapter 4, there is a bipolar distribution of attitudes within this group.

What is interesting, however, is the pattern of responses among white women and black men and women. For both groups, respondents with the Equal Privilege orientation

indicate lower levels of antagonism toward white men than other respondents. This reflects the belief in a meritocracy - white men are in no better position to receive promotions than any other group. Among white women, those with the Other Privilege orientation have less antagonism toward white men than those with the White Privilege orientation, which is not true for black men and women. This reflects the belief that white men are not the only privileged group; people of color also have access to privileges that white women do not.

TABLE 7.6
Antagonism Toward White Men
By Racioethnic Gender Group and Orientational Category

	White Privilege	Other Privilege	Equal Privilege	Total
Black Men and Women	4.1 (.8)	4.3 (.5)	2.3 (.9)	4.1 (.9)
White Women	4.1 (.8)	3.2 (1.1)	2.4 (1.0)	3.7 (1.1)

My Role in the Research Process

I find my results interesting and believe they make a valuable contribution to management research. For me, however, the real value in this research has been the personal learning involved. By personal learning, I do not mean how to conduct a research project. Rather, I mean I have learned what it means to be a researcher and how who I am influences the questions I ask, the data I collect, the analysis I undertake, and the conclusions I draw. I have learned that it is impossible to separate myself from the research process, no matter how hard I try.

This is not a new concept. Other researchers have been interested in and aware of how assumptions, needs, and experiences shape the research process (Berg, 1985; Kram, 1985). However, I believe it is a concept that one needs to experience to understand the full range of its implications.

This research document would not be complete without a description of how my assumptions, needs, and experiences shaped the questions I asked, the data I collected, the analysis I undertook, and the conclusions I drew. Berg (1985) writes:

When a description of the emotional dynamics of the research relationship is missing from a research report, the reader is denied access to the researcher's perception of the emotional context in which the study was conducted (p.214).

In this section, I will document the emotional context in which this study was conducted, and demonstrate how it shaped the research process.

Key to understanding the emotional context of this study is knowing that I am a white woman in my early 30's and that I did my doctoral work at M.I.T. I follow a framework used by Kram (1985) to document the emotional context of this study. I look at three stages of the study: defining the problem, collecting the data, and analyzing the data.

Defining the Problem

My social group membership strongly affected the nature of the research questions I asked. I came to M.I.T. with an undergraduate degree in economics intending to study strategic formulation and implementation. At that time, I had never experienced gender discrimination.³³ The first time I ever felt I was treated differently because of my gender was during my first years at M.I.T., and it made me mad. One might say my subjective perceptions of reality shifted from an Equal Privilege orientation to a White Male Privilege orientation. Because of this experience, I began questioning what I saw as the

³³ Or rather I thought I had not. As a result of my early experiences at M.I.T. I began reflecting on other experiences and reinterpreted what I had thought were individual failures. For example, in my senior year of high school, the faculty advisor to the school paper did not choose me to be editor-in-chief. This was despite being news editor of an award-winning news page for the two previous years. Rather, he selected two boys to share the position. Many years later I found out that I was not the only one who wondered why he did not select me. At the time, I felt I was not competent to be editor-in-chief. In reflection, I realize that I was competent, but that in all his years as faculty advisor, he never selected a female editor-in-chief.

status quo with respect to the role of women in United States society. Rather than spending time studying for my general examinations in strategy, I dove head first into feminist literature. I was losing interest in researching strategic issues because I felt the research would only benefit white men and my literature review on the status of women in management indicated that white men did not need any more help. At the same time, I was worried about changing focus from a safe, conservative, and well-received area to an area that is viewed as radical by most members of our profession.³⁴ A pivotal event occurred during a class I was taking on data analysis at the Harvard School of Education. One day I asked the professor a question about principal components analysis. I used a set of variables in my second year paper (a paper on strategic formulation) as the context. He asked me to explain the purpose of my paper, so I did. After I finished, he stared quizzically at me for a few very long seconds and said in his charming British accent, "How boring!" It was that day that I decided I no longer cared to take the safe route. I was going to study women in organizations. Although I had no idea of the particular topic, I felt this would be an area of research that would be of interest and benefit a group of people who are important to me.

I am relating all this because it is important to know that when I decided to study diversity in organizations, I was at a place in my life where I was angry, confused, skeptical, and defiant. I suppose I was somewhat radical in my feminist stance. Somehow, I had to define who I was. My dissertation allowed me to do that. By studying diversity, I learned how to question the status quo, unveil my own assumptions about other groups and my own group, and take my destiny into my own hands. I am no longer the angry, confused, and defiant student I was six years ago, although I am still skeptical. Nor do I consider myself a radical feminist.³⁵ I believe the final research report reflects who I am now. It still has strong feminist underpinnings, yet it

³⁴ It is funny that studying women in business is considered radical. After all, they comprise about 1/2 of the work force. For many years, we only studied men in the work force and that was never considered radical.

³⁵This became apparent on my 33rd birthday. As I got out of my car, some teenage boys drove past and yelled out "Nice ass!" Six years ago I would have been indignant and all up in arms about the chauvinist pigs our society creates. On my 33rd birthday, with two children under my belt, I decided to take it as a compliment.

demonstrates the fallacy of making too broad assumptions about white men, or any group for that matter.

Collecting the Data

I believe that this is the stage in which my racioethnic gender group membership most influenced the research process. I defied advice from a committee member who knew better and studied groups other than my own. Rather than concentrating on understanding only white females, I was convinced I wanted to understand all racioethnic gender groups. This committee member correctly felt that interviews would not elicit honest responses from respondents other than white women. I felt that I should be able to avoid problems with interviewer bias by using an anonymous survey to collect data.

Well, I was wrong. My group membership influenced the data collection process in several very important ways. First, unconsciously I was focusing on understanding white men. In retrospect, I see that I was really interested in how white men could hold the feelings they did when they clearly enjoyed status and power in the organization. As a white woman, it was very clear to me that white men enjoyed enormous status and privilege in organizations, and I could not see how they could feel otherwise. The survey I developed reflects this bias. More questions are pertinent to the experiences of white men than to other groups. For example, I ask questions about threat from women and people of color, but not about threat from white men.

Second, as a white woman it was difficult for me to ask the right questions of other groups. Although I received some advice from others, ultimately the questions I asked on my survey were filtered by my perceptions of what were appropriate areas to cover. As a consequence, I neglected areas that, as the qualitative data made clear, were appropriate for other groups. For example, the stresses of working in a predominately white organization, were important issues for black respondents. However, my survey focused more on promotion opportunities. As another example, I did not ask questions that would elicit from the black respondents antagonistic attitudes toward white women. Maybe it did not cross my mind that black people could hold resentful attitudes toward white women (since white women and black men and women shared discriminatory experiences). Or maybe I was subconsciously avoiding a topic that could be very painful

to me. Either way, my social group membership strongly affected the questions I asked on the survey.

Data Analysis

My social group membership influenced the data analysis phase of the research project in at least three ways: 1) the analysis I was able to conduct based on my data; 2) limitations on my ability to interpret the data from other groups; and 3) my ability to critically examine the data. I will discuss each of these in turn.

First, the biases that surface from examination of the data collection phase of the research project carry over into the data analysis phase. The data analysis is contingent on the data I collected. Because the data I collected has biases, ultimately so will the analysis of the data. In particular, because I did not ask all the right questions of all the groups, I was unable to analyze all of the groups to the same extent. For example, antagonistic intergroup attitudes are very salient in the context of diversity. However, since the data I gathered from white men on this variable are much more complete than the data I gathered from black men and women or white women, I was able to conduct a more thorough analyses of these intergroup attitudes on white men.

Second, while I will not claim to be a spokesperson for all white women, my membership in that social category increases my ability to interpret the data I received from that group. At some level, I share historical and cultural experiences, or am perceived to have shared historical and cultural experiences by other groups, with other white women. On the other hand, my experiences are very different from white men and even more different from many black men and women. Thus, when I analyze the data from these groups, I can do so only within my limited repertoire of experiences. I truly believe that if a white man had analyzed the data on the white men, his conclusions would have been very different from mine. Similarly, if a black man or a black woman had analyzed the data on the black respondents, their conclusions would have been different as well. For example, when I discuss the lack of opportunities to demonstrate competence among black respondents, I originally cited Kanter (1977) when I suggested that because they have few opportunities to demonstrate competence black employees may behave in ways that sabotage organizational goals and aspirations. One of my committee members, an African-American woman, pointed out that Kanter's theory is based on observing white

men and women. She suggested that rather than “sabotaging,” black employees end up overcompensating for their lack of opportunities. Black employees cannot afford to sabotage organizational goals because they are extremely visible and watched carefully. This is only one example of how my perceptions cloud alternative interpretations. In this case, my interpretation was called into question, but I am certain there are other instances in which my interpretation of the data was not.

Third, my social group membership influenced the extent to which I was able to critically analyze the data from the different groups. A tenet of feminist methodology is that because women are a subordinate group, we are in a position to see the truth more clearly (Harding, 1987). A corollary of this tenet is that because men are a dominant group, their perceptions are clouded by their desire to maintain their hold on power. I feel that my analysis of white men is very critical. I look between the lines to uncover the assumptions that characterize their perceptions, and then I question their assumptions. As a member of the subordinate group, I feel that I am in the position to do this and to claim that my interpretations reflect social reality. On the other hand, the analysis of black men and women is not very critical. In retrospect, I believe two forces were at play in my subconscious. One, when we discuss gender relations, men are considered a dominant group. Yet when we discuss race relations, white people are considered a dominant group and black people are considered a subordinate group. Following the logic of the feminist methodology, as a white person and a member of the dominant group, I am not in a position to see the truth about the status of black men and women. Thus, at some level, I believe I was insecure about my ability to interpret these data truthfully. Two, and related to the first, I believe white guilt played a role. While I was willing to question the assumptions suggested by the comments from the white men, I took what the black respondents told me at face value. There is some validity to my tendency to take what the black respondents wrote as accurate versions of reality. Feagin and Vera (1995, p. 12) write:

White views of blacks are often not based on significant personal experiences with African Americans. In contrast, black views of whites are much more likely to be grounded in personal experiences because most blacks have had substantial experiences with whites by the time they are a few years old.

Summary of research experience

Thus, there are three important things to learn from my experience and these should be taken into account when researching intergroup dynamics. First, it is important to conduct separate analyses for different social groups. Combining social groups can result in the loss of important intergroup dynamics and attitudes. Second, much information can be gained from examining intragroup variations in perceptions of some relevant social reality. Finally, researchers need to illuminate their emotional role in the research process in order to understand in what ways their conclusions may be biased.

It appears that an analysis of reactions to diversity strategies and intergroup attitudes is not simple. One must take into account intragroup variations when examining differences, and look for similarities across racial/ethnic gender groups. This research has focused on one particular context of organizational change, namely the culture surrounding career opportunities for different groups of people. Moreover, it has focused on one delineation of social groups, namely racial/ethnic gender groups. However, this finding has broader implications. Another social group delineation that has particular relevance in the organizational context is functional identity. Organizations comprise a number of functional groups, each with their own set of basic assumptions, beliefs, values, and expectations. Strategies to change culture often have differential impacts on different functional groups. For example, many organizations are changing internal processes to become more “environmentally conscious.” As with diversity strategies, these changes shift the power structure. Different departments become more important, while others need to radically change the way they operate.

In this section, I discussed implications for researchers. This study also has implications for organizations wishing to manage diversity. In the next section, I discuss these implications.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL POLICY

This study takes an organizational level phenomenon and looks at how it affects individual employees at an intergroup level. In this section, I reverse the process and think about what intergroup actions mean for organizational policies dealing with

diversity-related cultural change. The consequences for organizations of the attitudes, perceptions, and feelings discussed in this dissertation are nontrivial. First, Kanter (1977) associates low opportunity for advancement with low organizational commitment, withdrawal from responsibility, and resisting innovations and new ideas from higher levels. Consequently, among white men who perceive the strategy as a threat to their careers, commitment and performance may be lower than they would be otherwise. Related to lower commitment, turnover may also be higher than it would otherwise be.

Similarly, there may be frustration among white women who feel that diversity strategies benefit other groups. For those white women who feel that the company is not making serious efforts to improve the diversity climate and that the company remains dominated by the white male culture, frustration may lower commitment and increase turnover.

Kanter (1977) studied a predominately white organization. Although she claims that her findings generalize to nonwhite groups, Feagin and Sikes (1994) suggest that black employees do not feel they can withdraw from responsibility and sabotage innovations and new ideas. Rather, they face pressure to always perform to their maximum potential and not be seen as deviant in any way. Actions indicating otherwise are blown out of proportion and attributed to race rather than individual or institutional factors. However, these pressures can also lead to higher turnover among black employees who do not want to or cannot handle the stress associated with working in a white-dominated culture.

Second, because white men who perceive their status to be unstable because of a diversity strategy constitute the largest group of white men, the strongest resistance to the diversity strategy comes from the majority of managerial employees. If the majority of white men in an organization feel threatened by the change, the organization may have a more difficult time implementing an intended change because of the resistance it encounters.

Third, when the resistance to the change is related to the surfacing of fallacious assumptions, white women and people of color will face even greater obstacles to career advancement. Despite an organization's best intentions, turnover may be high among white women and people of color due to the frustration they feel from these obstacles. Also, these obstacles may be preventing the employees from performing to their fullest potential.

Fourth, intergroup dynamics, low commitment, low performance, high turnover, frustration, and resistance, are potential sources of increased inefficiency and costs for the organization. When people should be worrying about their work and their own career development, they are devoting time and energy to thinking about other groups. It is even more consequential when people act on their fears and stereotypes to make life difficult for other employees and prevent these other employees from efficiently completing organizational tasks..

Thus, to successfully implement a strategy for organizational change that threatens the status hierarchies, organizations need to manage conditions to ameliorate threat, antagonism, ethnocentrism, and self-deprecation. For example, organizations need to clarify what they mean by equal treatment. An event that appears to be unfair at an individual level may be seen as fair at a more macro level that considers broader social, legal, and moral issues. It is easier to see the effects of discrimination at the societal level than at the individual level. Organizations should encourage evaluating outcomes at a macro level because a narrowly defined concept of equality perpetuates and exacerbates the disadvantaged status of people who already possess disproportionately fewer resources. The focus on individual inequities personalizes the general issue and opens the door for the misperceptions, misunderstandings, and false assumptions we witness in the data I gathered from Wireco and Pipeco.

Further, organizations must acknowledge that individuals from different racioethnic gender groups operate on different sets of assumptions, beliefs, and values. In other words, there are subcultures that exist side by side with a dominant organizational culture. Managing diversity requires creating a language that allows members of the different subcultures to recognize this. For example, in the data from Wireco and Pipeco, diversity strategy has different meanings for different groups of people. Most white men do not differentiate diversity strategy from Affirmative Action programs and have very strong negative reactions to the term. At the same time, black men and women associate diversity strategies with sharing organizational power and feel that management is doing very little to effect substantial change. Clear definition of a diversity strategy and articulation of the actual implementation steps and measures of success might be a first step toward creating a common language. A second step might be to verify that a common understanding exists. These are only initial steps because, as my data clearly

show, differences in perceptions of social reality act as a filter and scrambler. Individuals with different orientations will have different interpretations of the same phenomenon.

I am not advocating a visible over a subtle strategy. Rather, I am suggesting that organizations need a clear language with which different groups can discuss differences in assumptions. To do this, members of the different groups need to have a clear understanding of what diversity means to the organization.

Finally, when developing diversity strategies, diversity managers and others must recognize that there are white men who recognize their privileged status in the organization. These men might be offended by the presumption that, because they are white men, they share an orientation with the majority of the white men in the organization. Organizations need to be careful not to alienate white men who may potentially support the diversity strategies. Similarly, organizations need to recognize that there are black men and women who do not share with the majority of their racioethnic group the perception that they are treated differently because of their race. Assuming intragroup homogeneity in this instance may increase feelings of disenfranchisement where previously there were none, thus increasing, rather than mitigating, intergroup attitudes. Finally, organizations must recognize the variety of groups with which white women may identify. Some white women focus on the privileges they enjoy because of their race, some focus on the disadvantages they experience because of their gender, some focus on the benefits all other groups receive for a variety of reasons, and some believe that neither race nor gender matter. Assuming homogeneity along only one of these dimensions runs the risk of alienating some white women. For example, white women who believe that neither race nor gender are an issue in promotion decisions might be offended at the implication that they must support and participate in the design and implementation of diversity strategies just because they are white women. They may have other interests, priorities, and desires.

Thus, managers need to avoid assumptions of homogeneity in attitudes within racioethnic gender groups and assumptions of homogeneity in reactions to diversity strategies across racioethnic gender groups. They need to manage conditions to ameliorate intergroup attitudes and resistance to the strategy, and they need to create a common basis for understanding differences in assumptions, attitudes, and beliefs across subcultures.

FUTURE RESEARCH

I never envisioned this dissertation as being a closed book. Rather, I viewed it as the beginning of a stream of research that can illuminate how policies created at the organizational level affect individual and intergroup behavior. As I proceeded with the project, I realized that the number of unanswered relevant questions was much greater than the number of questions I was able to answer. In this final section, I will discuss areas of research that stem from this dissertation.

First, and most obvious, research is needed to understand the bases for orientational categories. In this dissertation, I took the orientations as exogenous to the analysis - people came in with a set of orientations. However, the orientations are not really exogenous. Knowing where people develop their orientations is critical for knowing how to manage diversity in the organization. For example, orientations might develop from family influences, educational experiences, or organizational experiences. Orientations that develop from family influences require a different mode of management than orientations that develop from organizational experiences. In the context of diversity, it may be that the Equal Privilege orientation is a result of family influences, whereas the Other Privilege orientation is a result of organizational influences. Alternatively, all orientations might have developed in the organization, at school, or at home.

Related to understanding the bases of the orientations, research is needed to understand what social realities are pertinent in different situations. I argued that access to privileges is a pertinent social reality in the context of diversity. However, there might be other relevant perceptions that more in-depth interviews could surface. Further, there are likely to be other perceptions that are relevant in other contexts. For example, access to resources might be a pertinent social reality in the context of changes related to becoming an environmentally conscious organization. Understanding the relevant dimensions on which to examine intragroup variations in attitudes can help organizations manage change.

Second, this dissertation examines a change in organizational culture in one context. It appears that organizations use two different strategies for changing the culture with respect to diversity, namely subtle and visible strategies. It is not necessarily true that

organizations use these types of strategies for other less revolutionary changes. Using the example of becoming a more environmentally conscious organization, it may be that organizations use only visible strategies. Or organizations might also employ what Schein (1985) and Siehl (1984) call secondary or implicit strategies. More research in multiple contexts is needed to understand the full range of strategies organizations use to foster change.

Third, these data were collected at one point in time. This limits my ability to evaluate the effectiveness of either strategy. Longitudinal studies of change would allow more in-depth evaluations of strategies. This would include differential effects of, for example, visible and subtle strategies on individuals from different racioethnic gender groups and with different orientations within the groups.

Fourth, I only analyzed the data on white and black employees. This analysis provides insight on the career development issues of these employees. However, there is a dearth of literature on the experiences of Asian and Hispanic employees. The importance of understanding the career experiences of Asian and Hispanic employees is highlighted by both the increasingly global nature of organizations and by the influx of immigrants into the United States from Central and South America.

Fifth, I looked at intergroup relations in a very "U.S. centric" context. While race and gender are salient in the United States, they are not necessarily so in other parts of the world. In other countries, for example, class is more salient. Further, as more countries enter the global market, national identities become more important. For example, joint ventures involving multiple European or multiple South American countries involve multiple cultures. The international context could provide another arena in which to study intergroup relations and cultural change. After expanding the study of intergroup relations out of the United States context, we could use the learnings to reflect back on and enrich our understanding of race and gender relations.

Sixth, this research is exploratory. As a consequence, construct validity is often questionable. For example, I have a unidimensional indicator of antagonism. Further, I define self-deprecation and ethnocentrism based on data collected from the survey. Despite the questionable construct validity, the concepts are clearly important. Future

research should operationalize the variables prior to data collection to improve measurement of the constructs.

Finally, as I indicated earlier in this chapter the quality of the data I collected from the different social groups varies. Now that we have an improved understanding what issues are important for different groups, it is necessary to redesign the method and content of data collection to further our theoretical knowledge of the experiences of groups other than white men and women.

A FINAL NOTE ON STRATEGIES TO CHANGE CULTURE

There are some quantitative differences between the companies, especially when I control for orientational category of the respondent. However, if one examines the comments, and controls for orientational category and racioethnic gender group, there really are no significant differences in attitudes between the two companies. This raises two questions: 1) am I really looking at two different strategies, and 2) can any strategy really change the culture? First, the lack of differences between the two companies might raise the question of how different in practice the diversity strategies of these two companies really are. I base my categorization of the strategies on interviews with one individual in each organization. Since these individuals are diversity managers, they have a vested interest in seeing that diversity remains a viable item on the organizational agenda. It may be that the diversity manager in Pipeco, the organization with the visible strategy, overstated the importance and visibility of diversity. Nonetheless, the data from the respondents indicate that those from Pipeco are more aware of the strategy than those from Wireco, validating my categorization of the strategies.

Second, and more importantly, we need to ask the question of whether it is possible to change an aspect of culture that is so deeply embedded in the organization. The responses from many white men indicate that racism and sexism persist in blatant and subtle ways. When white men write that they have seen too many unqualified white women and people promoted and receive preferential treatment because of their gender and race, they are making racist and sexist assumptions about what it means to be qualified and who should assess qualifications. Further, they are using assumptions about what equality means and who has access to equal opportunity to justify continued exclusion of white women and people of color from high status positions. Racism is not

limited to white men. White women also are guilty of racist assumptions. We also heard from white women who thought that incompetent black people were getting jobs that should be going to white women.

At the same time, we hear from the black respondents that they still face discrimination, lack of opportunities to demonstrate competence, and exclusion from key networks. They also feel they have extra stresses from having to prove competence, needing to be perfect in the workplace, and having to deal with discrimination on a day-to-day basis. These attitudes exist despite years of Affirmative Action and several years of diversity programs. For some reason, white men and some white women feel their power being usurped and want to stop or reverse this process. As Feagin and Vera (1995, p. 147) write, “many find it hard to accept the fact that they have been (or are) oppressors. The reality is that white men continue to enjoy privileges based on their race and gender and white women enjoy privileges based on their race.”

What is so disheartening to those of us who wish to see real change take place is that so little has changed. The stereotypes, false assumptions, and behaviors that exist are the same ones that existed in the 1970's (Almquist, 1975; Bass, et al., 1972; Davies, 1975; Dobbins & Platz, 1986; Dubno, 1985; Garland & Price, 1977; Hartmann, 1976; Jacobson & Koch, 1977; Kanter, 1977; Katz, 1978; O'Leary, 1976; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974; Schein, 1973; Spangler, Gordon, & Pipkin, 1978). Further, the sexism and racism that white women and people of color face in the organization mirror the dynamics that occur in society. Feagin and Vera (1995) use recent examples to demonstrate that in 1995 racism still exists at a societal level. It just takes different forms than it did 30, 40, 50 or 60 years ago.

Given how little has changed over time, and given how little support there is for change in our society, is it reasonable to believe that either a visible or a subtle strategy can create an environment that is conducive to the hiring, retention, and promotion of all individuals, regardless of race or gender? Feagin and Vera (1995) are optimistic that change can happen. It requires “a dramatic change in individual, group, and societal ways of seeing” (p. 18). The diversity strategies I study are relatively new (within the last 5-10 years). Perhaps over more time we will begin to see more change. My question is how much more time do we need? Meanwhile, diversity strategies that attempt to foster

dramatic change are met with resistance and serve only to make salient the ugly mask of racism and sexism that characterize so much of United States society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J., Rice, R. W., & Instone, D. (1984). "Follower attitudes toward women and judgments concerning performance by female and male leaders." Academy of Management Journal, 27 (3), pp. 636-643.
- Ahlburg, D., & Kimmel, L. (1986). Human resource management: Implications of the changing age structure of the U.S. labor force. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Gerris (Eds.), Research in Personnel and Human Resource Practice (pp. 339-374). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Alderfer, C. P., & Smith, K. K. (1982). "Studying intergroup relations embedded in organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 27, pp. 35 - 65.
- Alexander, M. (1994, March 7, 1994). Backlash felt by majority, minority workers. Boston Globe, p. 4.
- Allport, F. H. (1924). Social Psychology. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Allport, G., W. (1954). The nature of Prejudice. New York: Addison Wesley.
- Almquist, E. M. (1975). "Untangling the effects of race and sex: The disadvantaged status of black women." Social Science Quarterly, 56, pp. 129-142.
- Alsop, J. (March 7, 1994). When being the best isn't good enough. Boston Globe, p. 17.
- Bailyn, L. (1989). Understanding individual experience at work. In M. B. Hall, D. T. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), Handbook of Career Theory. (pp. 475-489). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailyn, L. (1993). Breaking the mold: Women, men and time in the new corporate world. New York: The Free Press.
- Baron, J. N. & Bielby, W. T. (1985). Organizational barriers to gender equality: Sex segregation of jobs and opportunities. In A. S. Rossi (Ed.), Gender and the life course (pp. 233-251). New York: Aldine.
- Bass, B. M., Krussel, J., & Alexander, R. A. (1972). "Male managers' attitudes toward working women." American Behavioral Scientist, 15, pp. 221-236.
- Beehr, T. A. & Juntunen, D. L. (1990). "Promotions and employees' perceived mobility channels: The effects of employee sex, employee group, and initial placement." Human Relations, 43 (5), pp. 455-472.
- Bell, E. L. (1990). "The bicultural life experience of career-oriented black women." Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11, pp. 475.
- Bell, E. L. (1992). "Myths, stereotypes, and realities of black women: A personal reflection." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 28(3), pp. 363-376.

- Berg, D. N. (1985). Anxiety in research relationships. In D. N. Berg & K. K. Smith (Eds.), The self in social inquiry (pp. 213-228). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Billig, M. (1976). Social psychology and intergroup relations. London: Academic Press.
- Blake, R. R., Shephard, H. A., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). Managing intergroup conflict in industry. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Blalock, H. M., Jr (1956). "Economic discrimination and Negro increase." American Sociological Review, 21, pp. 584-588.
- Blalock, H. M. (1967). Toward a theory of minority-group relations. New York: Wiley.
- Blanton, K. (1994). Retaining a diverse workforce is a new goal. Boston Globe, p. 1,15-16.
- Blau, P. M. (1977). Inequality and heterogeneity. New York: Free Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1980). "A fable about social structure." Social Forces, 58, pp. 777-788.
- Braddock, J. H. & McPartland, J. M. (1987). "How minorities continue to be excluded from equal employment opportunities: Research on labor market and institutional barriers." Journal of Social Issues, 43(1), pp. 5-39.
- Brass, D. J. (1984). "Being in the right place: A structural analysis of individual influence in an organization." Administrative Science Quarterly, 29, pp. 518-539.
- Brass, D. J. (1985). "Men's and women's networks: A study of interaction patterns and influence in an organization." Academy of Management Journal, 28(2), pp. 327 - 343.
- Brenner, O. C., Tomkiewicz, J., & Schein, V. E. (1989). "The Relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics revisited." Academy of Management Journal, 32(3), pp. 662-669.
- Campbell, B. M. (1984). To be black, gifted, and alone. Savvy, p. 69.
- Campbell, D. T. (1958). "Common fate, similarity, and other indices of the status of aggregates of persons as social entities." Behavioral Science, 3, pp. 14-25.
- Cantor, N. & Mischel, W. (1979). "Prototypes in person perception," Advances in Experimental Psychology, 12, pp. 3-52.
- Catalyst, I. (1991). "Women in corporate management: Model programs for development and mobility."
- Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Cox, T. (1993). Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publications.
- Crichton, M. (1993). Disclosure. New York: Ballantine Books.

- Davies, M. (1975). "Women's place is at the typewriter: The feminization of the clerical labor force." In R. Edwards, M. Reich, & D. Gordon (Eds.), Labor Market Segmentation. (pp. 279-296). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Deschamps, J.C. (1982). Social identity and relations of power between groups. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), Social identity and intergroup relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dipboye, R. L. (1987). "Problems and progress of women in management." in Working women: Past, present, future. Industrial Relations Research Association, pp. 118 - 153.
- DiPrete, T. A. & Whitman T. (1988). "Gender and promotion in segmented job ladder systems." American Sociological Review, 53, pp. 26 - 40.
- Dobbins, G. H. & Platz, S. J. (1986). "Sex differences in leadership: how real are they?" Academy of Management Review, 11(1), pp. 118-127.
- Doise, W. (1978). Groups and individuals: Explanations in social psychology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doise, W. & Sinclair, A. (1973). "The categorization process in intergroup relations." European Journal of Social Psychology, 3, pp. 145-157.
- Dovidio, J. F., Mann, J. & Gaertner, S. L. (1989). Resistance to Affirmative Action: The implications of aversive racism. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative Action in Perspective (pp. 83-102). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Dubno, P. (1985). "Attitudes toward women executives: A longitudinal approach." Academy of Management Journal, 28 (1), pp. 235 - 239.
- Edmonson Bell, E. L. J., & Nkomo, S. (forthcoming). Our separate ways: Journeys of Black and White women in corporate America.
- Edmonson Bell, E. L. J., & Nkomo, S. M. (1994). Barriers to work place advancement experienced by African-Americans. U.S. Department of Labor, Glass Ceiling Commission Report No. B9434164.
- Exter, T. G. (1992). "In and out of work." American Demographics, June, pp. 63.
- Feagin, J. R. & Sikes, M. P. (1994). Living with racism. Boston, MA: Beacon Press Books.
- Feagin, J. R. & Vera, H. (1995). White racism. New York: Routledge.
- Fernandez, J. P. (1982). Racism and sexism in corporate life. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Fitt, L. & Newton, D. A. (1981). "When the mentor is a man and the protégé is a woman." Harvard Business Review, March-April, pp. 56-60.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Galen, M. (1994). White, male, and worried. Business Week, p. 50-55.
- Garland, H. & Price, K. H. (1977). "Attitudes toward women in management and attributions for their success and failure in a managerial position." Journal of Applied Psychology, 62(1), pp. 29-33.
- Giles, M.W. (1977). "Percent black and racial hostility: an old assumption reexamined." Social Science Quarterly, 58, pp. 412-417.
- Granovetter (1974). "The strength of weak ties." American Journal of Sociology, 78(6), pp. 1360-1380.
- Guillaumin, C. (1994). Racism, sexism, power and ideology. Routledge.
- Hamner, W.C., Kim, J.S., Baird, L. & Bigoness, W.J. (1974). "Race and sex as determinants of ratings by potential employers in a simulated work-sampling task," Journal of Applied Psychology, 59 (6), pp. 705-711.
- Harding, S. (1987). "Is there a feminist method?" In S. Harding (Ed.), Feminism and Methodology (pp. 1-14). Indiana University Press.
- Harlan, A. & Weiss, C. L. (1982). Sex differences in factors affecting managerial career advancement. In P. A. Wallace (Ed.), Women in the workplace. Boston: Auburn House.
- Hartmann, H. (1976). "Capitalism, patriarchy, and job segregation by sex." In M. Blaxall & B. Reagan, (Eds.), Women and the workplace, (pp. 37-169). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes. London: Routledge.
- Hogg, M. A. & Turner, J. C. (1987). "Intergroup behavior, self-stereotyping and the salience of social categories." British Journal of Social Psychology, 26, pp. 325-340.
- Hunt, D. M. & Michael, C. (1983). "Mentorship: A career training and development tool." Academy of Management Review, 8(3), pp. 475-485.
- Jacobson, M.B. & Hunt, W. (1977). "Women as leaders: Performance evaluation as a function of leader selection," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 20, pp. 140-157.
- Johnston, W. B. & Packer, A. H. (1987). Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the 21st century. Indianapolis: Hudson Institute.
- Jussim, L. (1986). "Self-fulfilling prophecies: A theoretical and integrative review." Psychological Review, 93(4), pp. 429-445.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- Katz, J. H. (1978). White awareness: Handbook for anti-racism training. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

- Kelley, H. (1973). "The process of causal attribution." American Psychologist, pp. 107-128.
- Kennedy, R. (1986). "Persuasion and distrust: The affirmative action debate." Harvard Law Review, April, pp. .
- Kram, K. (1988). Mentoring at Work. University Press of American.
- Kram, K. E. (1983). "Phases of the mentor relationship." Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), pp. 608-625.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). On the researcher's group memberships. In D. N. Berg & K. K. Smith (Eds.), The self in social inquiry (pp. 247-266). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kram, K. E. & Bragar, M. (1991). Development through mentoring: A strategic approach for the 1990's. In D. H. Montross & C. J. Shinkman (Eds.), Career Development in the 1990's. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Press.
- Lewin, K. (1948). Resolving social conflicts. New York: Harper and Bros.
- Lincoln, J. R., & Jon, M. (1979). "Work and friendship ties in organizations: A comparative analysis of relational networks." Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, pp. 181-199.
- Macke, A. S. (1981). "Token men and women: A note on the salience of sex and occupation among professionals and semiprofessionals." Sociology of Work and Occupations, 8, pp. 25-38.
- Malveaux, J. (1985). "The economic interests of black and white women: Are they similar?" Review of Black Political Economy, 14, pp. 5-27.
- Martin, J. (1990). "Deconstructing organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organization." Organization Science, 1(4), pp. 339-359.
- McDougall, W. (1921). The Group Mind. London: Cambridge University Press.
- McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In Working Paper No. 189. Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.
- McIntyre, S., Moberg, D., & Posner, B. Z. (1980). "Preferential treatment in preselection decisions according to sex and race." Academy of Management Journal, 23(4), pp. 738-749.
- Molm, L. (1986). "Gender, power, and legitimation: A test of three theories." American Journal of Sociology, 91(6), pp. 1356-1386.
- Morrison, A. M., & Von Glinow, M. A. (1990). "Women and minorities in management." American Psychologist, 45(2), pp. 200-208.
- Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Naughton, T. J. (1988). "Effect of female-linked job titles on job evaluation ratings." Journal of Management, 14(4), pp. 567-578.
- Nelson, J. (1993). Volunteer Slavery. Chicago: Noble Press, Inc.
- Nieva, V. F., & Gutek, B. A. (1980). "Sex effects on evaluation." Academy of Management Review, 5(2), pp. 267-276.
- Nkomo, S. M. (1988). Race and sex: The forgotten case of the black female manager. In S. Rose & L. Larwood (Eds.), Women's careers: Pathways and pitfalls. New York: Praeger.
- Noe, R. (1988a). "Women and mentoring: A review and research agenda." Academy of Management Review, 13(1), pp. 65-78.
- Noe, R. A. (1988b). "An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships." Personnel Psychology, 41, pp. 457-479.
- O'Leary, V. E. (1976). "Some attitudinal barriers to occupational aspirations in women." Psychological Bulletin, 81(11), pp. 809-826.
- Oakes, P. J., & Turner, J. C. (1985). "Attribution and the salience of social categories: Correlation and normative consistency as determinants of personality, category membership and entity attributions."
- Offerman, L. R., & Gowing, M. K. (1990). "Organizations of the future: Changes and challenges." American Psychologist, 45(2), pp. 95-108.
- Pettigrew, T. F. & Martin, J. (1987). "Shaping the organizational context for Black American inclusion." Journal of Social Issues, 43(1), pp. 41-78.
- Ragins, B. R. (1989). "Barriers to mentoring: The female manager's dilemma." Human Relations, 42(1), pp. 1 - 22.
- Ragins, B. R., & McFarlin, D. (1990). "Perceptions of mentor roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships." Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37, pp. 321-339.
- Reed, J. S. (1972). "Percent black and lynching: a test of Blalock's theory." Social Forces, 50, pp. 356-360.
- Rosen, B. & Jerdee, T. H. (1974). "Influence of sex role stereotypes on personnel decisions." Journal of Applied Psychology, 59(1), pp. 9 - 14.
- Rosenbaum, J. E. (1989). Organization career systems and employee misperceptions. In M. B. Hall, D. T. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), Handbook of Career Theory. (pp. 329-353). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sachdev, I., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1987). "Status differentials and intergroup behavior." European Journal of Social Psychology, 14, pp. 35-52.
- Sathe, V. (1985). Culture and related corporate realities. Homewood, IL.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

- Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schein, V. E. (1973). "The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management stereotypes." Journal of Applied Psychology, 57(2), pp. 95-100.
- Shao, M. (1994, March 7, 1994). Diversity training: What is it? Who does it? Boston Globe, p. 8-9.
- Sherif, M. (1966). In Common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1979). Research on intergroup relations. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The Social psychology intergroup relations. (pp. 7-18). Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Siehl, C. & Martin, J. (1984). The role of symbolic management: How can managers effectively transmit organizational culture? In J. C. Hunt, D. Hosking, C. Schriesheim, & R. Stewart (Eds.), Leaders and managers: International perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership. New York: Pergamon.
- Smith, A., & Tienda, M. (1988). Employment prospects for minority women. In D. E. Thompson & N. DiTomaso (Eds.), Ensuring minority success in corporate management. New York: Plenum.
- South, S. J., Bonjean, C. M., Markham, W. T., & Corder, J. (1982). "Social structure and intergroup interaction: Men and women of the federal bureaucracy." American Sociological Review, 47, pp. 587-599.
- Spangler, E., Gordon, M. A., & Pipkin, R. M. (1978). "Token women: An empirical test of Kanter's hypothesis." American Journal of Sociology, 84(1), pp. 160-170.
- Stamp, G. (1986). "Some observations on the career paths of women." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 22(4), pp. 385-396.
- Stephan, C.W., Stephan, W.G., and Pettigrew, T.F. (Eds.). (1991). The future of social psychology: defining the relationship between sociology and psychology. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Tajfel, H. (1972). Social Categorization. In S. Moscovici (Ed.), Introduction a la psychologie sociale Paris: Larousse.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Thomas, D. (1986). An intra-organizational analysis of black and white patterns of sponsorship and the dynamics of cross-racial mentoring. PhD, Yale University.
- Thomas, D. (1989). "Mentoring and irrationality: The role of racial taboos." Human Resource Management, 28(2), pp. 279-290.
- Thomas, D. A. & Alderfer, C. P. (1989). The influence of race on career dynamics: Theory and research on minority career experiences. In M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall, &

- B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), Handbook of Career Theory. (pp. 133-158). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, R. J. (1991). Beyond race and gender: Unleashing the power of your total work force by managing diversity. New York: American Management Association.
- Tichy, N. (1973). "An analysis of clique formation and structure in organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 18, pp. 194-208.
- Tougas, F. & Veilleux, T. (1989). Who likes affirmative action: Attitudinal processes among men and women. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective. (pp. 111-124). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Turner, J. C. (Ed.). (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), Advances in group processes: Theory and research. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- U.S. Congress (1993). The glass ceiling: hearing before the Committee on Business. House of Representatives, One Hundred Third Congress, first session.
- Wellman, D. T. (1993). Portraits of white racism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilbur, J. (1987). "Does mentoring breed success?" Training and Development Journal. (November), pp. 38-41.