

Psychological and Organizational Perspectives on Discrimination in the Workplace: Research, Theory, and Practice

May 19-21, 2000

A Scholarly Conference Sponsored by:

School of Social Sciences, Rice University
Department of Psychology, Rice University
Rice Center for Organizational Effectiveness Studies

Place:

Rice University
Rice Memorial Center
Farnsworth Pavilion
Houston, Texas

Schedule:

Friday	May 19	2:00	reception begins	Farnsworth
		5:00	opening remarks	Farnsworth
		5:30	presentation	Farnsworth
		6:45	roundtable discussions, refreshments	Baker College
		7:45	dinner	Baker College
Saturday	May 20	8:00	continental breakfast	Meyer Lounge
	8:45		opening remarks	Farnsworth
		9:00	presentations	Farnsworth
		12:00	lunch	Farnsworth
		1:15	presentations	Farnsworth
		5:00	roundtable discussions/ refreshments	Baker College
		6:30	dinner	Baker College
Sunday	May 21	8:00	continental breakfast	Meyer Lounge
		8:45	opening comments	Farnsworth
		9:00	presentations	Farnsworth
		10:15	envisioning the inclusive organization	Farnsworth
		11:45	wrap up	Farnsworth
		12:00	lunch	Farnsworth

Objectives:

The conference will bring together social and organizational psychologists to explore the current state of research, theory, and practice on the issue of discrimination in organizations. By encouraging dialogue among diverse scholars, the conference will set an agenda for integrating existing research and stimulating future research. The ultimate objective is to facilitate research that will contribute to not only the understanding of employment discrimination but also practical strategies for eliminating barriers to organizational diversity and justice. Four primary questions are posed for consideration in this conference.

Issue 1: How do we explain discrimination in organizations?

A variety of different models have been proposed to understand discrimination in the work place. The emphasis in both the social psychological and organizational literature has been at the level of the individual and has emphasized social cognitive processes (e.g., stereotyping). Other factors at the individual level include affective processes (e.g., mood of decision makers), individual differences (e.g., the prejudiced personality), and normative influence (e.g., perceived expectations to discriminate). Much less attention has been given to antecedents of discrimination at the level of the dyad and group although recent research on relational demography, social roles, and social identity promises new insights. The least attention has been given to discrimination at the level of the organization.

Issue 2: How should we conduct research on discrimination in organizations?

There appear to be four primary sources of data on discrimination in the workplace: laboratory experiments, field experiments, opinion surveys, and labor statistics. The two dominant methods in the psychological literature are laboratory experiments with college students and field studies involving self-report questionnaires. There are strong differences of opinion on the strengths and weaknesses of each approach. Some of the gatekeepers of the profession (e.g., reviewers, editors) have suggested that we need much less of certain types of research (e.g., self-report, cross-sectional surveys or laboratory experiments with college students). What can we learn about discrimination in the workplace from each of these two types of research?

Issue 3: What are the implications of research and theory for eliminating unfair discrimination in organizations?

A fourth issue that we will address is how to reduce unfair discrimination in organizations. The research and theory in social psychology, organizational behavior, and personnel psychology have influenced laws and regulatory guidelines, human resources practices, and organizational policy. The participants in this conference have designed and implemented HR programs in organizations and in other ways have consulted with organizations on diversity issues. They have served as expert witnesses in court cases for both plaintiffs and defendants. They also have shaped opinion in the courses they have taught, the

books and articles they have written, and their statements to the press. There is continuing debate, however, about the proper role of psychologists and organizational scientists. How do we increase the impact of the scholarly work on policy, practice, and public opinion while maintaining scientific rigor and integrity?

Posters

Posters will be on display in the Minor lounge of the Rice Student Center during the entire event. Specific times that the author will be available to discuss and answer questions will be announced later.

1. When "Good Soldiers" Discriminate: The Interaction of Organizational Commitment and The Advice to Maintain a Homogeneous Workforce

Lars-Eric, Petersen, Martin-Luther University, Halle/Germany
Joerg Dietz, Richard Ivey School of Business, London/Ontario

2. A Model of Factors Affecting the Treatment of Foreign Accented Employees in Organizations

Elizabeth Múniz (with other authors!), Central Florida University

3. Body Image and Disidentification Theory: Do Black Women Have the Answer?

Mikki Hebl and Jean Lin, Rice University

4. Multicultural Competence for Managers: Same Old Leadership Skills or Something New

Donna Chrobot-Mason, University of Colorado - Denver

5. Corporate Discrimination as an Impetus for Women's Entrepreneurship

Lauren Rauscher and Mary Ann Glynn, Emory University

6. On the Social Construction of 'Merit': Valorization and Devalorization of Wall Street Journal Coverage of Women Executives

Linda Krefting, Texas Tech University

7. Identities and Distinctions Among Stigmatized Groups

Annette J. Towler and David J. Schneider, Rice University

8. *Gender Discrimination in Collegiate Sports: The Score with Respect to Exposure Levels and Ticket Pricing*

Laura Mannix, Mikki Hebl, Traci Giuliano, Alan Swinkels, Anjali Wig, & Leslie Tsai., Rice University

9. *How Does the Perception of Discrimination Affect Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action?: It Depends on the Nature of the Program*

Leanne S. Son Hing, D. Ramona Bobocel, and Mark P. Zanna, Waterloo University

10. *Does Disclosure of Same-Sex Orientation Impact Perceptions of Service Quality?*

Carolyn Wiethoff, Ohio State University

11. *Parental Status and Discrimination: The Role of Sex-Stereotyped Jobs*

Jessica Bigazzi Foster and Mikki Hebl, Rice University

12. *Framing Diversity Training*

Beth Haley, Rice University

13. *Lending a Helping Hand: Gender-specific Outcomes for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors*

Julie Chen, New York University

14. *Weighing Health Care: An Examination of Physician's Reactions to the Average Weight, Overweight, and Obese Patient*

Jingping Xu, University of Texas-Houston, School of Public Health and Mikki Hebl, Rice University

15. *Sexual Orientation and Job Interview Decisions: Do Gender-Related Stereotypes Make a Difference?*

Brian Welle, NYU

16.. *Perceiver Threat During Interactions with Racially and Socio-economically Stigmatized Others*

Neneh Kowai-Bell, Wendy Berry Mendes, Brian Lickel, Sarah B. Hunter, and Jim Blascovich, University of California, Santa Barbara

17. Ethnic difference in attitudes toward Houston's affirmative action contracting program: Changes associated with the campaign surrounding Proposition A

Stephen L. Klineberg, Rice University, & David A. Kravitz, George Mason University

Psychological and Organizational Perspectives on Discrimination in the Workplace: Research, Theory, and Practice

Conference Outline

FRIDAY, MAY 19, 2000

2:00 - 5:00: Reception. Posters will be available for discussion for the duration of the conference. Refreshments and snacks.

5:00 - 5:30: Robert L. Dipboye, Rice University

“Formal Welcome and Opening Remarks”

5:30 - 6:30: Erika Hayes James, Emory University (with Wooten)

“Workplace Discrimination: Why Do Firms Continue to Make the Same Mistakes?”

Scholarly and anecdotal evidence suggests that despite many American’s increasing tolerance for diversity, many U.S. organization’s have yet to fully realize how to incorporate that diversity into the workplace in a manner that reduces or eliminates unfair discrimination. In this paper, we discuss the role that learning, or more specifically barriers to learning, plays in the perpetuation of workplace discrimination.

We discuss multiple ways in which learning can occur at the individual level of analysis (e.g., through observation, experience and/or reinforcement), followed by a discussion of barriers that may prevent managers within organizations from learning how to effectively manage diversity. For example, rarely do managers experience consequences, positive or negative, for their handling of diversity issues. Therefore, there may be no incentive for their behavior to change or adapt in accordance with an increasingly diverse workforce. Furthermore, previous efforts, if any existed at all, at managing diversity may prove to be insufficient as the organization’s demographic make-up changes, thereby opening the door for real or perceived unfair discrimination. A second individual learning barrier may result from ego defenses. The psychological literature suggests that people invoke ego defenses (e.g., denials and rationalizations) when confronted with information, expectations, and requests that challenge their personal beliefs, values, or capabilities. We argue that these defenses may serve as barriers to learning effective diversity management strategies because the issue of diversity and discrimination is perceived as sensitive and emotional, and as such

tends to be avoided in an effort to protect one's ego and to distance one's self from such a controversial topic.

Later in the paper we establish a connection between individual learning and learning that occurs at the organizational level of analysis, reasoning that the latter is a by-product of former because individuals, who are capable of learning and transferring knowledge, comprise the organizational context. Like individual learning, however, there are several barriers to learning that occur at the organizational level. First, organizations establish defensive routines that are associated with their denying discrimination exists or has the potential to exist in their organization. By denying this possibility, firms fail to take action that may result in their learning how to manage their environment differently; thus there is no opportunity for learning by experience. Second, firms have a tendency to engage in single loop learning, a process of simply detecting and correcting problems (e.g., discrimination), that often results in the maintenance of those present policies and procedures that gave way to the problems initially. Lastly, firms generally fail to establish an organizational memory for how they have responded to discrimination challenges in the past. They do not document decisions and procedures, for responding to discrimination, so when they are challenged in this way again they are forced to start from scratch. In this case, firms do not take advantage of a learning opportunity by documenting successful and unsuccessful diversity management strategies. We conclude the paper with suggestions for improving a firm's ability for learning how to manage diversity in a way that limits or eliminates discrimination.

6:45 - 7:45: **Roundtable Discussions**

Primary question: What can we learn from our research about the extent of the problem?

It seems likely that many of the participants in this conference would endorse the view that there are barriers to diversity in organizations in the form of discrimination against employees who are racial and ethnic minorities, female, gay or lesbian, disabled, unattractive, and elderly. However, a cursory review suggests that the pronouncements of researchers are far from consistent on this point. Some researchers have concluded that bias against these groups accounts for relatively little variance and that the problem is not severe. Others have drawn a very different conclusion from their data.

Participants in the roundtable will be given about one hour to consider three questions with regard to one of several groups.

- *How would you characterize the current status of this group in the workplace?
- *Does the research in psychology and organizational sciences allow us to accurately assess the problem of discrimination in the workplace?
- *What should be the focus of the research on discrimination? Identifying the problem? Generating theories and explanations for the problem? Solving the problem?

The leader (in bold) and the co-leaders of each group are:

Race:	Ferdman , Brief, Dovidio, Blascovich, James
Test bias:	Stone-Romero , Quiñones
Sexual orientation:	Ragins , Hebl
Disability:	Stone , Colella, DeNisi
Appearance:	Graves , Kleck, Dipboye
Gender:	Heilman , Eagly, Martell,
Age:	Greller , Riordan
Religious:	Wiethoff , Schneider
Sexual harassment:	Powell , Colbert

Participants are asked to join one of these group discussions.

7:45 - 9:30 Barbecue buffet dinner in Baker College Commons

SATURDAY, MAY 20, 2000

8:00 - 8:30: Continental breakfast, coffee, juice, milk

8:30 - 9:00: Mikki Hebl, Rice University

“Opening Comments/Summary of Roundtable Discussions”

9:00 - 9:40: Alice Eagly, Northwestern University

“Few Women at the Top: Is Prejudice A Cause?”

Many organizational scholars have proposed that a glass ceiling of discrimination and prejudice poses formidable barriers to women’s occupancy of top leadership positions. To address this issue, I propose a social-role theory of prejudice toward female leaders that follows from assumptions about how people typically define gender roles and leadership roles. In this theory, prejudice toward female leaders consists of (a) perceiving women as possessing less leadership ability than equivalent men and (b) evaluating behavior that fulfills the prescriptions of a leader role more negatively when it is enacted by a woman compared with a man. One consequence of these two forms of prejudice is that attitudes are more negative toward female than male leaders and potential leaders. Other consequences are that it is more difficult for women to

become leaders and to achieve success in leadership roles. Research evidence from several sources substantiates that these consequences occur, especially for leadership roles given more masculine definitions. Research also shows that prejudice against female leaders has decreased over time.

9:50 - 10:30: Jack Dovidio, Colgate University

“Race, Racial Disparities, and Racial Discrimination”

Despite laws and policies to combat discrimination and significant declines in expressed racial prejudice over time, substantial disparities between Whites and people of color continue to exist in employment and economic and physical well-being. This presentation considers the influence of one important factor, contemporary racial bias, on outcomes for Blacks and for interracial interactions. This contemporary bias is expressed more subtly than old-fashioned racism, is not necessarily conscious or intentional, and may be expressed more strongly toward Blacks aspiring higher status. Besides manifesting itself in terms of different evaluations and consequent outcomes, this bias can influence personal relations and group processes in ways that unintentionally but adversely affect group cohesiveness and productivity and therefore create barriers indirectly to the advancement of Blacks in employment settings. Empirical data illustrating these processes will be presented and theoretical and practical implications will be discussed.

10:40 - 11:20: Jim Blascovich, University of California, Santa Barbara

“Discrimination in the Workplace as a Function of Threat”

Our recent work on intergroup interactions involving members of stigmatized (e.g., racial minority) and non-stigmatized groups demonstrates experimentally that members of both groups are threatened during such intergroup interactions. Our physiological data demonstrate mutual threat even during cooperative social interactions when stigmatized and non-stigmatized individuals share clearly defined goals. Our biopsychosocial model suggests ways to reduce threat in such interactions thereby reducing threat-based discrimination in the workplace.

11:20 - 12:00 Christine Riordan, University of Georgia

“A Relational Demography Perspective on Discrimination “

Relational demography theory has generated considerable recent interest because of its importance for understanding the meaning and impact of demographic diversity within work organizations. In general, relational demography proposes that individuals compare their own demographic characteristics with the demographic composition of a social unit (e.g.,

work group) or with another individual (e.g., supervisor) to determine if they are similar or dissimilar. A high level of demographic similarity is proposed to positively affect individuals' work attitudes and behaviors. In this presentation, I will review the theoretical underpinnings of relational demography theory (social identity and self-categorization theories, similarity-attraction paradigm, the tokenism hypothesis) for their meaning for discrimination in the workplace. Findings from empirical studies will be used to highlight key concepts and relationships. Additionally, implications for organizational practice will be discussed. Finally, a future research agenda for understanding discrimination from a relational demography perspective will be presented.

12:00 - 1:15: Lunch

Box lunches. This also provides an opportunity to view posters, exchange information on research, etc.

1:15 - 1:45: Eugene F. Stone-Romero, University of Central Florida

“Testing and Unfair Discrimination in Organizations”

Personality assessment is quite common in organizations. More specifically, data from an American Management Association study (AMA, 1997) revealed that 19.3% of firms use personality instruments for employment decision-making purposes. This compares with the use of cognitive ability tests by 27.9% of firms. Moreover, given the reluctance of some organizations to use measures of cognitive ability for personnel decision-making purposes, the use of personality measures for such purposes may actually increase in future years. Unfortunately, the use of personality measures (e.g., measures of negative affectivity, need or achievement, need for power) such purposes raises serious concerns about their potential to unfairly discriminate against individuals who are members of various “minority” groups (e.g., women, Blacks, Hispanics, American Indians). Thus, my presentation will deal with both access- and treatment-related discrimination problems associated with the use of personality measures for personnel decision-making purposes.

1:50 - 2:20: Adrienne Colella and Angelo DeNisi, Texas A&M University

“Behavioral Evidence of Disability Discrimination in Personnel Decisions: Methodological and Conceptual Considerations”

We'll present a brief review of the behavior literature on disability discrimination- which shows that it is inconclusive. We will then discuss methodological and conceptual or theoretical reasons for this confusion. We'll then make suggestions about conducting systematic research in order to overcome these problems and thus learn more about the nature of discrimination against persons with disabilities in terms of personnel decisions.

2:30 - 3:00: Dianna Stone, University of Central Florida

“Cultural and Emotional Determinants of Unfair Discrimination Against People with Disabilities”

The proposed presentation will focus on the impact that cultural beliefs and ideologies have on the treatment of people with disabilities in organizations. In particular, cultural beliefs in competitiveness, rugged individualism, self-reliance, proportionality, and group superiority influence organizational practices. Furthermore, organizational practices and policies based on these ideologies (e.g., competitive reward systems, scarce resources, individualistic reward systems) have a profound effect on the treatment of people with disabilities (e.g., inclusion/exclusion in work groups, job suitability rating, job assignments, pay increases, training and mentoring opportunities). Similarly, cultural factors influence individuals' emotional responses to people with disabilities (e.g., resentment or jealousy because accommodation violates equity norms) and affect the extent to which individuals with disabilities are fully included in work organizations.

3:00 - 3:30: Break

3:30 - 4:00: Madeline Heilman, New York University

“Preferential Selection: Benefit or Burden?”

This presentation will review our research demonstrating that recipients of gender-based preferential selection often are stigmatized, and that the affirmative action label seems to be associated with perceptions of incompetence. I also will present research that: 1) investigates the conditions regulating when incompetence perceptions result from preferential selection policies; and 2) examines the effects of a woman knowing that another believes her to have been preferentially selected on both her attitudes and work behavior. Lastly, I will discuss new work that extends the research on the stigmatizing consequences of preferential selection to the “diversity” label, demonstrating that female and minority group members are likely to be viewed as incompetent when work groups are believed to have been assembled to ensure diversity of composition. Consideration will be given to the implications of our findings for solutions to combating discrimination in organizations.

4:00 - 4:30 Art Brief, Tulane University

"Prejudice Matters: Understanding the Job Reactions of Whites to Affirmative Action Programs Targeted to Blacks"
(with Erika James, Joerg Dietz, & Robin Cohen). □

We examined, in two studies, the effects of EEO/AA policies on Whites' job-related attitudes. □First, in an experiment, White prospective job

recruits, as expected, rated a potential employer whose EEO/AA policies were framed as targeted to benefit Blacks as less attractive than a potential employer whose EEO/AA policies were framed more generally. □ Second, the results of a field study showed that prejudice against Blacks moderated the relationship between Whites' perceptions that their organization's EEO/AA policies were targeted to benefit Blacks and their satisfaction with promotion opportunities. □ Specifically, among prejudiced Whites, this relationship was negative and considerable in size); whereas, among nonprejudiced Whites, it was negligible). □ The implications of our findings for the study of prejudice in organizations are discussed.

4:40 - 5:10: Belle Ragins, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
(with John M. Cornwell, Loyola University)

"Heterosexism in the workplace: Do race and gender matter?"

We examined the influence of race and gender on reports of sexual orientation discrimination and the decision to disclose sexual orientation at work. Our national sample was comprised of 534 gay and lesbian employees, 162 of whom were people of color. Although respondents' race and gender did not significantly influence their perceptions of heterosexism in the workplace or their decision to disclose their sexual identity at work, both disclosure and perceived discrimination were influenced by the demographic composition of the work team and supervisor. In support of predictions based on relational demography theory, respondents who had gay supervisors and gay coworkers were more likely to disclose their sexual orientation and reported less discrimination at work than respondents who worked with heterosexual supervisors and coworkers. In addition, gay employees who worked with supervisors and coworkers of the same race were more likely to disclose their sexual orientation at work than gay employees who worked with individuals of a different race. While gay employees were more likely to disclose their sexual orientation when working with supervisors and coworkers who shared their sexual orientation and race, working with same-gender groups or supervisors had no effect on disclosure. These findings suggest that gender similarity predictions grounded in relational demography theory may have limited applicability to gay and lesbian employees.

5:15 - 6:45: Roundtable discussions

1. *Discrimination, Diversity and Differential Returns on Human Capital Investments* (Martin Greller and Angelo DeNisi)

"Human capital" is a concept from economics which usually takes the perspective of the nation or employer. But, it raises question about how people acquire human capital, the types they choose to acquire, the way they communicate it, and how it is valued. These have the potential to

create interesting hypotheses for areas of research outside of economics. Some questions to start:

- a. Is the same human capital valued differently for members of different groups?
- b. What influence the way in which people from different groups acquire their human capital?
- c. Is it appropriate to look at these decisions are wholly individual or are social structures important?

3. *Sound bites and drive-by-debates: The oversimplification of diversity issues*
(Linda Krefting)

Media coverage of diversity research often reduces complex issues to sound bites like "preferences," "reflecting the diversity of customers" or "looking like America."

- a. Has media coverage established the importance of diversity or increased contentiousness?
- b. Has oversimplification encouraged employer actions that are at odds with prevailing law (e.g., Piscataway's race-based lay-off decision)?
- c. How should we bring attention to our research in a way that has impact but does not distort?

4. *Discrimination as a Health Issue* (Ben Amick)

- a. What types of data are required to demonstrate a relationship between discrimination and health?
- b. What are the pathways through which workplace discrimination affects physical and mental health?
- c. Can the process of resolving a discrimination claim also be illness provoking?

6. *Research on Affirmative Action: Shaping the "River"* (Audrey Murrell)

- a. What are the key areas of research on affirmative action that have been under-researched or ignored?
- b. How do we compare and contrast the work on affirmative action and diversity? What are the similarities and differences and can/should this work be integrated in some manner?
- c. How can affirmative action programs be designed and implemented to increase acceptance on the part of our society?
- d. What are the issues involved in the use of affirmative action in organizations that need to be examined?

6. *Issues related to multiple group memberships* (Bernardo Ferdman, David Schneider, Belle Ragins)

Organizational participants belong to multiple groups. Yet, the research on discrimination has focused almost exclusively on biases against single group membership.

- a. What research needs to be done on multiple group membership (e.g., gender and race and sexual orientation).

- b. What are the implications of theories of categorization for multiple group membership?
8. *The role of discrimination research in expert testimony* (Ramona Paetzold, Judith Colbert)
- a. What new opportunities are there for psychologists to serve as expert witnesses in discrimination cases? What specializations are helpful?
 - b. How does the Daubert standard for the admissibility of expert scientific testimony (requiring objective evidence that an expert's assertion relies on the scientific method and the testimony is based on scientifically valid principles) affect expert testimony by psychologists?

8. *Discrimination against Parents and the Institution of Family-Friendly Policies in the Workplace* (Mikki Hebl and Jessica Foster)

- a. To what extent is gender discrimination in the workplace now manifested through parental discrimination?
- b. What research methods and findings accompany research focused on working mothers who are expecting or who already have children?
- c. How do fathers face negative repercussions in the workplace?
- d. What can organizations do to assist families?
- e. How are family-friendly practices beneficial to the individual and to the organization?

9. *Ways of Conducting Research on Employment Discrimination: Some Better?* (Rich Martell and Ramona Bobocel)

- To what extent do our research methods advance or constrain the understanding of stereotyping and discrimination?
- a. How should effect size measures be interpreted in discrimination research? What's big and what's small? What's of statistical importance and what's of practical importance?
 - b. What should be the dependent variables of choice? How might dependent variables differ in terms of their organizational relevance and/or sensitivity to discrimination effects?
 - c. How can the "cost" of discrimination to individuals, organizations and society be measured? What problems are involved in measuring cost? Might other disciplines (e.g., economics) be useful?
 - d. Are there innovative research methods that should be considered in future research?
 - e. What is the role of individual differences in better understanding discrimination?
 - f. How alive is the generalizability issue in discrimination research, especially with respect to subject source and study context? Are some research participants more appropriate than others? Why? To what extent might subject source influence our research findings and our impact on the field and on organizations? How can we capture the complexities of the organizational context in our research? Does it make sense to try? How might context influence the phenomena we are interested in understanding?

A summary of the roundtable discussions will be provided Sunday morning by Mickey Quiñones.

6:45 - 8:30: Mexican food buffet (Baker College Commons)

SUNDAY MAY 21, 2000

8:00 - 8:30: Continental Breakfast. Coffee, milk, and juice

8:30 - 9:00: Mickey Quiñones, Rice University

“Opening Comments/Summary of Roundtable Discussions”

9:00 - 9:30: Jan Cleveland, Pennsylvania State University

“What is Success? Who Defines it?: Diverse Perspectives on the Criterion Problem”

Work psychologists have a long standing interest in the criterion problem and how to measure success on the job. However, their approach to the problem has been narrow and has reinforced the status quo in terms of what is defined as success or successful behaviors in organizations. It is argued in this presentation that how success is defined and by whom is one less 'visible' reason why discrimination continues to exist in the workplace. Specifically, I will argue that (1) success is a much broader and more encompassing concept, (2) who defines success may receive undue advantage over those who do not have a voice in how success is defined and (3) the criterion problem is one avenue of diversity research that may increase our understanding and handling of workplace discrimination.

9:30 - 10:10: Laura Graves, Clark University, & Gary Powell, University of Connecticut

“Explanations for Discrimination in the Workplace: How Well do They Apply Across Target Groups?”

We will examine the applicability of several well-known explanations for discrimination (e.g., stereotyping, social identification, status characteristics theory, similarity-attraction paradigm) to the experiences of members of different target groups (e.g., women, people of color, gays and lesbians, people with disabilities, the obese) in organizations. We will present a preliminary model that links target groups, explanations for discrimination, contextual factors, and organizational phenomena (e.g., selection, promotion, appraisal, mentoring).

10:15 - 11:45: Bernardo Ferdman, California School of Professional Psychology

“Dialogue for Envisioning the Inclusive Work place”

Is the goal simply to reduce or eliminate workplace discrimination? Or do we want something more? In this interactive session, conference participants will join together in a dialogue to describe and imagine, and perhaps jointly construct, our ideal inclusive workplace. We will address questions such as: 1) what should be the goal(s) of workplace anti-discrimination and/or diversity initiatives?; 2) what does inclusion look like for individuals and groups?; and 3) what individual, interpersonal, group, intergroup, and organizational factors contribute to inclusion? The session will provide an opportunity to reflect on the themes of the conference and their implications for action.

11:45-12:00: Robert L. Dipboye, Rice University

“Concluding Remarks”

Box lunch