



The Color and Culture of Gender in Organizations

Attending to Race and Ethnicity

Bernardo M. Ferdman

Growing numbers of theorists and researchers (e.g., Bell, Denton, & Nkomo, 1993; Cox & Nkomo, 1990; Holvino, 1994; St. Jean & Feagin, 1997) have called for increased attention to race and ethnicity as key variables in the study of gender in organizations, pointing out the limitations of a color- and culture-blind approach. Others seek more explicit consideration of gender when the focus is race or ethnicity. Hurtado (1997), for example, decries the separation of ethnic and gender studies and points out that research on group differences has not sufficiently addressed individuals' multiple group identifications and their relationships to psychological outcomes.

The same can be said with respect to most theory and research on gender in organizations. Much of this literature ignores or makes only cursory

AUTHOR'S NOTE: I am grateful to Cláudio Vaz Torres, Arianne Weiner, Lydia Hang-I Leong, and Kasey Corbett, who provided valuable and extensive assistance in the preparation of this chapter by locating, selecting, organizing, abstracting, and joining in conversations about many of the articles, books, and chapters reviewed here. The first two were especially supportive in developing this project. Raquel Hicks, Schuyler Gordon, Stella Nkomo, and Gary Powell provided useful and thoughtful comments on an earlier draft.

mention of race, ethnicity, and culture. One reviewer (Ely, 1991) found that in four major journals over a five-year period in the late 1980s only 9 of 48 studies focusing on gender and organizational behavior addressed issues of race. Three of these considered both race and gender in the analyses, and just one looked at their interaction. In contrast, the interconnections of gender, race, ethnicity, and culture have been increasingly explored by many scholars in the broader social science literature (e.g., Collins, 1998; Weber, 1998). This is only a more recent and less developed trend in work on gender in organizations. Bell et al. (1993) point out that much of the theory and research on women in management typically has focused on the experiences of White women and has overlooked the perspectives, roles, and experiences of women of color. Work focusing more broadly on gender differences or similarities also has not attended to race, ethnicity, and culture and so has been implicitly centered on dominant group perspectives and experiences.

Although some of the literature on gender in organizations occasionally mentions racial and ethnic dimensions of identity, this is typically done in separate and usually short subsections, or in asides or end remarks reminding readers to consider these issues in the future. This approach reinforces the notion of gender as an identity dimension quite distinct from race and ethnicity. Other work, especially that focusing on racial and ethnic variables, often considers each dimension independently, such that when gender is discussed, race or ethnicity is ignored, and when race or ethnicity is discussed, gender is neglected. For example, many researchers report the demographic composition of their samples in terms of gender and race, without reporting the two-way frequencies. Others, in focusing on ethnicity or race, control statistically for gender, thus precluding consideration of interactions. In one such study (Sánchez & Brock, 1996), focusing on perceived discrimination among *Latínos/as*, the authors viewed the likelihood that women would perceive gender discrimination as a potential confound. Rather than exploring the possibility that gender and ethnicity could interact or combine in perceptions of discrimination, the authors assumed that the two identities could be separated and so controlled for gender as the first step in hierarchical regression analyses. This approach, however, made it impossible to see if their assumption was valid, because they did not test for or even discuss the possibility of interactions.

We are often reminded, however, that individuals cannot separate gender from race, ethnicity, or culture. As Collins (1998) remarks,

I am frequently asked, "Which has been most oppressive to you, your status as a Black person or your status as a woman?" What I am really being asked to do is divide myself into little boxes and rank my various statuses. If I experience oppression as a both/and phenomenon, why should I analyze it any differently? (p. 481)

Every person has both gender and ethnic or racial identities, which together with a range of other group memberships make up the individual's social identity (Deaux, 1996; Ferdman, 1995; Nkomo & Cox, 1996).

This multiplicity of group-based identities is not always or even typically acknowledged, especially among dominant racial or ethnic groups. Alderfer (1991) indicates the problems with a commonly used term, *women and minorities*. In his view, this usage simply differentiates between White men and everyone else and obscures other important differences and dynamics, including, in the case of Black-White relations, all combinations of relationships among Black and White men and women. In the context of multiracial and multiethnic populations, such as that of the United States (Reed, 1997), dynamics are even more complex. In Alderfer's view, usage of the term *women and minorities* can be defensive, in that it permits avoiding consideration of who specifically is in the minority in an actual setting and reduces the complexity of investigations and conversations about race and gender dynamics, ultimately preserving the racial status quo.

Similarly, the often unacknowledged focus on White women and men in gender research and theory may not be simply a passive oversight, but a way of maintaining a particular racial and ethnic order. As Hurtado (1996) points out, "The powerful have the privilege to ignore and therefore to make invisible those with less power" (p. 129). She explains how "naturalizing whiteness" is a key component in its maintenance at the "center of the universe":

For whiteness to be the "center of the universe" it has to be considered a "natural" unmarked racial category. Indeed, the recurrent finding in the study of whiteness is the fact that white respondents do not consider their "whiteness" as an identity or a marker of group membership per se. Most feminist theorists also assume whiteness is the norm. . . . [W]hiteness is a natural identity because it has not been problematic and therefore salient to most respondents in these studies or to most feminist theoreticians. (p. 137)

Hurtado cites duCille: "Feminist [critics] continue to see whiteness as so natural, normative, and unproblematic that racial identity is a property only of the nonwhite. . . . '[A]s a woman' in mainstream feminist discourse all too often continues to mean 'as a white woman'" (duCille, 1994, p. 607, in Hurtado, 1996, p. 137).

There is insufficient work focusing on how gender, race, ethnicity, and culture combine to affect how people behave, interact, and perceive themselves and others in the workplace. There is however, a growing stream of theory and research that is specific about some gender and ethnic or racial combinations, focusing, for example, on the experiences of African American

women (e.g., Blake, 1999; Davidson, 1997; Denton, 1990; Dumas, 1979; Parker & Ogilvie, 1996) or other women of color (e.g., Bento, 1997; Karambayya, 1997; Mighty, 1997; Muller, 1998; Ontiveros, 1998) in organizations. This work has typically focused on the "marked" groups. Scholarship on White women still gets framed simply as work about women, whereas scholarship on men is often framed simply as work on (generic) people. Considering race and ethnicity in the study of gender is not only about including those "others." It also means examining whiteness (Fine, 1997; Jacques, 1997) and the ways in which gender studies have not traditionally done so (Hurtado & Stewart, 1997). "Doing gender" (West & Zimmerman, 1998) is not now nor has ever been culture free or color-blind.

Framing Gender in the Context of Race, Ethnicity, and Culture

Why is it important to consider gender simultaneously with other aspects of identity, particularly race and ethnicity? What do we know at this point about how gender in the workplace is framed in the context of race, ethnicity, and culture? In this section, I review these constructs and then insert them into gender and gender processes. My primary thesis is that the significance and experience of gender are colored and given shared (i.e., cultural) meaning by race and ethnicity.

Race

Scholarship focused on race in recent years emphasizes the socially constructed aspects of this system of classification (Appiah, 1996; Banton, 1988; Ferrante & Brown, 1998; Nkomo, 1992; Oquendo, 1998; Zack, 1998). Responses on the U.S. census and other surveys, as well as reports from those not easily classified into whatever system happens to be in use, highlight how racial categories are not biologically fixed or meaningful. In the United States, categories used to classify individuals by race have shifted over time (Lee, 1993). Although physical markers combined with ancestry are used as the primary bases for assigning individuals to racial categories, scientists have concluded that "there is no scientific basis for our idea of race as a human biological difference. Race . . . is a social overlay on actual physical traits" (Zack, 1998, p. 4).

Nkomo (1992) points out how much of the work purporting to explore the dynamics of race in organizations has instead reified the concept in ways that tell us less, rather than more, because the focus has been on people in essentialized categories, instead of on race relations in which "race" is not a stable category" (p. 507). Others (e.g., Fishman, 1989) emphasize that the primary function of racial classification systems is to maintain racial hierar-

chies and racism. Jones (1997) elucidates the multiple levels—interpersonal, institutional, and cultural—at which racism can operate.

Many scholars have begun to focus on racial identity as an individual-level variable (e.g., Helms, 1995; Thompson & Carter, 1997), constituted by how persons deal with the way they are categorized within the society. Helms (1996) distinguishes racial and ethnic identity models, suggesting that those primarily related to intergroup relations of domination and oppression should be considered “racial,” whereas those focused on the acquisition and maintenance of cultural characteristics should be considered “ethnic.” Within this racial identity approach, growing heed is being paid to White identity (e.g., Fine, Weis, Powell, & Mun Wong, 1997) and biracial or multiracial identity (e.g., Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995).

Privilege and oppression have been key themes in the consideration of race and racial dynamics. McIntosh (1988), for example, in a widely distributed essay, focuses on her own blindness to the privileges she carries as a White person in a White-dominated society. In her struggle for women’s rights, this unearned privilege had become particularly obscured to her. Maier (1997b) and Jacques (1997) consider similar issues as White men.

Gender in the Context of Race

In the United States, both at present and historically, race has been intertwined with gender in the workplace and in the production and maintenance of gender ideologies, stereotypes, and processes. I review theory and research on these intersections in this section.

Data on earnings and other social indicators show that race and gender are both important in predicting wages, occupation, and other opportunities (e.g., Barnum, Liden, & DiTomaso, 1995; Durden & Gaynor, 1998; Farley & Allen, 1989; Landrine, Klonoff, Alcaraz, Scott, & Wilkins, 1995; U.S. Department of Labor, 1997a). Higginbotham (1997) describes how the increase in the number and proportion of working mothers is primarily a White phenomenon, because large numbers of Black women have always worked outside of the home. Robles (1997) documents the broad racial diversity among women on a variety of socioeconomic indicators, including age distribution, family arrangements, educational attainment, labor force participation, occupation, income, and poverty.

Hurtado (1997) critiques the common practice of aggregating statistics across all women for the purpose of comparisons with men, because this hides the large differences among women from different groups. Such differences are also present among men of different groups. The magnitude of the gender differences also often varies by group, indicating an interaction of race and gender. As Robles (1997) shows, gender differences in median income in the United States are greatest among Whites. Even though men in all groups had higher median incomes than women (in 1992), the within-group ratio of

women's to men's income was lowest (0.70) among non-Hispanic Whites. Among Asians, Hispanics, and African Americans it was 0.78, 0.85, and 0.89, respectively. Median income among White women was more than for any of the other groups of women, except Asian Americans. Essentially, being White *and* male was disproportionately associated with having a higher income. Stated differently, the advantage of being male was not as evident for men of color. Similarly, U.S. Department of Labor (1997a) statistics show that, in 1996, 15.3% of employed White men in the United States were in executive, administrative, or managerial occupations. The corresponding proportions of employed White women, Black men, and Black women were 13.9%, 8.3%, and 9.6%, respectively. Not only were Whites employed in such occupations proportionately more than Blacks, but also White men had an advantage relative to White women, whereas the opposite gender pattern was found among Blacks. The gender difference was even larger for Hispanics, among whom 6.6% of employed men and 8.5% of employed women were in such managerial occupations. Comparisons of these data to those for 1988 and 1995 show that although the difference between White men and White women has diminished, that between Black women and Black men has increased. Among Hispanics, the difference has both increased and shifted in the opposite direction.

Hurtado (1996), following Sojourner Truth and other feminists of color, argues that the critical distinction between women of color and White women has been their relationships to White men in a system focused on maintaining White privilege:

White men need white women in a way that they do not need women of Color because women of Color cannot fulfill white men's need for racially pure offspring. This fact creates differences in the relational position of the groups—distance from and access to the source of privilege, white men. Thus, white women, as a group, are subordinated through seduction, women of Color, as a group, through rejection. (p. 12)

In Hurtado's view, this has resulted in a "dual construction of womanhood . . . [in which] the definition of *woman* is constructed differently for white women and for women of Color" (p. 13).

Sidanius and Pratto (in press), in their social dominance theory, argue that men in subordinated racial groups are likely to experience greater discrimination than women in the same groups. As does Hurtado, they use an argument based on sexuality and reproductive strategies to claim that discrimination by dominant men against both dominant and subordinated women is motivated by the desire to control rather than to weaken or to harm. In contrast, they see discrimination against out-group males as more aggressive and designed to debilitate, implying that dominant men view subordinated men as threats and rivals in reproduction.

■ Racism and Sexism

Reid (1988) and others (e.g., Garcia, 1997; Sterba, 1997) explored the similarities and differences between racism and sexism. Although finding parallels, in that both are ideologies and systems of exclusion of some groups and privileging of others, Reid also found important distinctions between the two concepts. Similarly, Glick and Fiske's (1996) notion of ambivalent sexism, although in some ways similar to ambivalent racism (Katz & Hass, 1988), is in essence different. Using the case of Black women, Reid looked at the interactive and additive effects of race and sex prejudice. In doing so, she highlighted that Black men and Black women historically have been treated quite differently by Whites, whereas women have been treated differently on the basis of race. Concurrently, Black women have been the targets of sexism on the part of Black men and racism on the part of White women. This, according to Reid, has put Black women in a double bind and disadvantaged them compared with other groups defined by race and sex.

In her work on racism, Essed (1991) explores its forms that may be unique to the experiences of Black women and considers the interactions of racism with other ideologies of domination. She argues that because sexism and racism "narrowly intertwine and combine under certain conditions into one, hybrid phenomenon . . . it is useful to speak of *gendered racism* to refer to the racial oppression of Black women as structured by racist and ethnicist perceptions of gender roles" (p. 31). Such constructions of gender roles can also greatly affect Black men, for example, via certain stereotypes, but Essed does not explore these in any detail.

Historically, Black women in the United States have had to do many types of jobs, often at the bottom of the labor market and including many arduous ones that most White women did not have to do. Harley (1997) points out how "the middle-class gender norms that were the guiding principles of the 19th-century 'cult of domesticity' were unattainable for enslaved and most free (and newly freed) African American women and men" (p. 31). These dominant norms also contrasted with attitudes about women's work and reproductive roles rooted in Africa and with African American women's realities. It was only after the civil rights movement that Black women were able to get jobs that were traditionally female (and White), such as clerical positions, but typically only the lowest paying of these.

Essed (1991) describes how racialized notions of femininity and sexuality, especially White standards of female beauty, served to rationalize continued abuse:

Contrary to the patriarchal image of White, middle-class women as weak, dependent, passive, and monogamous, Black women were thought of as hardworking, strong, dominant, and sexually promiscuous. . . . The "Aunt Jemima" stereotype epitomized the sexist/racist/classist stereotype of Black

women. . . . These images . . . rationalized the violation of the role of Black women as mothers and the control of Black women through rape and sexual exploitation. (pp. 32-33)

Via such stereotypes, features seen as positive in White men were and are viewed as negative in Black women. Thus, to advance, Black women have to be better than both Black and White men, but they "have to conform to the ideal of White femininity, which means that they cannot afford to appear threatening" (Essed, 1991, p. 35). Gendered racism, then, works by marginalizing, culturally problematizing, and blocking social mobility of Black women (Essed, 1991). Consistent with Essed's analysis, Deaux and LaFrance (1998) point out that racial and ethnic groups in the United States have different gender stereotypes and are also stereotyped differently. Similarly, they point out how "people's gender stereotypes exist at varying levels of specificity and include beliefs about particular types of women and men, each with its own defining features" (Deaux & LaFrance, 1998, p. 796). It is likely that such subtypes are systematically associated with different ethnic or racial categories.

Other work has approached race relations and gendered processes of domination from the perspective of White men, also documenting how racism is directly connected to and intertwined with gender and sexism. Fine, Weis, Addelston, and Marusza (1997), for example, studied the views of other groups and themselves held by urban poor and working-class men and high school boys. On the basis of their research, the authors argue that "white working-class male identity is parasitically coproduced as these men name and mark others, largely African American and white women. Their identity would not exist in its present form (and perhaps not at all) if these simultaneous productions were not taking place" (pp. 55-56). The White high school boys, for example, view themselves as having "entitled access to white women" (p. 57), whom they protect from a supposedly aberrant African American male sexuality. Expressions of racism in this context become ways of subordinating both Blacks and White women, thus becoming intertwined with sexism. As the authors point out, these young White men "treat Black women far worse than they say Black men treat white women" (p. 58). The parallel study of working-class young adults shows how "the target site for this white male critique shifts from sexuality to work but remains grounded *against* men of color" (p. 60).

In related research highlighting the importance of attending to gender in studies of racism, and vice versa, Stack (1997) compared the views of White men and women with regard to race-targeted interventions in the workplace (such as affirmative action). Data from a 1990 national survey of adults in the United States showed that, overall, White men were more opposed to race-targeted interventions. White women who were against income inequality or who thought White-Black differences are not due to discrimination were

also more likely to be opposed, whereas these relationships were not present for the men. Stack concluded that this was consistent with predictions derived from social dominance theory (Sidanius & Pratto, in press). In a study also using U.S. national survey data, Gay and Tate (1998) found that most Black women strongly identified on the basis of both race and gender and that the two were positively correlated. However, the researchers found that, overall, Black women's political attitudes were better predicted by racial than by gender identification, a possible explanation of why Black and White women often view gender issues differently. Aries et al. (1998) found that group racial composition affected college students' awareness of their own gender; for men their gender was most salient when they were in the racial minority, whereas for women it was more salient when they were in the racial majority.

■ Double Jeopardy or Double Advantage?
Exploring Interactions of Race and Gender

Bell et al. (1993) and others (e.g., Landrine et al., 1995) review evidence related to the combined impact of race and gender for Black women and other women of color relative to White men and women, Black men, and other men of color. Such combinations, according to Landrine et al., may have (1) only additive effects, such that gender and race function independently to affect outcomes; (2) only interactive effects, such that neither gender nor race alone is sufficient to predict outcomes; or (3) both additive and interactive effects, such that, for some groups, effects are stronger (or weaker) than would be predicted simply by summing the effects of race and gender. Building on Ransford's (1980) work, Landrine et al. (1995) advance a double jeopardy-advantage hypothesis, which "predicts that (1) people who occupy a subordinate (low-status) position in more than one hierarchy will be found to be doubly disadvantaged, whereas (2) those who occupy a ruling (high-status) position in more than one hierarchy will be found to be doubly advantaged" (p. 186). According to this hypothesis, Black women and other women of color should be especially disadvantaged, whereas White men should be especially advantaged, relative to White women and to men of color. Bell et al. (1993) point to an alternative version of the double advantage hypothesis, based on claims of benefits to the race-gender combination experienced by Black women:

The double advantage (colloquially referred to as "twofer") hypothesis holds that the sum effect of race *and* gender is positive and black women enjoy a preferred status in organizations compared with other groups including black males. (p. 111, italics in original)

Bell et al.'s review of some empirical evidence related to both hypotheses as applied to Black women points to little or no research supportive of the

“twofer” prediction and suggests the need for more complexity in considering the double jeopardy perspective. In exploring predictions of multiple jeopardy and advantage, Landrine et al. (1995) review a variety of evidence, including salary data and empirical investigations of interpersonal discrimination. They conclude that, although evidence does point to the presence of either double advantage or double jeopardy in a range of settings, it is important to develop hypotheses that are “more specific regarding the nature of the interaction among specific status positions with respect to specific discriminatory behaviors” (p. 221). They also warn against approaches that treat all low-status positions as socially equivalent.

In a more recent study of perceived discrimination among African American, Latino/a, and White men and women at the University of California, Los Angeles, Levin, Sinclair, Veniegas, and Taylor (1998) explored both additive and interactive double jeopardy hypotheses, as well as a new prediction they designate the *transfer hypothesis*. This hypothesis predicts that perceptions of discrimination in one domain influence those in another for women of color, but not other groups. Thus, among women of color, experiences or perceptions of gender discrimination should result in increased perceptions of racial or ethnic discrimination, and vice versa. Levin et al. propose that this transfer may occur, first, because women of color may have a greater recall of incidents and misattribute them to the other domain, and second, because women of color may have increased sensitivity to one type of discrimination as a function of their experiences with the other. This prediction is supported by findings that women of color, compared to White women, report experiencing more sexism (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995; Weber & Higginbotham, 1997) and that Mexican American high school girls see sexism as a greater problem than their White counterparts (McWhirter, 1997). Regarding the transfer from sexism to racism, three studies reviewed by Levin et al. showed that, in contrast to their prediction, men of color see more ethnic discrimination than do women of color, and two other studies found no gender differences.

Levin et al. (1998) found that, consistent with the additive double jeopardy hypothesis, African Americans and Latinos reported more ethnic and general discrimination than did Whites, whereas women perceived greater amounts of gender and general discrimination than did men. This was consistent with Weber and Higginbotham (1997), who found that 42% of Black women professionals in their study reported unfair treatment as “Black women,” compared to 25% of White women professionals reporting unfair treatment as “White women.” At the same time, in contrast to an interactive double jeopardy prediction, Levin et al. found no difference between women and men of color in perceptions of general discrimination. However, White women saw themselves as worse off than White men. In line with the transfer hypothesis, women of color who perceived ethnic discrimination were more likely to perceive gender discrimination, and this correlation was greater among women of color than among White women. However, men and women of

color saw about the same amount of ethnic discrimination. Also, perceptions of gender discrimination varied as a function of group among women, but not for men, such that there was no main effect of ethnicity in perceived gender discrimination. Finally, there was a greater difference in perceived general discrimination (both personal and social) between White women and White men than between African American and Latino men and women.

Powell and Butterfield (1997), in a study of the effects of race on promotions in a government agency, also considered the possibility of interactions with gender. Although the results suggested the presence of such an interaction, the small number of women of color in their sample did not permit formal statistical tests. Nevertheless, they saw the data as possibly, though not reliably, indicating double advantage for women of color. One interpretation they did not consider, however, is that the extremely small and disproportional number of women of color in managerial ranks was itself an indication of double jeopardy.

Ethnicity and Culture

Introducing ethnicity, and with it culture, adds even greater complexity to the consideration of interactions of gender with other identities. Before discussing these interactions, I explore the construct of ethnicity.

Some authors use the terms *ethnicity* and *race* interchangeably or even blend them into one construct. Cox (1993), for example, uses the term *racioethnicity*, defining it as "racially and/or ethnically distinctive within the same nationality group" (p. 6), and Phinney (1996) uses the term *ethnicity* "to refer to broad groupings of Americans on the basis of both race and culture of origin" (p. 919). Similarly, because of common usage and for convenience, investigators often request research participants in organizations and elsewhere to identify themselves on questionnaires in terms of "racial/ethnic" categories.

I believe it is important and useful to distinguish between race and ethnicity in spite of the associations of these two concepts. Conflating race and ethnicity makes it more difficult to consider their socially constructed yet different components and applications, including the ways their use varies at different times and in different places. Some authors base their work in part on the distinction between race and ethnicity. Landrine and Klonoff (1996), for example, see race as a problematic basis for distinguishing among people in part because it blends together and blurs the differences between a variety of ethnic groups, ignores cultural differences, and harms society, groups, and individuals.

Ethnicity, in contrast to race, can have both positive and negative associations. Fishman (1989), for example, describes how the notion of *ethnos* was historically viewed in both of these manners. In a widely used definition, Schermerhorn (1996) framed the construct as follows:

An ethnic group is defined here as a collectivity within a larger society having real or putative common ancestry, memories of a shared historical past, and a cultural focus on one or more symbolic elements defined as the epitome of their peoplehood. Examples of such symbolic elements are: kinship patterns, physical contiguity (as in localism or sectionalism), religious affiliation, language or dialect forms, tribal affiliation, nationality, phenotypical features, or any combination of these. A necessary accompaniment is some consciousness of kind among members of the group. (p. 17)

Hutchinson and Smith (1996), building on this definition but making it less restrictive, offer the following construction of ethnic group:

A named human population with myths of common ancestry, shared historical memories, one or more elements of common culture, a link with a homeland, and a sense of solidarity among at least some of its members. (p. 6)

Similarly, Nash (1996) sees the focus of ethnic inquiry as “cultural categories with social and group referents” (p. 24) and identifies both the most common markers of ethnic boundaries as well as the elements of ethnicity as “blood, substance, and cult” (p. 25). Eriksen (1996) points out that ethnicity, in social anthropology, “refers to aspects of relationships between groups which consider themselves, and are regarded by others, as being culturally distinctive” (p. 28). He goes on to note that, even though the focus in ethnicity discourse is often on subgroups or minorities, “majorities and dominant peoples are no less ‘ethnic’ than minorities” (p. 28).

Ethnicity, then, involves both identity and culture (Ferdman, 1990, 1992) and is a characteristic of all people. In terms of identity, ethnic groups are distinguished by socially meaningful labels that distinguish between *us* and *them*, capturing a sense of shared ancestry and continuity with the past. This boundary typically also incorporates a shared style (Royce, 1982) or distinguishing cultural features—patterns of behaviors, values and beliefs. In addition to individual- and group-level aspects, ethnicity also incorporates inter-group elements (Ferdman, 1992). It is for this reason that ethnicity is typically more salient among members of minority groups, those groups in the society with less power than the dominant group; such groups are usually somewhere below the top in the social stratification ladder. In this sense, ethnic minorities and their members are “marked,” such that their differences from the dominant group are considered to reside in them, instead of in their relationship to the dominant group; their ethnic identity is seen as added to or combined with the larger national identity. In the United States, for example, one often hears talk of “diverse” people when what is meant is people who are not White. Similarly, the generic “American” is used for citizens of White European descent, whereas other citizens are referred to in ethnic terms, such as

Latino, African American, and Chinese American. Members of the dominant group are seen as the standard. When no mention is made of ethnic group membership in the United States, it is typically assumed that the reference is to a White person. As defined here, however, ethnicity is a feature of all groups, including those with power. Thus, attending to ethnicity permits noting the cultural diversity within groups broadly categorized in racial terms, such as Whites, that include a variety of ethnic groups. Power differentials, however, are an important component of ethnic dynamics and experience.

In addition to boundaries and identity, culture is a key component of ethnicity. Although a group's culture and its expression by individuals is continually in flux (Ferdman & Horenczyk, in press; Nagel, 1994), at the group level and from a psychological perspective it can be seen to consist of shared lenses for perceiving, believing, evaluating, communicating, and acting (Triandis, 1996). It is useful to consider culture not only in terms of those features prevalent for the group in general but also as it is constructed or represented for each individual group member. I describe elsewhere (Ferdman, 1990, 1995; Ferdman & Horenczyk, in press) the construct of *cultural identity* as referring to one's individual images of the cultural features characteristic of one's group together with both one's feelings about those features and one's understanding of their location in oneself.

Gender in the Context of Ethnicity and Culture

As a primary culture-bearing grouping, ethnicity gives memory and reality to gender. A growing literature (e.g., Cheng, 1996b; Das Gupta, 1997; Doss & Hopkins, 1998; Hurtado, 1997; Levant, Majors, & Kelley, 1998; Tay & Gibbons, 1998; Vazquez-Nuttall, Romero-Garcia, & De Leon, 1987; Watkins et al., 1998; Williams & Best, 1994) documents how the meaning and experience of gender is culturally defined in the context of particular societies, social settings, and ethnicities. Given that gender is constructed and lived in an ethnocultural context, gendered experiences and interactions may not be the same for members of different ethnic groups, and gender in organizations may be better illuminated when ethnicity is explicitly considered. As Muller (1998) points out, "Group distinctiveness is reflected in culturally specific understandings of gender and gender differences" (p. 6).

Fundamentally, gender, as a set of beliefs and practices for structuring human experience, is relatively meaningless outside of a particular cultural context. There is no such thing as "just" a man or a woman, without reference to culture. All men and women belong to or participate in social groupings and interactions that shape the meaning and experience of their genders. To the extent that these groups and their interactions are ethnic, gender interacts with ethnicity and culture. Individuals may often think of themselves solely in gender terms, but this may in part be a result of belonging to the privileged group (McIntosh, 1988). At the individual level, people of all groups can vary

in the degree to which they think about or incorporate ethnic identity in their self-concept (Phinney, 1996). For those with weaker ethnic identities, one might speak of gender operating by itself at the individual level, but this is logically problematic from the group or intergroup level. The fact that ethnic identity has not been elaborated or does not play a conscious role for the individual can itself be evidence of the ways that ethnic group membership affects the person and group.

Various studies have documented how gender interacts with culture. Watkins et al. (1998), in their study of self-concepts in 14 nations, expected that women would place greater emphasis than men on "family values" and "social relationships" as a basis for self-esteem. They found, however, that this difference was only present in individualist countries. Williams and Best (1994), in contrast, did not find culturally based differences in masculinity and femininity, and they found that across countries, stereotypes of men tended to be stronger and more active than those of women. They did find variation in the degree of differentiation of the stereotypes for men and women and in their self-concepts across cultures. Moreover, there were great disparities in the sex-role ideologies expressed in different countries; in some countries, such as the Netherlands, Germany, and Finland, more egalitarian views were expressed, whereas in others, such as Nigeria, Pakistan, and India, views tended to be more male dominant. Finally, and most relevant here, although, on average, women in all countries expressed more egalitarian sex-role ideologies than men, this sex difference varied by country. On average, however, these differences were smaller than the between-country differences, suggesting that culture contributes to sex-role ideology more strongly than gender.

In two U.S. studies, Gaines et al. (1997) compared cultural values across race and ethnic groups and found that although people of color scored higher than Anglos on collectivism and familism in Study 1, this was replicated only for men and not women in Study 2. Vazquez-Nuttall et al. (1987) reviewed literature on sex roles among Latinas, documenting their differences from sex roles in other ethnic groups as well as their variations as a function of both subgroup and acculturation. Similarly, Das Gupta (1997), Muller (1998), Cheng (1996b), Levant et al. (1998), and others explore variations in gender roles and ideology as a function of culture and ethnicity.

A common theme in this body of work is that many members of ethnic minority groups experience cultural transitions in part through shifts in expected and received gender roles. Among Dominican immigrants in New York, for example, women tended to assume new roles in their family as they increased their labor force participation and became the primary wage earner (Pessar, 1987).¹ Thus, gender can become a key locus for experiencing cultural transitions and transformations (Hurtado, 1997). Women who are not of the dominant culture must switch between two worlds, part of which involves dealing with gender relations in their own group. Thus, attending to culture

and ethnicity highlights the problems inherent in generalizing about all women and men.

In the organizational context, Parker and Ogilvie (1996) describe a model of African American women executives' leadership strategies as culturally distinct. They criticize the predominant practice of describing "female" models of leadership as contrasting with Anglo-American male hierarchical models, and they suggest that African American women display a distinctive style influenced by both culture and gender. Filardo (1996) conducted a related study of social interaction patterns in mixed-gender, same-race groups. On the basis of social role theory (Eagly, 1987), she predicted that men and women differ in social behaviors because they occupy different roles in society, and she cites Williams and Best (1990b) to point out that gender stereotypes and behaviors vary cross-culturally as a function of the proportion of women working outside of the home. Filardo also cites evidence of greater gender equality among African Americans than Whites in their mixed-gender social interactions. The results of her study of eighth graders in the northeast United States, matched for socioeconomic status and reading achievement, showed that although White boys displayed greater activity, more influence attempts and fewer incomplete, interrupted utterances than White girls, African American groups showed no such gender differences. On two speech form measures, action opportunities and mitigated performance outputs, among African Americans, girls were higher than boys, but there was no difference for Whites. Overall, White girls were less powerful and less assertive, and displayed speech that was more tentative, conciliatory, and polite. Filardo inferred that the equality among African Americans was due to assertiveness by African American girls, rather than facilitation by African American boys. The implication, then, is that White males may experience African American females as unfeminine and aggressive and that this could create ambivalence for African American females as they try to "fit in" to largely White contexts. The results also fit well with a social role theory account.

Implications for Future Theory and Research

This review raises a variety of important issues for the study of gender in organizations. Key themes, summarized in Figure 2.1, may be illuminated and better addressed by simultaneously attending to gender, race, ethnicity, and culture. This section builds on these themes and considers implications for future theory and research.

As illustrated earlier, experiences of discrimination in the workplace can be better understood when both gender and racial or ethnic identities are considered. The research by Levin et al. (1998), Landrine et al. (1995), Weber and Higginbotham (1997), and others shows that gender by itself is insufficient to illuminate perceptions of sex, race, or general discrimination. Similarly, DiTomaso (1989) found differences in how Black women as opposed to

Sexism and racism are intertwined in their history and expression. Although distinct, they cannot be fully separated either in individual or collective experience.

Gender stereotypes are neither color- nor culture-blind.

Experiences of discrimination in the workplace can vary as a function of both gender *and* race or ethnicity. Gender by itself is insufficient to illuminate perceptions of sex, race, ethnic, or general discrimination.

Identity is complex, and incorporates multiple components, which intersect and interact to affect the subjective experience of individuals and their treatment by others (Ferdman, 1995). Interactive and complex views of identity can help to move us away from essentialism and permit greater understanding of how identity is shaped by situational factors.

Gender roles in the workplace can be better and more fully understood in their ethnocultural and racial context. Predominant norms in U.S. organizations have often been those of White men (Maier, 1997c), not those of men in general.

The nature and dynamics of power, privilege, and oppression can be better illuminated and understood if gender is considered in combination with other identities, especially race and ethnicity, but also class, sexual orientation, and other bases of social stratification (see Ferree & Hall, 1996).

Gendered processes such as mentoring and networking may be more clearly understood when race, ethnicity, and culture are also considered and addressed (see, e.g., Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Ibarra, 1993; Pugliesi & Shook, 1998; Ragins, 1997b).

The relationships of work, family, and other life domains, which are often addressed only in terms of gender, may be better illuminated to the extent that multiple cultural constructions of work, family, and other life concerns are considered (see, e.g., Watanabe, Takahashi, & Minami, 1997). This includes variant views of the nature and permeability of the boundaries between work and home.

The study of organizational socialization of women and men may benefit from incorporating constructs of acculturation, more often used in the literature on cultural transitions.

Planned change processes in organizations geared toward increasing inclusion, such as diversity initiatives (Ferdman & Brody, 1996), may be more effective to the extent that they address the full complexity of identity and pluralism and simultaneously attend to a variety of differences and similarities. For example, programs directed at "Women" are likely to be more meaningful and have a greater impact to the extent that they consider the diversity among women.

Figure 2.1. Key Themes Highlighted by Considering Gender in Organizations in Combination With Race, Ethnicity, and Culture

White or Hispanic women experienced discrimination, and Yoder and Aniakudo (1997) documented the unique patterns of subordination lived by African American women firefighters.

Because the expression of sexism can be colored by racism, consideration of race and gender interactions should lead to a clearer understanding of both of these ideologies of oppression. Most researchers and theorists continue to sustain the guiding (usually unstated) assumption that gender and racial or ethnic discrimination processes are distinguishable and separate. It may be very difficult if not impossible, however, to know definitively if a particular incident is an instance of gender discrimination and not of racial or ethnic discrimination, or vice versa. When the target is a woman of color, making

such a determination is especially problematic. If a White man treats a woman of color poorly, the two dimensions clearly may be involved. But when a Black man treats a Black woman in a sexist manner, the history of race relations in the United States is also playing a background role in the interaction. Similarly, racism against Blacks on the part of White men (and White women) has always included a component of sexism, affecting not only Blacks but also White women. Thus, the two processes of racism and sexism are inextricably linked.

Explorations of the interactions of race and ethnicity with gender pose both empirical and conceptual challenges. Empirically, it is often problematic to find appropriate samples of sufficient size and diversity to test hypotheses. Moreover, it is not always clear what is the appropriate group in which to test predictions, and whether the measures used appropriately capture the domain of interest. Conceptually, it is important to consider the full range of possibilities in exploring what the interaction of race and gender might look like. The interactive position would simply say that, either, (a) gender effects and gender dynamics will be different across racial groups, or (b) race or ethnic effects will be different for men and women. A complete set of predictions would specify which specific patterns will be present under what conditions and why.

Complex interactions are also the case when the focus is identity. Individual identities cannot be easily (if at all) disentangled into separate components. Certainly, attempts to do so should address the potential implications and influences of one type of identity on the others. Here, I have presented the view that it is only in a social system that takes one racial or ethnic identity, such as White, as normative, that gender can be considered apart from its ethnic or racial context and that doing so can be a way of perpetuating that social system. By considering gender in the context of other identities, the ways in which individuals simultaneously carry multiple identities that together constitute a whole is highlighted. An individual's identities intersect and interact to affect the person's subjective experience and treatment by others (Ferdman, 1995). Elsass and Graves (1997) take such an approach in developing a model for interactions and experiences in a diverse work group. Such strategies can help us resist essentialism and shed light on the reciprocal effects of identity and situations, as well as on the simultaneous reality of both between- and within-group diversity.

Interactive perspectives are also important in the study of gender roles in organizations. Much literature focuses on gender roles in the context of work, as well as on what women versus men bring to the workplace. By considering gender roles in their cultural, ethnic, and racial context, we should be able to get a better understanding of their subtlety and complexity. Traditional theory and research considers the ways in which gender shapes people's behavior patterns, as well as expectations by and of individuals. This can have implications for systemic differences, for example, in power. Maier's (1997c; also Chapter 5, this volume) work on masculinity in organizations is quite

sensitive to this, in that he focuses on normativeness in organizations as mostly akin to White maleness, not to maleness in general. Similarly, Cheng (1996b) shows how Asian and Asian American men are not considered "hegemonically masculine." He found, for example, that being an Asian American man meant a loss of male privilege. Black men and Latinos can also be denied such privilege, although in different ways. Popular depictions and stereotypes, for example, often show Black men as hypermasculine. Latino men must likewise contend with a stereotype of machismo.

Hofstede (1980a) has documented notable cross-national differences in the degree of distinction made between genders and in the "softness" of the society's culture. Thus, in the international arena, the interaction of gender roles and culture also becomes an issue, for example, as women expatriates seek to work effectively in host societies with expectations and norms different from those to which they are accustomed (see, e.g., Caligiuri & Cascio, in press). The experience of women heads of state, diplomats, and many executives working in societies that are very restrictive of women's roles is that they are sometimes treated as honorary males (e.g., Adler, 1987; also Chapter 13, this volume).

Romero (1997) reminds us that

recognizing that a woman cannot be a woman without race, ethnicity, and social class allows us to begin examining both the range of diversity and the kinds of commonalities that make up the gendered work experience. (p. 236)

Certainly, this is true both for women and men. A focus on ethnicity and race highlights the cultural, ethnic, and racial specificity of gendered interactions. Theorists and researchers interested in gender must be more precise about the ethnic, racial, and cultural context for their work and the identities of their participants. I believe that the time has come for the study of gender in organizations to fully incorporate and attend to race, ethnicity, and culture.

Note

1. Related to this, Schoeni (1998) documents how different groups of immigrant women participate in and assimilate into the labor force at different rates. Whereas Filipinas had the highest labor force participation (80% in 1990), Mexican women were the least likely to be working outside the home. Also, Japanese, Korean, and Chinese immigrant women were found to have the highest probability of working in the first 10 years after immigration.

Ferdman, B. M. (1999). The color and culture of gender in organizations: Attending to race and ethnicity. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 17-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

References

- Adler, N. J. (1987). Pacific basin managers: A *gaijin*, not a woman. *Human Resource Management*, 26, 169-192.
- Alderfer, C. (1991, August). *The new corporate language for race relations*. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Academy of Management, Miami Beach.
- Appiah, K. A. (1996). Race, culture, identity: Misunderstood connections. In K. Anthony Appiah & Amy Gutmann, *Color conscious: The political morality of race* (pp. 30-105). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Aries, E., Olver, R. R., Blount, K., Christaldi, K., Fredman, S., & Lee, T. (1998). Race and gender as components of the working self-concept. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 138, 277-290.
- Banton, M. (1988). *Racial consciousness*. London: Longman.
- Barnum, P., Liden, R. C., & DiTomaso, N. (1995). Double jeopardy for women and minorities: Pay differences with age. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 863-880.
- Bell, E. L., Denton, T. C., & Nkomo, S. (1993). Women of color in management: Toward an inclusive analysis. In E. A. Fagenson (Ed.), *Women in management: Trends, issues, and challenges in managerial diversity* (pp. 105-130). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bento, R. F. (1997). When good intentions are not enough: Unintentional subtle discrimination against Latinas in the workplace. In N. V. Benokraitis (Ed.), *Subtle sexism: Current practice and prospects for change* (pp. 91-116). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Blake, S. (1999). At the crossroads of race and gender: Lessons from the mentoring experiences of professional Black women. In A. J. Murrell, F. Crosby, & R. Ely (Eds.), *Mentoring dilemmas: Developmental relationships in multicultural organizations*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Caligiuri, P. M. & Cascio, W. F. (in press). *Can we send her there?* Maximizing the success of Western women on global assignments. *Journal of World Business*.
- Cheng, C. (1996). "We choose not to compete": The "merit" discourse in the selection process, and Asian and Asian American men and their masculinity. In C. Cheng (Ed.), *Masculinities in organizations* (pp. 177-200). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Collins, P. H. (1998). Toward a new vision: Race, class, and gender as categories of analysis and connection. In J. Ferrante & P. Brown, Jr. (Eds.) *The social construction of race and ethnicity in the United States* (pp. 478-495). New York: Longman.
- Cox, T., Jr. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research & practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Cox, T., Jr. & Nkomo, S. M. (1990). Invisible men and women: An overview of research on minorities in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 419-431.
- Das Gupta, M. (1997). "What is Indian about you?": A gendered, transnational approach to ethnicity. *Gender & Society*, 11, 572-596.
- Davidson, M. J. (1997). *The Black and ethnic minority woman manager: Cracking the concrete ceiling*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Deaux, K. (1996). Social identification. In E. T. Higgins & A. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 777-798). New York: Guilford.
- Deaux, K. & LaFrance, M. (1998). Gender. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology, Vol. 1, 4th Ed.* (pp. 788-827). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Denton, T. (1990). Bonding and supportive relationships among black professional women: Rituals of restoration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 447-457.
- DiTomaso, N. (1989). Sexuality in the workplace: Discrimination and harassment. In J. Hearn, D. L. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff, & G. Burrell (Eds.), *The sexuality of organizations* (pp. 71-90). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ferdman, B. M. (1999). The color and culture of gender in organizations: Attending to race and ethnicity. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 17-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Doss, B. D. & Hopkins, J. R. (1998). The Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale: Validation from three cultural perspectives. *Sex Roles*, 38, 719-741.

duCille, A. (1994). The occult of true Black womanhood: Critical demeanor and Black feminist studies. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 19, 591-629.

Dumas, R. G. (1979). Dilemmas of Black females in leadership. *Journal of Personality and Social Systems*, 2, 3-26.

Durden, G. C. & Gaynor, P. E. (1998). More on the cost of being other than White and male: Measurement of race, ethnic, and gender effects on yearly earnings. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 57, 95-103.

Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Elsass, P. M. & Graves, L. M. (1997). Demographic diversity in decision-making groups: The experiences of women and people of color. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 946-973.

Ely, R. (1991, August). *Gender difference: What difference does it make*. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Academy of Management, Miami.

Ensher, E. A. (1997). Effects of race, gender, perceived similarity, and contact on mentor relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 460-481.

Eriksen, T. H. (1996). Ethnicity, race, class and nation. In J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith (Eds.), *Ethnicity* (pp. 28-31). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Farley, R. & Allen, W. R. (1989). *The color line and the quality of life in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ferdman, B. M. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60, 181-204.

Ferdman, B. M. (1992). The dynamics of ethnic diversity in organizations. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Issues, theory and research in industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 339-384). Amsterdam: North Holland.

Ferdman, B. M. (1995). Cultural identity and diversity in organizations: Bridging the gap between group differences and individual uniqueness. In M. Chemers, S. Oskamp, & M. A. Costanzo (Eds.), *Diversity in organizations: New perspectives for a changing workplace* (pp. 37-61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ferdman, B. M. & Brody, S. E. (1996). Models of diversity training. In D. Landis & R. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training, 2nd Ed.* (pp. 282-303). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ferdman, B. M. & Horenczyk, G. (in press). Cultural identity and immigration: Reconstructing the group during cultural transitions. In E. Olstein & G. Horenczyk (Eds.), *Language, identity, and immigration*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Ferrante, J. & Brown, P., Jr. (Eds.) (1998). *The social construction of race and ethnicity in the United States*. New York: Longman.

Ferree, M. M. & Hall, E. J. (1996). Rethinking stratification from a feminist perspective: Gender, race, and class in mainstream textbooks. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 929-950.

Filardo, E. K. (1996). Gender patterns in African American and White adolescents' social interactions in same-race, mixed-gender groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 71-82.

Fine, M. (1997). Witnessing Whiteness. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell, & L. Mun Wong (Eds.), *Off White: Readings on race, power, and society* (pp. 57-65). New York: Routledge.

Fine, M., Weis, L., Addelston, J., & Marusza, J. (1997). (In)secure times: Constructing White working-class masculinities in the late 20th century. *Gender & Society*, 11, 52-68.

Fine, M., Weis, L., Powell, L. C., & Mun Wong, L. (Eds.). (1997). *Off White: Readings on race, power, and society*. New York: Routledge.

Fishman, J. A. (1989). *Language and ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

- Ferdman, B. M. (1999). The color and culture of gender in organizations: Attending to race and ethnicity. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 17-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gaines, S. O., Jr., Barájas, L. Hicks, D., Lyde, M., Takahashi, Y., Yum, N., García, B. F., Marelich, W. D., Bledsoe, K., L., Steers, W. N., Henderson, M. C., Granrose, C. S., Ríos, D. I., Farris, K. R., & Page, M. S. (1997). Links between race/ethnicity and cultural values as mediated by racial/ethnic identity and moderated by gender. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 1460-1476.
- Garcia, J. L. A. (1997). Racism as a model for understanding sexism. In N. Zack (Ed.), *Race/sex: Their sameness, difference, and interplay* (pp. 45-59). New York: Routledge.
- Gay, C. & Tate, K. (1998). Doubly bound: The impact of gender and race on the politics of Black women. *Political Psychology*, *19*, 169-184.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491-512.
- Harley, S. (1997). Speaking up: The politics of Black women's labor history. In E. Higginbotham & M. Romero (Eds.), *Women and work: Exploring race, ethnicity, and class* (pp. 28-51). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helms, J. E. (1996). Toward a methodology for measuring and assessing racial as distinguished from ethnic identity. In G. Sodowsky & J. Impara (Eds.), *Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology* (pp. 143-192). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute.
- Higginbotham, E. (1997). Introduction. In E. Higginbotham & M. Romero (Eds.), *Women and work: Exploring race, ethnicity, and class* (pp. xv-xxxii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Holvino, E. (1994). Women of color in organizations: Revising our models of gender at work. In E. Y. Cross, J. H. Katz, F. A. Miller, & E. W. Seashore (Eds.), *The promise of diversity: Over 40 voices discuss strategies for eliminating discrimination in organizations* (pp. 52-59). Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.
- Hurtado, A. (1996). *The color of privilege: Three blasphemies on race and feminism*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hurtado, A. (1997). Understanding multiple group identities: Inserting women into cultural transformations. *Journal of Social Issues*, *53*, 299-328.
- Hurtado, A. & Stewart, A. J. (1997). Through the looking glass: Implications of studying Whiteness for feminist methods. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell, & L. Mun Wong (Eds.), *Off White: Readings on race, power, and society* (pp. 297-311). New York: Routledge.
- Hutchinson, J. & Smith, A. D. (1996). Introduction. In J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith (Eds.), *Ethnicity* (pp. 3-14). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ibarra, H. (1993). Personal networks of women and minorities in management: A conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*, 56-87.
- Jacques, R. (1997). The unbearable whiteness of being: Reflections of a pale, stale male. In P. Prasad, A. J. Mills, M. Elmes, & A. Prasad (Eds.), *Managing the organizational melting pot: Dilemmas of workplace diversity* (pp. 80-106). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism, 2nd ed.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Karambayya, R. (1997). In shouts and whispers: Paradoxes facing women of colour in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *16*, 891-897.
- Katz, I. & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*, 893-905.

- Ferdman, B. M. (1999). The color and culture of gender in organizations: Attending to race and ethnicity. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 17-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kerwin, C. & Ponterotto, J. G. (1995). Biracial identity development: Theory and research. In J. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 199-217). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Klonoff, E. A. & Landrine, H. (1995). The Schedule of Sexist Events: A measure of lifetime and recent sexist discrimination in women's lives. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 19, 439-472.
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1996). *African American acculturation: Deconstructing race and reviving culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Landrine, H., Klonoff, E. A., Alcaraz, R., Scott, J., & Wilkins, P. (1995). Multiple variables in discrimination. In B. Lott & D. Maluso (Eds.), *The social psychology of interpersonal discrimination* (pp. 183-224). New York: Guilford.
- Lee, S. M. (1993). Racial classifications in the U.S. Census: 1890-1990. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 16, 75-94.
- Levant, R. F., Majors, R. G., & Kelley, M. L. (1998). Masculinity ideology among young African American and European American women and men in different regions of the United States. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health*, 4, 227-236.
- Levin, S., Sinclair, S., Veniegas, R. C. & Taylor, P. L. (1998, May). *Gender, ethnicity, and perceived discrimination: Is double jeopardy in jeopardy?* Poster presented at the 10th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Society, Washington, DC.
- Maier, M. (1997a, Summer). Invisible privilege: What White men don't see. *The Diversity Factor*, pp. 28-33.
- Maier, M. (1997b). "We have to make a MANagement decision": Challenger and the dysfunctions of corporate masculinity. In P. Prasad, A. J. Mills, M. Elmes, & A. Prasad (Eds.), *Managing the organizational melting pot: Dilemmas of workplace diversity* (pp. 226-254). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies*. Working Paper No. 189. Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA.
- McWhirter, E. H. (1997). Perceived barriers to education and career: Ethnic and gender differences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 124-140.
- Mighty, E. J. (1997). Triple jeopardy: Immigrant women of color in the labor force. In P. Prasad, A. J. Mills, M. Elmes, & A. Prasad (Eds.), *Managing the organizational melting pot: Dilemmas of workplace diversity* (pp. 312-339). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Muller, H. J. (1998). American Indian women managers: Living in two worlds. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 7, 4-28.
- Nagel, J. (1994). Constructing ethnicity: Creating and recreating ethnic identity and culture. *Social Problems*, 41, 152-176.
- Nash, M. (1996). The core elements of ethnicity. In J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith (Eds.), *Ethnicity* (pp. 24-28). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nkomo, S. M. (1992). The emperor has no clothes: Rewriting "race in organizations." *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 487-513.
- Nkomo, S. M. & Cox, T., Jr. (1996). Diverse identities in organizations. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 338-356). London: Sage.
- Ontiveros, M. L. (1998). Three perspectives on workplace harassment of women of color. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *The Latino/a condition: A critical reader* (pp. 531-535). New York: New York University Press.
- Oquendo, A. R. (1998). Re-imagining the Latino/a race. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *The Latino/a condition: A critical reader* (pp. 60-71). New York: New York University Press.
- Parker, P. S. & Ogilvie, D. (1996). Gender, culture, and leadership: Toward a culturally distinct model of African-American women executives' leadership strategies. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 189-214.

- Ferdman, B. M. (1999). The color and culture of gender in organizations: Attending to race and ethnicity. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 17-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pessar, P. R. (1987). The Dominicans: Women in the household and the garment industry. In N. Foner (Ed.), *New immigrants in New York* (pp. 103-129). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Phinney, J. S. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? *American Psychologist*, *51*, 918-927.
- Powell, G. N. & Butterfield, D. A. (1997). Effect of race on promotions to top management in a Federal department. *Academy of Management Journal*, *40*, 112-128.
- Pugliesi, K. & Shook, S. L. (1998). Gender, ethnicity, and network characteristics: Variation in social support resources. *Sex Roles*, *38*, 215-238.
- Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: A power perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *22*, 482-521.
- Reed, I. (Ed.) (1997). *Multiamerica: Essays on cultural wars and cultural peace*. New York: Viking.
- Reid, P.T. (1988). Racism and sexism: Comparisons and conflicts. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 203-221). New York: Plenum.
- Robles, B. J. (1997). An economic profile of women in the United States. In E. Higginbotham & M. Romero (Eds.), *Women and work: Exploring race, ethnicity, and class* (pp. 5-27). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Romero, M. (1997). Epilogue. In E. Higginbotham & M. Romero (Eds.), *Women and work: Exploring race, ethnicity, and class* (pp. 235-248). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Royce, A. P. (1982). *Ethnic identity: Strategies of diversity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sánchez, J. I. & Brock, P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: Is diversity management a luxury or a necessity? *Academy of Management Journal*, *39*, 704-719.
- Schermerhorn, R. (1996). Ethnicity and minority groups. In J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith (Eds.), *Ethnicity* (pp. 17-18). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schoeni, R. F. (1998). Labor market assimilation of immigrant women. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, *51*, 483-504.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (in press). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- St. Jean, Y. & Feagin, J. R. (1997). Racial masques: Black women and subtle gendered racism. In N. V. Benokraitis (Ed.), *Subtle sexism: Current practice and prospects for change* (pp. 179-200). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stack, S. (1997). Women's opposition to race-targeted interventions. *Sex Roles*, *36*, 543-558.
- Sterba, J. P. (1997). Racism and sexism: The common ground. In N. Zack (Ed.), *Race/sex: Their sameness, difference, and interplay* (pp. 61-71). New York: Routledge.
- Tay, L. S. & Gibbons, J. L. (1998). Attitudes toward gender roles among adolescents in Singapore. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *32*, 257-278.
- Thompson, C. E. & Carter, R. T. (1997). *Racial identity theory: Applications to individual, group, and organizational interventions*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Triandis, H. C. (1996). The psychological measurement of cultural syndromes. *American Psychologist*, *51*, 407-415.
- U.S. Department of Labor (1997). Women in management. *Accessibility Information No. 97-3* [On-line]. Available: http://www.dol.gov/dol/wb/public/wp_pubs/wmgt97.htm.
- Vazquez-Nuttall, E., Romero-Garcia, I., & De Leon, B. (1987). Sex roles and perceptions of femininity and masculinity of Hispanic women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *11*, 409-425.
- Watanabe, S., Takahashi, K. & Minami, T. (1997). The emerging role of diversity and work-family values in a global context. In P. C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 276-318). San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.

Ferdman, B. M. (1999). The color and culture of gender in organizations: Attending to race and ethnicity. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 17-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Watkins, D., Akande, A., Fleming, J., Ismail, M., Lefner, K., Regmi, M., Watson, S., Yu, J., Adair, J., Cheng, C., Gerong, A., McInerney, D., Mpofu, E., Singh-Sengupta, S., & Wondimu, H. (1998). Cultural dimensions, gender, and the nature of self-concept: A fourteen-country study. *International Journal of Psychology*, 33, 17-31.

Weber, L. (1998). A conceptual framework for understanding race, class, gender, and sexuality. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 13-32.

Weber, L. & Higginbotham, E. (1997). Black and White professional-managerial women's perceptions of racism and sexism in the workplace. In E. Higginbotham & M. Romero (Eds.), *Women and work: Exploring race, ethnicity, and class* (pp. 153-175). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Doing gender. In B. McVicker Clinchy & J. K. Norem (Eds.), *The gender and psychology reader* (pp. 104-124). New York: New York University Press.

Williams, J. E. & Best, D. L. (1990). *Sex and psyche: Gender and self viewed cross-culturally*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Williams, J. E. & Best, D. L. (1994). Cross-cultural views of women and men. In W. J. Lonner & R. Malpass (Eds.), *Psychology and culture* (pp. 191-196). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Yoder, J. D. & Aniakudo, P. (1997). "Outsider within" the firehouse: Subordination and difference in the social interactions of African American women firefighters. *Gender and Society*, 11, 324-341.

Zack, N. (1998). *Thinking about race*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Author contact information:

Bernardo M. Ferdman, Ph.D.
Organizational Psychology Programs
California School of Organizational Psychology
6160 Cornerstone Ct. E.
San Diego, CA, 92121
Tel. (858) 623-2777 x362
Fax (858) 552-1974
E-mail: bferdman@cspp.edu