Industrial and Organizational Psychology
PERSPECTIVES ON SCIENCE AND PRACTICE

Backlash! What It Is, Where It Comes From, and How We Can Fix It

MINDY E. BERGMAN AND PHIA SALTER
Texas A&M University

Throughout Lindsey, King, Dunleavy, McCausland, and Jones's (2013) review of discrimination–reduction strategies, a concern about backlash appears. Lindsey et al. suggest that their recommended strategies for discrimination reduction might be best paired with practices that will attenuate backlash among majority group organizational members. Backlash occurs when people react negatively to policies or decisions that they believe caused others

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mindy E. Bergman.
E-mail: mindybergman@tamu.edu
Address: Texas A&M University, 4235 TAMU, College Station, TX 77845

https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to receive undeserved outcomes (Crosby & Gonzalez-Intal, 1984; Kidder et al., 2004). Although we certainly agree with the authors that discrimination-reduction strategies should be enacted in ways that are fair and legal, we are critical of their concern with backlash. We believe that this concern helps uphold the current system (which, by Lindsey et al.'s account, is problematic) and perpetuates the idea that diversity and antidiscrimination efforts are somehow a zero-sum game where the tradeoff is job loss for the majority. In this commentary, we discuss possible root causes of and remedies for backlash as well as problems with being concerned about backlash. We use some examples from Lindsey et al. to amplify this discussion.

Why Does Backlash Occur?

We imagine that backlash occurs for a variety of reasons. The following is not meant to be an exhaustive list, but an illustrative set of concerns that could arise among employees.

''Reverse discrimination'' concerns. Some backlash might occur because some majority individuals could mistakenly believe that discrimination-reduction strategies will unfairly privilege minority groups (i.e., so-called reverse discrimination) rather than remedy long-standing errors that resulted in inequitable organizational decisions that negatively impacted minority group members more frequently than they negatively impacted majority group members.[1] Such individuals' primary concern would be that the locus of unfairness is changing rather than unfairness ending.

There is evidence that many majority group members perceive a zero-sum framework, such that any gains by minority group members must be met with equivalent losses by majority group members (Eibach & Keegan, 2006; Norton & Sommers, 2011)—a perception that does not seem to be shared by most minority group members (Norton & Sommers, 2011). Along these lines, Lindsey et al. note that ''we need to know more about how to develop unbiased performance management systems that do not also result in 'reverse discrimination' by instead favoring minorities'' (p. 411). This seems to state that (a) all performance management systems are biased and (b) bias that favors minorities is somehow worse than bias that favors members of the majority group. Regarding the first issue, there is ample evidence that nearly all performance measures are biased in some way, whether through deficiency relative to the performance domain, contamination relative to the performance domain, opportunity biases, ratings effects, and the like (DeNisi & Sonesh, 2011). However, the goal of performance appraisal and other performance management systems is to accurately manage and reward performance; the goal of performance appraisal and performance management researchers is to reduce (and preferably eliminate) biases in the systems. We completely agree with Lindsey et al. that continued research on eliminating bias in performance appraisal and management processes is absolutely necessary.

The second part, that bias that favors minorities is somehow worse than bias that favors majority members, is where our concerns lie. First, why must changes that reduce preferential treatment for one group result in *preferential* treatment for a different group? If an unbiased performance measurement system—that is, perfect performance measurement—were to be developed, then it would not be preferential treatment for any group. Even though the outcomes of a perfect system and current systems would differ, this would not be because of preferential treatment but because bias had been removed. Second, why is bias that favors the minority group worse than bias that favors the majority group? Although we agree that bias should be reduced regardless of who is favored or

1. Note that we are not referring to explicit and overt preferences to redress historical trends in discrimination (e.g., affirmative action plans) but rather changes in policies and procedures that result in changes in selection ratios today, regardless of historical trends.

https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

disfavored by the system, it is unclear why bias in favor of the minority is any more problematic than bias favoring the majority. Bias results in less-than-optimal measurement and decision making, regardless of who the bias favors.

This is not to suggest that ''reverse discrimination'' (for lack of a better term) never occurs. The law clearly prohibits job decisions predicated on class memberships (e.g., race, sex, national origin, religion) regardless of which group (e.g., Caucasian, African American, Hispanic/Latino[a], Asian American, Pacific Islander, Native American) a person identifies with (cf. *McDonald v. Santa Fe Trail Co.*, 1976). Our point, however, is that people seem much more concerned about systems that are biased to favor minorities over the majority *in theory*; this strikes us as especially noteworthy considering that the rate at which ''reverse discrimination'' occurs appears to be lower than the rate at which discrimination against the minority occurs *in reality* (www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/index.cfm; Evans, 2004). Further, people seem to assume that changes to systems that presently favor the majority must consequently unfairly favor the minority; the underlying assumption is that the status quo must be fair, and therefore any changes to the status quo must be unfair (Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004).

Lindsey et al.'s statement that we need to guard against creating bias toward a different group when instituting policy changes, while true, also seems to assume that modifying the current bias in employment practices would not also benefit majority members. Such statements legitimize the zero-sum mentality as well as concerns about reverse discrimination as the likely outcome of systemic changes. The fact is, whenever less-than-perfect measurement occurs, members from all groups are mismeasured; if mismeasurement is systematic relative to group membership, then (a) members of some groups are mismeasured at a greater rate or with greater error than others and/or (b) some groups are mismeasured in one direction (i.e., positive biases) and other groups in the other direction (i.e., negative biases). However, there are bound to be some members of *any* group that receive positively biased scores, negatively biased scores, and even accurate scores. In summary, individuals from all groups and the system as a whole would benefit from better measurement, even though particular individuals will experience less positive outcomes that they receive under the current, flawed system.

The ''diversity–excellence dilemma.'' Backlash could also occur because individuals might mistakenly believe that diversity and excellence are opposing forces in organizations. We suspect many readers, like ourselves, have heard statements such as this from colleagues: ''If we try to find a candidate who diversifies our group, we probably won't get a top candidate.'' That is, there is a belief that achieving diversity goals will cause the organization to fall short in its quest for excellence (Valian, 1999).

The ''diversity–validity dilemma'' (Ployhart & Holtz, 2008; Pyburn, Ployhart, & Kravitz, 2008) in the industrial–organizational (I–O) literature fits into this worldview. As stated by Pyburn et al. (2008):

> Due to racioethnic and sex subgroup differences on predictor scores in many selection procedures, it is difficult for organizations to simultaneously maximize the validity of their selection procedures and hire a diverse workforce (p. 143).

This statement was further amplified by Ployhart and Holtz (2008), who wrote that the diversity–validity dilemma is one ''requiring organizations to choose between diversity and optimal prediction'' (p. 154). We recognize that there are significant differences between racioethnic groups or sexes on a variety of tests that are used in selection. We also recognize that individual performance is an essential component

https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to organizational performance (Brewer & Selden, 2000; Combs, Liu, Hall, & Ketchen, 2006; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).

Our concern is with the narrow focus on individual performance to the detriment of attending to organizational performance and how diversity plays a role in organizational performance. For example, Lindsey et al. write, ''cognitive ability tests are among the best predictors of workplace success'' (p. 396). But this ''workplace success'' is *individual* performance; that is, how individuals perform is the focus of many I–O psychologists. The narrow focus on individual performance (never mind the possible biased group differences in performance ratings; Kraiger & Ford, 1985) in the validity–diversity dilemma, with little attention to group or organizational performance, means that the broader contributions to organizational excellence (beyond individual performance) that are brought about by diverse personnel with diverse experiences and worldviews are not considered as part of the criterion. That is, we argue that the validity–diversity dilemma and the diversity–excellence tradeoff occur in large part because of the narrow focus on individual-level criteria.

We suspect that organizations and their stakeholders are concerned about individual success as a means to organizational success rather than as an ends unto itself. Although the research on diversity and organizational performance has mixed results (see Jayne & Dipboye, 2004, for a brief review), the number of studies to date has been sparse, generally focused on immediate or intermediate financial indicators, utilizing small samples, and focusing on only one or two factors of diversity at a time (e.g., racioethnic groups, sex) with little attention to the processes internal (e.g., diversity climate) or external (e.g., demographics of labor and customer markets) to the organization. Thus, further examining diversity in relation to organizational performance—and discussing the nature of organizational performance beyond financial indicators (e.g., reputation, lack of law suits, customer loyalty)—might be a useful exercise.

So turning back to the initial issue—where is the backlash coming from?—one response might be a misguided notion that diversity and excellence must be at odds. The framing of such a discussion usually suggests that an organization can have diversity or excellence, when in fact an organization that uses careful selection procedures, appropriate criteria, strong recruiting tactics, good socialization and mentoring practices, and an eye on long-range successes rather than short-term indicators of performance, can have diversity and excellence.

Prejudice As our final example of where backlash might arise, we consider genuine prejudice as a cause. Prejudice is a negative attitude toward a social group or a person perceived to be a member of that group (Fiske, 1998). Undoubtedly, there are some people who dislike people who are different from themselves and wish to separate themselves from those different others. Research demonstrates that prejudice predicts opposition to policy initiatives aimed at reducing social inequality (Bobocel, Son Hing, Davey, Stanley, & Zanna, 1998; Feldman & Huddy, 2005; Harrison, Kravitz, Mayer, Leslie, & Lev-Arey, 2006; Hayes-James, Brief, Dietz, & Cohen, 2001). As such, some backlash likely constitutes an expression of prejudice in which discrimination-reduction strategies merely provide a justification for expressing previously held negative attitudes or beliefs (e.g., Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). If this is the case, then altering discrimination-reduction strategies to avoid backlash will not be an especially efficient strategy because any attempts to reduce discrimination would provoke a prejudiced response.

Unfortunately, even if discriminations were effectively eliminated in organizations and in other high-stakes decisions (e.g., education), prejudice will likely still exist. In organizations, even in the absence of discrimination-reduction policies, a variety of alternative justification processes would

https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

still be utilized among these prejudiced individuals to express their discontent with the changing demographics within an organization. For prejudiced individuals, the mere presence of others defying societal stereotypes (e.g., women in leadership positions) can be enough to induce them to engage in social and economic sanctions (Rudman & Phelan, 2008).

Thus, it would be unfortunate if discrimination eradication policies were rendered impotent in order to placate prejudicial backlash concerns. Backlash that arises from prejudice cannot be placated, as it is merely one form of the various prejudiced expressions that arise from bigoted people. Although backlash toward specific policies would abate if the policies were ended, the underlying prejudices would still remain.

Remedies

In this section, we briefly explore some remedies to the problems outlined above, some of which might also further address strategies to reduce discrimination.

Include diversity appreciation values in the selection paradigm. Our selection paradigms traditionally focus on job-relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities, although there has been an increased interest in selecting for organizational values and other orientations that are job or organization relevant (Ployhart & Holtz, 2008; Schmitt, Clause, & Pulakos, 1996; Schneider, 1987). As Lindsey et al. noted, broadening the range of knowledge, skills, and abilities included in the selection paradigm might be particularly useful. However, we believe that it could be useful in reducing discrimination itself as well as backlash. It might be time to consider appreciation for diversity and working with people unlike oneself as an important selection criterion. It seems like the assumption is that people tend to not want to work with people who are different from them. Undoubtedly, basic, automatic, cognitive processes tend to lump ''other'' and ''bad'' together. But these automatic processes can be overridden. When was the last time we entertained the idea that there may be plenty of people of all sorts of backgrounds, experience, and upbringing who would be skilled at—or would even *like*—working in a diverse work environment (Ang et al., 2007; Caliguiri & Tarique, 2009; Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000). Perhaps companies would benefit from attracting them.

Organizational communication. As described above, better organizational communication is necessary to explain the fairly complex issues associated with bias, measurement, and organizational decisions. As a field, I–O psychologists might take for granted that our walking knowledge is obvious to people with a small amount of explanation. We might be forgetting that advanced degrees in our field and closely related fields take 2 years (master's) or 5 plus (PhD), and still many of us struggle with some of these issues. Investing in greater communication and education around changes in policy and how they reduce inequities across the board could reduce backlash.

However, as noted above, majority group members perceive a zero-sum game regarding organizational resources, whereby any gains by minority group members must result in losses by majority group members. Thus, even with top-notch organizational communication regarding policy changes that are designed to redress inequities in organizational decisions, the recipients of those messages might not be able (or willing) to hear those messages because of their ingrained perceptions that any gains by others must be offset by losses.

Rethinking diversity and inclusion programs. It is important to recognize that when organizations promote ''diversity'' and ''inclusion,'' it is no secret who is ''diverse'' and who needs to be included. For example, Lindsey et al. wrote, ''By striving for inclusion we mean striving to create a workplace environment where

https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

underrepresented groups feel they are welcome and respected on the job'' (p. 402). Although the term *diversity* is meant to reflect the differences within the whole group (Harrison & Klein, 2007), colloquially it means bringing people into the organization who have not typically been there (Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008; Unzueta & Binning, 2010). Lindsey et al. listed several routes to inclusion in their paper; we focus on these two of these routes in the following.

Benefits. One route to inclusion is implementing provisions to facilitate the full participation and inclusion of marginalized groups. Lindsey et al. provide an excellent example: a workplace day care center, which would appeal to working parents. Lindsey et al. suggest that one way to reduce backlash is to frame such benefits as something that all employees can take part in. Lindsey et al. note that although any specific benefit (e.g., day care center) might not be useful to a particular member of the organization, it is likely that as many of these programs are implemented nonminority workers are likely to find use of some of them as well and that the overall quality of working life should improve either primarily (through use of the benefit) or secondarily (because coworkers are more likely to be present and productive because of the benefit). Lindsey et al. propose, ''Framing the benefits in this manner will hopefully avoid (a) potential resentment from other employees in the workplace as well as (b) feelings of guilt on the part of the marginalized group members for utilizing these benefits to their advantage (see Heilman & Haynes, 2006)'' (p. 405).

Although we agree with their main point, we disagree with Lindsey et al.'s reasoning. Instead of framing these improvements as ''accommodations'' for ''them'' (because they are weird and need special treatment), companies should frame such benefits as improvements to work–life. *Period*. Although a benefit program might be developed with a particular group of people in mind, there may be many others who would also use it. For example, more accessible buildings (e.g., elevators, ramps, wide hallways, and doorways) not only improve work–life quality of employees and customers who use wheelchairs but also for other workers who have to move heavy objects around the facility. Another example of this kind of benefit is a plus-one health care plan, which could be instituted to allow workers with same-sex partners in states in which there is not yet marriage equality to include their partners in their health plans; such plus-one plans could also be used to cover a parent, niece, or nephew.

Training. Diversity and inclusion training should also be framed with care. Diversity training form and content varies widely (Bezrukova, Jehn, & Spell, 2012), but some diversity training—especially ''inclusion'' training—is designed to teach people how to make ''different others'' feel welcome, reinforcing the ''otherness'' of the people who need to be ''included.'' Instead of focusing on these diverse people as being different, such training should instead focus on diverse people being *people* (Holladay & Quiñones, 2008). Workplaces as a whole would benefit from more attention to civility and respectful interaction (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001; Hershcovis et al., 2007).

Let's fire all the bigots—or better yet, never hire them. We propose that one of the simplest ways to end discrimination is to remove any person from organizations who is likely to engage in it. Although some backlash might arise because well-intentioned, fair-minded people just do not understand bias, measurement, and statistics, we contend—as described above—that a substantial amount of backlash arises because of more nefarious reasons such as prejudice. Assuming that the backlash that arises from misunderstanding that can be remedied with better education and communication, should we even care about the remainder of backlash? As we described above, backlash can arise from a number of negative attitudes, including a belief that

https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

groups are in zero-sum competition for any resources in an organization and that the current distribution is the correct one, a false dilemma between organizational excellence and organizational diversity, and prejudice. At the base of all of these attitudes is the notion that some people are better than other people because of the groups they are from. Is this an attitude that an organization should want to maintain or foster? That is, maybe the one good thing about backlash is the ability for it to identify people we do not want in our organizations.

Stop caring about backlash. As a final issue, we need to seriously consider why we even care about backlash. Why do we want to protect people who do not want to be fair? Assuming that backlash due to misunderstanding can be parsed out from other backlash and rectified, do we really want to protect the backlash that arises for other reasons? Being concerned about backlash legitimizes the prejudices that people hold and protects the wrong groups in the organization.

As a case in point, consider the recently ended Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT) policy in the U.S. military, in which lesbians and gays were permitted to serve so long as they were not open about their sexuality. Concern about backlash to discrimination-reduction practices strikes us as the same kind of rhetoric that was used to uphold DADT for so many years. Basically, the arguments in favor of DADT stated that the presence of openly gay and lesbian service members in the military would decrease morale of the soldiers and that there might be a mass exodus. To be clear, the people whose morale would decrease and subsequently exit the organization would not be the gay and lesbian service members (who, presumably, would be more motivated and satisfied when not required to hide an essential part of their identities) but everyone else. In this case, and for a long time, the potential hurt feelings of the majority were more important than the lived realities of minorities. When this is a primary concern, efforts to reduce and eventually eliminate discrimination can never be fully realized.

Summary

Although we agree with Lindsey et al.'s discussion of the various discrimination elimination strategies in which organizations can engage, we disagree that we should be so concerned about backlash. We argued that being overly concerned about backlash makes the concerns of the majority group outweigh the concerns of the minority groups. We also provided several suggestions about how backlash can be managed, including better communication about policy changes, reframing the organizational rhetoric about diversity and inclusion, and removing people from the organization who exhibit backlash. We hope that these ideas and suggestions not only encourage practitioners to engage in discrimination-reduction techniques despite fears or experiences of backlashes but also encourage academics to critically review their own writing and thinking about bias and discrimination.

References

Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, *3*, 335–371.

Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K. A., & Spell, C. S. (2012). Reviewing diversity training: Where we have been and where we should go. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *11*, 207–227.

Bobocel, D. R., Son Hing, L. S., Davey, L. M., Stanley, D. J., & Zanna, M. P. (1998). Justice-based opposition to social policies: Is it genuine? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*, 653–669.

Brewer, G. A., & Selden, S. C. (2000). Why elephants gallop: Assessing and predicting organizational performance in federal agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *10*, 685–711.

Caliguiri, P., & Tarique, I. (2009). Developing managerial and organizational cultural agility. In C. Cooper, & R. Burke (Eds.), *The peak performing organization*. (pp. 234–251) New York, NY: Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Combs, J., Liu, Y., Hall, A., & Ketchen, D. (2006). How much do high-performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology*, *59*, 501–528.

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *6*, 64–80.

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

Crosby, F., & Gonzalez-Intal, A. M. (1984). Relative deprivation and equity theories. In *The sense of injustice* (pp. 141–166). US: Springer.

DeNisi, A. S., & Sonesh, S. (2011). The appraisal and management of performance at work. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Volume 2: Selecting and development members for the organization* (pp. 255–279). Washington, DC: APA.

Eibach, R. P., & Keegan, T. (2006). Free at last? Social dominance, loss aversion, and White and Black Americans' differing assessments of progress towards racial equality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 453–467.

Evans, W. D. (2004). Reverse discrimination claims—Growing like kudzu. *The Maryland Bar Journal*, *37*, 48–51.

Feldman, S., & Huddy, L. (2005). Racial resentment and White opposition to race-conscious programs: Principles or prejudice? *American Journal of Political Science*, *49*, 168–183.

Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology. Vols. 1 and 2* (4th ed., pp. 357–411). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 1199–1228.

Harrison, D. A., Kravitz, D. A., Mayer, D. M., Leslie, L. M., & Lev-Arey, D. (2006). Understanding attitudes toward affirmative action programs in employment: Summary and meta-analysis of 35 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 1013–1036.

Hayes-James, E., Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., & Cohen, R. R. (2001). Prejudice matters: Understanding reactions of Whites to affirmative action programs targeted to benefit Blacks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 1120–1128.

Heilman, M. E. & Haynes, M. C. (2006). Affirmative action: Unintended adverse effects. In M. F. Karsten (Ed.), *Gender, Race, and Ethnicity in the Workplace* (Vol 2; p. 1–24). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Co.

Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupre', K. E., Inness, M., ... Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 228–238.

Holladay, C. L., & Quiñones, M. A. (2008). The influence of training focus and trainer characteristics on diversity training effectiveness. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *7*, 343–354.

Jayne, M. E. A., & Dipboye, R. (2004). Leveraging diversity to improve business performance: Research findings and recommendations for organizations. *Human Resource Management*, *43*, 409–424.

Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, *25*, 881–919.

Kraiger, K., & Ford, J. K. (1985). A meta-analysis of ratee race effects in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *70*, 56–65.

Kidder, D. L., Lankau, M. J., Chrobot-Mason, D., Mollica, K. A., & Friedman, R. A. (2004). Backlash toward diversity initiatives: Examining the impact of diversity program justification, personal and group outcomes. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *15*(1), 77–102.

Lindsey, A., King, E., McCausland, T., Jones, K., & Dunleavy, E. (2013). What we know and don't: Eradicating employment discrimination 50 years after the Civil Rights Act. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, *6*(4), 391–413.

McDonald v. Santa Fe Trail Transportation Co. (1976). 427 U.S. 273, 96 S.Ct. 2574.

Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2011). Whites see racism as a zero-sum game that they are now losing. *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, *6*, 215–218.

Ployhart, R. E., & Holtz, B. C. (2008). The diversity–validity dilemma: Strategies for reducing racioethnic and sex subgroup differences and adverse impact in selection. *Personnel Psychology*, *61*, 153–172. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00109.x

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance*, *10*, 133–151.

Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 612–624.

Pyburn, K. M., Jr., Ployhart, R. E., & Kravitz, D. A. (2008). The diversity–validity dilemma: Overview and legal context. *Personnel Psychology*, *61*, 143–151. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00108.x

Rudman, L. A., & Phelan, J. E. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes in organizations. In A. P. Brief & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior, 28*, (pp. 61–79). New York, NY: Elsevier.

Schmitt, N., Clause, C. S., & Pulakos, E. D. (1996). Subgroup differences associated with different measures of some common job-relevant constructs. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. *11*, pp. 115–139). New York, NY: Wiley.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, *40*, 437–454.

Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the benefits of diversity: All-inclusive multiculturalism and positive organizational

https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *44*, 116–133.

Unzueta, M. M., & Binning, K. R. (2010). Which racial groups are associated with diversity? *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *16*, 443–446.

Valian, V. (1999). *Why so slow? The advancement of women*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12082 Published online by Cambridge University Press