

Accepted Manuscript

It's Fair for Us: Diversity Structures Cause Women to Legitimize Discrimination

Laura M. Brady, Cheryl R. Kaiser, Brenda Major, Teri A. Kirby

PII: S0022-1031(14)00195-4
DOI: doi: [10.1016/j.jesp.2014.11.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.11.010)
Reference: YJESP 3274

To appear in: *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*

Received date: 30 May 2014
Revised date: 17 November 2014



Please cite this article as: Brady, L.M., Kaiser, C.R., Major, B. & Kirby, T.A., It's Fair for Us: Diversity Structures Cause Women to Legitimize Discrimination, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* (2014), doi: [10.1016/j.jesp.2014.11.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.11.010)

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

It's Fair for Us: Diversity Structures Cause Women to Legitimize Discrimination

Laura M. Brady^a, Cheryl R. Kaiser^a, Brenda Major^b, and Teri A. Kirby^a

^aDepartment of Psychology, Guthrie Hall, University of Washington, Box 351525, Seattle, WA
98195-1525

^bDepartment of Psychological and Brain Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA
93106-9660

Author Note

This research was supported by National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowships awarded to Laura Brady and Teri Kirby and National Science Foundation grants 1053732 & 1052886 awarded collaboratively to Brenda Major and Cheryl Kaiser. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Laura M. Brady or Cheryl R. Kaiser, Department of Psychology, Guthrie Hall, University of Washington, Box 351525, Seattle, WA 98195-1525. Phone: (206)-616-1435. Email: laurab33@uw.edu or ckaiser@uw.edu.

Abstract

Three experiments tested the hypothesis that the mere presence (vs. absence) of diversity structures makes it more difficult for women to detect sexism. In Experiment 1, even when a company's hiring decisions disadvantaged women, women perceived the company as more procedurally just for women and were less supportive of sexism litigation when the company offered diversity training, compared to when it did not. In Experiment 2, women perceived a company as more procedurally just for women and as less likely to have engaged in sexism when the company offered diversity training, compared to when it did not. This effect was not moderated by women's endorsement of status legitimizing beliefs. In Experiment 3, women perceived a company as more procedurally just and less discriminatory when the company had been recognized for positive gender diversity practices compared to when it had not. Additionally, these effects were most pronounced among women who endorsed benevolent sexist beliefs and mitigated among those who rejected benevolent sexist beliefs. Together, these experiments demonstrate that diversity structures can make it difficult for women to detect and remedy discrimination, especially women who hold benevolent sexist beliefs.

Keywords: sexism, diversity, discrimination, legitimacy, procedural justice, benevolent sexism

It's Fair for Us: Diversity Structures Cause Women to Legitimize Discrimination

As concerns about the treatment of legally protected groups (e.g., women, older employees, and minorities) remain prominent in American workplaces, many corporations have responded by implementing diversity structures (Dobbin, 2009; Kelly & Dobbin, 1998; Paluck, 2006). These structures take various forms such as diversity policies, diversity training programs, and affirmative action initiatives, but all profess to create equal opportunities and treatment for all employees (Edelman, Fuller, & Mara-Drita, 2001; Paluck, 2006). Empirical research, however, suggests that diversity structures often fail to achieve these egalitarian objectives, and many commonly employed diversity structures have little to no impact on increasing diversity (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). Despite the limited efficacy of many diversity structures, recent research shows that high status group members, such as White men, believe that the presence of diversity structures—even demonstrably ineffective diversity structures—signifies that organizations are indeed fair for underrepresented groups (Kaiser, Major, et al., 2013). That is, diversity structures create an *illusion of fairness*.

Diversity Structures Create an Illusion of Fairness Among High Status Groups

In a series of studies, Kaiser, Major, and their colleagues (2013) examined whether members of high status groups perceive companies with diversity structures as fairer for members of legally protected groups than companies without such structures, and whether they do so even when there is objective evidence that the companies' procedures unfairly disadvantage these groups. Across these studies, high status group members (i.e., Whites and men) were exposed to a company's diversity structure (e.g., diversity statement, diversity training program, or diversity award) or control structure (e.g., general mission statement, general management training program, or award for non-diversity related achievements). Those

who viewed a diversity structure believed that the company was less discriminatory and more procedurally just for underrepresented groups, even when they were given evidence that the company had acted unfairly (e.g., promoted more Whites than minorities, interviewed more men than equally qualified women, or paid men more than equally qualified women). This perception of procedural justice, or the belief that employees are valued and subjected to fair, neutral and consistent procedures (e.g., Colquitt, 2001; Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975), led high status groups to perceive less discrimination against underrepresented groups when diversity structures were present.

The finding that diversity structures cause high status groups to perceive organizations as fair and to overlook discrimination against low status groups converges with theoretical perspectives on legitimacy (Lind & Tyler, 1988). When forming opinions about the legitimacy of institutions and authorities, people are often more persuaded by the presence of seemingly fair procedures than by the outcomes of these procedures (Tyler, 2001). Similarly, because people are motivated to perceive their social systems as fair and legitimate, especially when their group resides at the top of those systems, they often overlook negative or unfair outcomes of these systems (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Thus, it is perhaps not surprising that high status group members are so easily persuaded that diversity structures are effective approaches to creating equality in the workplace.

Group Status and the Illusion of Fairness

Less is known, however, about how diversity structures shape the perceptions of low status groups (e.g., minorities and women), the intended beneficiaries of diversity structures. In comparison to high status groups, low status groups may be more concerned about potential negative outcomes for their groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and therefore less persuaded that the

mere presence of a diversity structure proves that their group is treated fairly. Low status groups' previous experiences as targets of discrimination may also raise suspicion about the motives of high status groups, causing low status groups to be more vigilant in detecting discrimination compared to high status groups (Crocker & Major, 1989; Major, Sawyer, & Kunstman, 2013; Kaiser, Vick, & Major, 2006; Major & Kaiser, 2006; Cohen, Steele, & Ross, 1999). Indeed, compared to Whites, minorities tend to be more attentive to their groups' representation and opportunities when forming opinions about a company and its commitment to diversity (Unzueta & Binning, 2011; Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlemann, & Randall Crosby, 2008). Although this research would suggest that minorities might *not* fall victim to the illusion of fairness, decades of research in legitimization demonstrate that low status groups are not immune to legitimizing unfair systems, even when those systems disadvantage their groups (Dasgupta, 2004; Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost & Hunyady, 2002; Major, 1994; Major & Schmader, 2001). Furthermore, low status groups may be particularly likely to legitimize unfair systems when they perceive those systems as having fair procedures (Tyler, 2001).

Indeed, in one study (Dover, Major, & Kaiser, 2014), Latino participants viewed a company that had won either diversity related awards (e.g., "Top 50 Company for Latino Diversity") or neutral awards unrelated to diversity (e.g., "Leader in Service") and subsequently evaluated a Latino employee's discrimination lawsuit against the company. Latino participants perceived the company that had won a diversity award as fairer for Latinos than a company that had won an award unrelated to diversity, but this effect was moderated by participants' endorsement of status legitimizing beliefs (SLBs; e.g., the belief that those who work hard succeed, that people can get ahead in society regardless of group membership, and that status differences between groups are justified; O'Brien & Major, 2005). Latinos who were strong (1

SD above the mean) in endorsement of SLBs perceived the company that had received diversity-related awards as more fair for Latinos compared to a company without diversity-related awards, but Latinos who rejected SLBs (1 SD below the mean) did not show this effect. SLBs also moderated the extent to which Latinos derogated the Latino who filed the lawsuit. Those who endorsed SLBs derogated the claimant more in the diversity condition compared to the control condition, but those who rejected SLBs did not show this effect. This study provides initial evidence that like high status group members, some low status group members perceive companies with diversity structures as inherently fairer for underrepresented groups and regard discrimination claims by members of those groups against those companies as less justifiable. Further, endorsement of SLBs may be important in understanding some low status groups' responses to diversity.

Dover and colleagues (2014) provided an important initial demonstration of variability in low status group members' reactions to diversity structures and inspired the current research, which sought to extend these findings in significant ways. First, Dover and colleagues (2014) used a particularly strong diversity structure manipulation; the company had been recognized with an award for diversity. Participants may readily infer that companies with diversity awards are actually successful in increasing diversity and treating minorities fairly. In contrast, the current studies examined the impact of the presence or absence of diversity training on low status group members' responses to potential discrimination against their group. Given that diversity training is ubiquitous in U.S. organizations (Dobbin, 2009), it may be less likely than an award to be intuitively linked with actual success in diversity management. Indeed, diversity training does not increase minority representation in management, nor does it reduce bias (see Dobbin, 2009).

Second, Dover and colleagues (2014) did not provide participants with any information about the actual fairness of the organization. Consequently, Latinos may have been particularly susceptible to perceiving organizations with diversity awards as fair. In contrast, in Experiment 1 of the current research, participants were shown clear evidence that an organization had engaged in discrimination. This allowed for a more stringent test of the hypothesis that diversity structures reduce low status group members' sensitivity to discrimination; that is, create an illusion of fairness among low status group members.

Third, Dover and colleagues (2014) report a single study with a relatively small sample of Latinos. The present paper presents three unique studies, each with multiple variables and larger samples, which can provide a stronger foundation for understanding how low status groups respond to organizations that tout their diversity structures.

Fourth, although psychologists often seek to describe the attitudes and behaviors of low status groups in general, these groups vary tremendously with respect to their historical and contemporary positions in society, their relationships with higher status groups, and the particular circumstances surrounding their oppression. These differences undoubtedly shape how low status groups perceive and react to inequality (Jackman, 1994; Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998; Sidanius & Veniegas, 2000). We believe that rather than assume that the responses of one low status group inevitably characterize the responses of all low status groups, it is important to empirically investigate generalizability.

Some scholars, for example, have suggested that compared to racial minorities, women are less likely to perceive discrimination against their group or themselves (Higginbotham & Webber, 1999) and do less publicly and privately to combat their disadvantage (Jackman, 1994). Women's relative lack of opposition to their disadvantaged status may stem from the unique

nature of the relationships men and women have with each other compared to minorities and Whites (Gurin, 1985). Specifically, women and men are unusually deeply embedded in relationships with each other across a variety of contexts, such as family relations, friendship networks, community environments, and work spheres. Minorities and Whites, in contrast, do not share such deeply entwined lives, in part due to the history of anti-miscegenation laws and segregation, and resulting contemporary interaction patterns.

Importantly, women's frequent interactions with men occur within patriarchal social structures in which women often have less power, resources, and status than the men with whom they interact (e.g., men are often in leadership positions over women; marriages often have unequal power distributions; Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). At the same time, women are often cherished, protected, and idealized in a way that reinforces traditional gender roles that give men more status than women (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Perhaps because of its relatively palatable nature, many women endorse this form of sexism, termed *benevolent sexism* (Glick et al., 2000). Importantly, women's endorsement of benevolent sexism serves a status legitimizing function (Becker & Wright, 2011; Jost & Kay, 2005), leading women to be complacent with gender inequality and undermining their willingness to engage in social change (Rudman & Glick, 2008; Becker & Wright, 2011).

Repeated exposure to gender embedded within interdependent power relations can cause both men and women to develop a set of seemingly natural, shared beliefs about gender in which women are inherently viewed through the lens of their low status positions (Eagly, 1987; Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). These beliefs about women become chronically reinforced through interactions in society, which results in both men and women chronically legitimizing the very hierarchy in which these interactions take place

(Ridgeway, 2011). This legitimacy surrounding gender relations can lead women to think of their roles as natural, and in turn they may not feel entitled to question their disadvantaged position (Major, 1994; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). Further, questioning their disadvantaged status may result in damaging the uniquely close ties between men and women, creating additional reasons women may be especially unlikely to notice and object to their disadvantaged status. In other words, given the benevolent component of sexism and the close interdependence of women and men, women might be particularly susceptible (relative to ethnic minorities) to legitimizing inequality.

Hypotheses

Based on the above reasoning, we hypothesized that *women on average will show the illusion of fairness*. That is, given women's strong tendencies toward legitimizing inequality, we hypothesized that the presence (versus absence) of an organizational diversity structure would cause women on average to: (1) believe that a company and its policies were more procedurally just for women, even in the face of evidence that the company treated women unfairly (Hypothesis 1); (2) be less supportive of sexism litigation (Hypothesis 2) and (3) perceive the company as less discriminatory toward women (Hypothesis 3). To test whether individual differences in legitimizing beliefs are relevant to understanding women's reactions to diversity structures, we examined whether the illusion of fairness is exacerbated among women high in endorsement of SLBs (Experiments 2) or benevolent sexism (Experiment 3). Because both sets of beliefs can serve to legitimize gender inequality, we hypothesized that the effect of diversity structures on perceptions of procedural justice and discrimination would be exacerbated among women who more strongly endorsed SLBs and/or benevolent sexism (Hypothesis 4). Finally, we

predicted that perceptions of procedural justice would mediate the effect of diversity structures on support for sexism litigation and perceived discrimination (Hypothesis 5).

Experiment 1

Experiment 1 examined whether diversity structures, operationalized as the presence or absence of managerial diversity training programs, create an illusion of fairness among women regarding the treatment of women. Female participants were exposed to clear evidence of gender disparities at an organization, learning that a company reviewed job applications from equal numbers of equivalently qualified men and women, but selected men for interviews 70% of the time (and women only 30% of the time). They then indicated how procedurally fairly they felt women were treated in the company and whether they would support litigation against the company for sex discrimination.

Method

Participants

One hundred nineteen female participants from the United States were recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk and were compensated with a small sum of money. Gender was not made salient during the recruitment process, and men were funneled into a separate study previously reported in Kaiser et al. (2013). One participant was excluded from analyses for showing a random pattern of responding (i.e., clicking on an item they were instructed not to click on; Oppenheimer, Mayvis, & Davidenko, 2009), and 5 participants were excluded for failing to recall whether they read about the diversity or control training program (details below). Results are unchanged when those eliminated for these reasons are included in analyses. Our final sample had a mean age of 32.28 years ($SD = 12.27$), and the majority identified as White American (85.8%). Minorities reported African American (4.4%), Asian American (3.5%),

Latino/Hispanic American (1.8%), Native American (.9%), and multiracial or other (3.5%) backgrounds. Participants varied in highest educational attainment, including some high school (.9%), high school diploma (8.8%), some college (38.9%), two-year degree (8.8%), four-year bachelor's degree (20.4%), some graduate school (8%), and graduate degree (14.2%). Eighty-six percent reported being currently or in the past employed in a full-time job.

Procedure

Participants first read an identical profile of a fictitious investment company. Depending on random assignment, they then read either that the company had a diversity training program ("Fostering Women's Success") or a general managerial training program ("Fostering Employee Success"; see Appendix A for the stimuli). These program descriptions were identical except that the diversity training program included phrases specifically about improving women's outcomes in the company. After reading the program description, participants wrote a one-sentence summary of the program.

Participants then learned that they would have 2.5 minutes to review a list of applicants who had applied for a managerial position at the company. The list contained 20 male and 20 female applicants, listed by first name and last initial to ensure that applicant gender was salient. The document also provided applicants' qualifications (i.e., years of relevant work experience, highest degree earned, score on an employment test ranging from 0-30, and score from a human resources resume screening ranging from 0-5). Male and female applicants were matched such that for every male applicant, there was a female applicant with identical qualifications. Next, participants were given one minute to review the short list of applicants who the company had selected for interviews. The shortlist included the top seven male applicants and top 3 female applicants. Thus, despite being equally qualified and equally represented in the applicant pool,

women were interviewed at only 43% the rate of men. Participants then completed dependent measures below.

Procedural justice. Participants completed five-items measuring the extent to which they perceived the company (Smith & Simon) to be procedurally just for women (Kaiser et al. 2013). Items were: *Women are able to express their views and feelings about their treatment at Smith & Simon Corporation; Women have influence over the outcomes they receive at Smith & Simon Corporation; Smith & Simon Corporation applies personnel procedures consistently across all employees, irrespective of gender; Smith & Simon Corporation values women's opinions; and Smith & Simon Corporation treats women with respect.* Participants responded on scales from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree), $\alpha = .93$.

Support for sexism litigation. Participants completed two items assessing their support for sexism related litigation: *If women brought a class action lawsuit against Smith & Simon for sex discrimination in hiring, how likely would you be to find in favor of the women who sued?* (1 = very unlikely, 7 = very likely), and *If women won a class action lawsuit against Smith & Simon for sex discrimination in hiring, how much money in damages do you think each plaintiff should be awarded?* The second question contained 13 response options labeled \$0 to \$600,000, with each option increasing by \$50,000. These two items were standardized and combined into a scale of support for sexism litigation ($r(110) = .39, p < .001$).

Perceptions of Disparate Treatment. To ascertain whether participants correctly perceived the disparate treatment of men and women, they were asked to provide estimates of the number of women who applied for the job (response options were 0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35 and 40 women) and the number of women who were selected for interviews (the 11 response options ranged from 0 to 10 women). They were also asked to recall male and female applicants' average

years of work experience (11-point scale ranging from 0-10 years), average resume score (6-point scale ranging from 0-5 points), employment test scores (7-point scale with scale points labeled with 0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30 points), and the percentage of men and women who earned high school, bachelor's, and master's degrees (11-point scales for each level of education, with response options beginning at 0% and increasing by 10% up to 100% of applicants).

Manipulation checks. Finally, as a check on the diversity structure manipulation, participants responded to a forced choice item asking whether they read about a training program called "Fostering Employee Success" or "Fostering Women's Success." Three additional items assessed their perceptions of the company's training program: *The managerial training program you read about emphasized that Smith & Simon values employees of different genders; Smith & Simon Corporation has a policy that addresses discrimination against women; and Smith & Simon Corporation engages in diversity practices to increase opportunities for female employees* ($\alpha = .86$; 1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree).

Results

Manipulation Checks

Ninety-six percent of participants correctly recalled whether they read about the control or diversity training program. Four percent (1 in the control condition and 4 in the diversity structure condition) responded incorrectly. A chi-square test of independence revealed that this pattern of responses was not due to chance, $\chi^2(1, N = 118) = 99.11, p < .001$. The five participants who responded incorrectly were excluded from further analyses. A one-way ANOVA revealed that participants exposed to the Fostering Women's Success training program were more likely to say that the company addresses gender diversity issues ($M = 5.90, SD = 1.04$) compared to those who read the Fostering Employee Success training program ($M = 3.71,$

$SD = 1.38$), $F(1, 111) = 91.46$, $p < .001$.

Main Analyses

Procedural justice for women. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, women exposed to the Fostering Women's Success training program perceived the company as more procedurally just for women ($M = 5.60$, $SD = 1.14$) compared to those who read about the Fostering Employee Success training program ($M = 4.85$, $SD = 1.06$), $F(1, 111) = 13.25$, $p < .001$, $d = .68$.

Support for sexism litigation. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, women exposed to the Fostering Women's Success program were less supportive of sexism litigation against the company ($M = -.18$, $SD = .66$) compared to those who read about the Fostering Employee Success program ($M = .18$, $SD = .94$), $F(1, 111) = 5.39$, $p = .02$, $d = .44$ ¹.

Mediation

To test the hypothesis that procedural justice mediates the relationship between diversity structure condition and support for litigation (Hypothesis 5), we used Hayes' (2014) PROCESS macro with 10,000 bootstrapped samples to estimate the indirect effect of diversity structure condition on support for litigation through procedural justice. The unstandardized indirect effect (-.21) was contained in a 95% confidence interval that did not contain 0 (-.44, -.08), demonstrating a significant indirect effect. Furthermore, when procedural justice was included as a predictor of support for litigation, the effect of diversity structure condition on support for litigation was no longer significant (see Table 1).

Because the data are cross-sectional, it is possible that support for litigation mediated the effect of the diversity structure condition on procedural justice, rather than the reverse. We tested this alternative mediational model using Hayes' (2014) PROCESS macro with 10,000

¹ Procedural justice and support for litigation were moderately negatively correlated; $r(111) = -.42$, $p < .001$.

bootstrapped samples to estimate the indirect effect of diversity structure condition on procedural justice through support for litigation. This model showed a significant indirect effect; the unstandardized indirect effect (.18) was contained within a confidence interval that did not contain zero (.04, .42). However, the relationship between diversity structure condition and procedural justice remained significant when support for litigation was included as a predictor of procedural justice, suggesting that support for litigation only partially mediated the effect of diversity structure on procedural justice (see Table 1).

Perceptions of Disparate Treatment

To examine whether participants correctly perceived women and men as equally qualified, but women as underrepresented on the shortlist, we examined their recall of the number of women and men on the applicant and interview lists as well as their perceptions of male and female applicants' credentials. Experimental condition did not affect participants' recollection of the number of women on the applicant list, $F(1, 109) = 2.27, p = .13$, or interview shortlist, $F(1, 111) = 2.70, p = .10$. Overall, participants recalled that approximately 15 (instead of 20) of the 40 applicants were women ($M = 3.90, SD = .94$), and that 3.4 (instead of 3) of the 10 candidates on the shortlist were women ($M = 4.40, SD = 1.18$).

Experimental condition also did not affect perceptions of applicants' credentials (Table 2). Results of six mixed model ANOVAs, entering condition as a between subjects variable and participants' ratings of men's and women's qualifications as a within subjects variable, revealed no significant main effects of condition (all $ps > .15$) or interactions with condition (all $ps > .09$) for any type of qualification. We observed three main effects of gender. Male applicants were perceived to have more years of work experience than women ($p < .001$), but female applicants were perceived to be more likely to have a bachelor's degree ($p = .05$) and as less likely than

men to have the lowest level of education (i.e., a high school diploma; $p = .003$).

Discussion

As hypothesized, the presence (vs. absence) of diversity structures created an illusion of fairness among women regarding the treatment of members of their own group. Specifically, the presence of a diversity training program oriented toward fostering women's success caused women to believe that women were treated more fairly in the company, despite being presented with evidence that equally qualified women were passed over in favor of men during the hiring process (Hypothesis 1). The presence of a diversity training program also caused women to be less supportive of sexism litigation (Hypothesis 2). Finally, perceptions of procedural justice mediated the relationship between the presence of a diversity structure and support for litigation (Hypothesis 5). These findings replicate and build upon those of Dover et al. (2014) by demonstrating that diversity structures also affect women's perceptions of fairness and by extending their effects to a different form of diversity structure (a diversity training program rather than receipt of a diversity award).

Experiment 2

In Experiment 2, we tested the hypothesis that diversity structures lead women to legitimize inequality by perceiving companies with diversity structures as more procedurally just for women (Hypothesis 1) and as less discriminatory toward a female employee who sues the company for gender discrimination (Hypothesis 3). We also examined whether women's endorsement of status legitimizing beliefs (SLBs) moderates the effects of diversity structures on perceptions of procedural justice and discrimination. To provide a direct comparison to Dover et al.'s (2014) work with Latinos, we assessed SLBs with the same 12-item measure used in their work. If the effects we observed in Experiment 1 were exacerbated among women who more

strongly endorse SLBs, this would replicate Dover's (2014) finding with Latinos and further illustrate the role that perceptions of the legitimacy of the status system play in low status groups' reactions to diversity structures.

Method

Participants

One hundred and seventy eight female participants were recruited from the University of Washington psychology subject pool. To avoid making gender salient, we recruited a smaller number of men whose data are described separately in the online supplement. We collected data until the end of the quarter. Eight participants were excluded due to random patterns of responding (Oppenheimer et al., 2009). We also excluded 29 women due to inadequate recall on the manipulation check (described below). Results are unchanged when those eliminated for these reasons are included in analyses. The final sample had a mean age of 18.76 years ($SD = 1.13$), and was predominately Asian American (53.2%) and White (25.5%). Non-Asian minorities reported African American (2.1%), Hispanic American (7.1%) and multiracial or other (12.1%) ethnicities.

Procedures

Experiment 2 was completed during two separate sessions. During a mass testing session at the beginning of the quarter, we assessed participants' endorsement of SLBs with 12 items used extensively in prior research ($\alpha = .73$; Dover et al., 2014; O'Brien & Major, 2005). Items measured participants' endorsement of the Protestant work ethic (e.g., *Most people who don't get ahead should not blame the system; they really have only themselves to blame*), their belief in individual mobility (e.g., *America is an open society where individuals can achieve higher status*), and their belief in status legitimacy (e.g., *America is a just society where differences in*

status between groups reflect actual group differences). Participants responded using 7-point scales (0 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree). On average, women responded near the midpoint on SLBs ($M = 2.75$, $SD = .65$), and responses did not differ by experimental condition, $t(139) = 1.12$, $p = .27$.

Several weeks later, participants took part in an ostensibly unrelated lab study. Participants first read the same company profile and then were randomly assigned to read either the diversity or general management training program descriptions used in Experiment 1. All participants then read a newspaper article describing a woman's gender discrimination lawsuit against the company. The woman claimed branch managers had preferentially referred clients to male employees, leading her and other female employees to have lower salaries than their male counterparts. Finally, participants completed the dependent measures described below.

Procedural justice for women. Participants rated their perceptions that the company was procedurally just using the same 5 items from Experiment 1 ($\alpha = .84$).

Perceived discrimination against the plaintiff. Next, participants completed a 5-item measure of perceived discrimination assessing the extent to which they believed that the woman suing the company had been discriminated against (Kaiser et al., 2013). Items included: *The individual suing Smith & Simon Corporation was discriminated against*; *The branch managers at Smith & Simon Corporation acted fairly in their distribution of customers to the individual suing the company* (reverse coded); *The individual suing Smith & Simon Corporation was given the same opportunities as other employees* (reverse coded); *The branch managers at Smith & Simon Corporation were biased when distributing customers to the individual suing the company*; and *The individual suing Smith & Simon Corporation was treated unfairly when*

customers were assigned. Participants responded using 7-point scales (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree; $\alpha = .74$).

Manipulation check. Participants indicated whether they had read about the company's "Fostering Employee Success" program, the "Fostering Women's Success" program, or did not recall.

Results

Manipulation Check

Eighty-two percent of participants (69 in the control condition and 70 in the diversity structure condition) correctly remembered whether they had read about the company's gender diversity training program or its general managerial training program. Seventeen percent (7 in the control condition and 22 in the diversity structure condition) incorrectly remembered which training program they read about. One percent (2 in the control condition) did not recall the name of the training program. A chi-square test of independence revealed that this pattern of responses was not due to chance, $\chi^2(2, N = 170) = 77.19, p < .001$. We excluded the 29 participants who incorrectly recalled which training program they read about but retained those who answered correctly or indicated that they did not recall which program they read about.

Main Analyses

We hypothesized that the presence of a diversity structure would increase women's perceptions of procedural justice (Hypothesis 1) and decrease women's perceptions of discrimination against the plaintiff (Hypothesis 3)². We anticipated that these effects would be enhanced among women high in SLBs (Hypothesis 4). To test these hypotheses, we conducted hierarchical regression analyses for each dependent variable. In Step 1, we entered the diversity

² Perceived procedural justice and perceived discrimination were moderately negatively correlated, $r(139) = -.40, p < .001$

structure condition (0 = control condition, 1 = diversity structure condition) and the mean-centered SLBs variable. In Step 2, we entered the two-way interaction.

Procedural justice. At Step 1, the overall regression model predicting procedural justice was significant, $F(2, 138) = 6.69, p = .002$, and accounted for 8.8% of the variance in procedural justice. This step revealed the predicted main effect of diversity structure condition; women who read about a company's diversity structure believed that the company was more procedurally just for women ($M = 3.89, SD = 1.19$) compared to those who read about the control structure ($M = 3.19, SD = 1.08$) (Hypothesis 1; $b = .70, SE = .19, t(138) = 3.63, p < .001, d = .62$). There was no effect of women's endorsement of status legitimizing beliefs on perceptions of procedural justice, $b = -.02, SE = .15, t(138) = -.12, p = .91$.

Step 2 of the regression model did not account for a significant increase in the variance of procedural justice, and there was no significant interaction between condition and status legitimizing beliefs, $F(1,137) = 1.13, p = .29; b = .32, SE = .30$. Thus, the presence of a diversity structure increased women's perceptions of procedural justice irrespective of their endorsement of status legitimizing beliefs.

Perceived discrimination. At Step 1, the overall regression model predicting perceived discrimination was significant, $F(2, 138) = 3.96, p = .02$, accounting for 5.4% of the variance in perceived discrimination. This step revealed the predicted main effect of condition; women who read about a company's diversity structure perceived the company as less discriminatory toward the plaintiff ($M = 4.70, SD = .73$) than women who read about the control structure ($M = 5.08, SD = .86$) (Hypothesis 3; $b = -.38, SE = .14, t(138) = -2.81, p = .006, d = -.48$). There was no effect of women's endorsement of status legitimizing beliefs on perceptions of discrimination, $b = -.02, SE = .10, t(138) = -.20, p = .84$.

Including the interaction in Step 2 did not account for a significant increase in variance, and the interaction was not significant, $F(1, 137) = .30, p = .59; b = .11, SE = .21$. Thus, the diversity structure decreased women's sensitivity to discrimination, irrespective of their endorsement of status legitimizing beliefs.

Mediation

We again used Hayes' PROCESS macro with 10,000 bootstrapped samples to estimate the indirect effect of diversity structure condition on perceived discrimination through procedural justice. The unstandardized indirect effect (-.17) was contained in a 95% confidence interval that did not contain zero (-.33, -.08), demonstrating a significant indirect effect. Furthermore, when procedural justice was included in the model, the effect of diversity structure condition on perceived discrimination was no longer significant (See Table 3). This finding supports our hypothesis that procedural justice mediates the relationship between diversity structure condition and perceived discrimination (Hypothesis 5). As in Experiment 1, switching the mediator and dependent variable also produced a significant indirect effect; the indirect effect (.19) was contained within a confidence interval that did not include zero (.06, .38). However, the relationship between diversity structure condition and procedural justice remained significant when perceived discrimination was included in the model, suggesting that perceived discrimination only partially mediated the relationship between diversity structure condition and procedural justice (see Table 3).

Discussion

Replicating the findings of Experiment 1, Experiment 2 revealed that diversity structures signaled to women that a company's procedures were fair for members of their group, which in turn decreased women's sensitivity to sexism. This finding is consistent with research on

legitimacy demonstrating that people can become content with unfair outcomes if they believe these outcomes are the product of fair procedures (Tyler, 2001). Contrary to our hypothesis and to previous work with Latinos (Dover et al., 2014), however, these effects were not moderated by endorsement of SLBs.

What accounts for this lack of moderation by legitimizing beliefs? On one hand, it is possible that diversity structures cause women to legitimize inequality for their group regardless of their endorsement of legitimizing ideologies. This would be consistent with the idea that women and men experience close, positive relationships, and that acknowledging sexism could be damaging to these relationships or at least cause discomfort among women who have to accept that men actually treat women unfairly (Ridgeway, 2011). On the other hand, it is also possible that there are meaningful individual differences in women's likelihood of legitimizing inequality that are not captured by women's endorsement of SLBs. While SLBs (e.g., belief in the protestant work ethic, social mobility, and status legitimacy) are relevant to justifying unequal outcomes between minorities and Whites (e.g., Schmader, Major, & Gramzow, 2001), these beliefs may be less relevant to justifying unequal outcomes between men and women, given the differences between racial and gender hierarchies and that men and women often share outcomes in ways that minorities and Whites do not (Jackman, 1994; Ridgeway, 2011). Instead, beliefs about gender relations specifically may be more influential in women's legitimization of gender inequality. To test this idea, we turned to benevolent sexism as a gender-specific legitimizing ideology.

While sexism is similar to racism in that it involves a hostile component (e.g., antipathy toward women), it differs from racism in that it also involves a seemingly positive component referred to as benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Benevolent sexism includes three

components: heterosexual intimacy, protective paternalism, and gender differentiation. These components create a belief system contending that men should cherish, protect, and idealize women and that men need women's superior moral sensibilities and affection to achieve fulfillment. Thus, benevolent sexism celebrates men and women's interdependence and simultaneously reinforces traditional gender roles that give men more status than women (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Importantly, women's endorsement of benevolent sexism serves a status legitimizing function (Becker & Wright, 2011; Jost & Kay, 2005). Whereas women who endorse this belief system are more complacent with gender inequality and less willing to engage in social change (Rudman & Glick, 2008; Becker & Wright, 2011), women who reject benevolent sexism are more skeptical about their group's treatment and less likely to legitimize gender inequality (see Becker & Wright, 2011).

Experiment 3

In Experiment 3, we examined whether endorsement of benevolent sexism moderates women's reactions to the presence versus absence of diversity structures, using a different set of experimental materials. As in Experiments 1 and 2, we hypothesized that when a company said it had a diversity training program (versus a general training program), women would perceive the company as more procedurally just (Hypothesis 1) and less discriminatory toward women (Hypothesis 3). However, we predicted that this effect would be exacerbated among women high in benevolent sexism and mitigated, if not absent, among women low in benevolent sexism (Hypothesis 4).

Method

Participants

Two hundred and forty nine women recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk participated in exchange for a small amount of money. Although we were interested in only the responses of women, men were recruited because we had no efficient way to screen them out without making gender salient to participants (see online supplement for results for male participants). Because we planned to test multiple continuous moderators, we decided to increase our goal sample size to 250. Given the subtle manipulation used in this study, we analyzed the data after the study had been posted for two days ($N = 170$) to ensure that the manipulation was working as intended. After seeing the manipulation was successful, we continued toward our goal sample size.

Eleven participants were excluded for failing to correctly recall whether or not the company had won a diversity award (details below), leaving a final sample of 238 female participants. The pattern of results was unchanged when participants who missed the manipulation check were included. The sample was predominantly White (80.3%), with minorities reporting African American (9.7%), Latino/Hispanic American (3.8%), Asian American (3.8%), and other (2.5%) backgrounds. Participants varied in educational attainment, including some high school (.4%), high school diploma (10.1%), some college (28.2%), two-year degree (16.8%), four-year bachelor's degree (34%), some graduate school (2.9%), and graduate degree (7.6%).

Procedure

Participants read an article formatted to resemble a New York Times contribution describing a woman's lawsuit against her employer, Novartis Pharmaceuticals (see Appendix B). The woman claimed that Novartis discriminated against her in pay and promotions because of her gender. She alleged that she was paid \$105 less per month than male employees in

comparable positions and was passed over for promotion by men with inferior sales numbers. In the diversity structure condition, the article included a sentence stating that a lawyer for Novartis denied the claim and stated that the company had been recognized by Diversity Careers magazine as a top company for women. In the control condition, the lawyer also denied the claim, but did not mention the diversity award. The remaining information was identical between conditions. Participants were required to stay on the page displaying the article for at least 60 seconds before completing dependent measures, providing demographic information, and reading the debriefing statement.

Procedural justice for women. Participants completed 3 items assessing the extent to which they perceived the environment at Novartis to be procedurally just for women: *Novartis values women's opinions*; *Novartis treats women with respect*; and *Women are able to express their views and feelings about their treatment at Novartis*. Participants responded using a 7-point scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree; $\alpha = .90$).

Perceived discrimination. Participants completed a 3-item measure assessing the extent to which they believed that the woman suing the company had been discriminated against.³ Items included: *The class of women suing Novartis was discriminated against*; *The class of women suing Novartis was given the same opportunities as male employees* (reverse coded); and *The class of women suing Novartis was treated unfairly*. Participants responded using a 7-point scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree; $\alpha = .83$).

Manipulation check. Participants indicated whether the article they read stated that Diversity Careers magazine had recognized Novartis as a top 100 company for women. Responses options were “Yes,” “No,” and “I don't recall.”

³ Due to an error, the perceived discrimination items referred to “the class of women suing Novartis” rather than “the woman suing Novartis.” Despite this error, participants seemed to interpret the items as intended, as we found support for all predicted effects on perceived discrimination.

Benevolent sexism. Finally, participants completed the 11-item benevolent sexism portion of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory⁴ (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Sample items include: *No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman; Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives; and Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility*). Participants responded to each item on scales from 1 (Disagree Strongly) to 6 (Agree Strongly). The benevolent sexism scale showed good reliability ($\alpha = .93$), and women's endorsement of benevolent sexism did not differ when a diversity structure was present ($M = 2.94$, $SD = 1.27$) versus absent ($M = 2.90$, $SD = 1.11$), $t(236) = -.23$, $p = .82$.

Results

Manipulation Check

Eighty-two percent of participants (94 in control and 111 in diversity) correctly recalled whether the article stated that Diversity Careers magazine had recognized Novartis as a top 100 company for women. A chi-square test of independence revealed that this pattern of responses was not due to chance, $\chi^2(2, N = 249) = 190.86$, $p < .001$. We excluded the 11 participants (3 in control and 8 in diversity) who incorrectly responded to this question but retained the thirteen percent (28 in control and 5 in diversity) who indicated that they did not recall whether the article included this information.

Main Analyses

We hypothesized that the presence of a diversity structure would increase women's perceptions of procedural justice (Hypothesis 1) and decrease women's perceptions of

⁴ In addition to benevolent sexism, we included two alternative moderators: relational interdependence with men (the belief that one is connected to men and defined by one's close relationships with men) and trust toward men. Neither of these moderators interacted with diversity structure to predict procedural justice or perceived discrimination; these results are included in the online supplement.

discrimination against the plaintiff (Hypothesis 3). Furthermore, we hypothesized that these effects would be stronger the more women endorsed benevolent sexism (Hypothesis 4). As in Experiment 2, we used separate hierarchical regression analyses to test these predictions. In Step 1, we entered the diversity structure condition (0 = control condition, 1 = diversity structure condition) and the mean-centered benevolent sexism variable. In Step 2, we entered the two-way interaction.

Procedural justice. At Step 1, the overall regression model predicting procedural justice was significant, $F(2, 235) = 4.62, p = .01$, and explained 3.8% of the variance in procedural justice. This step of the regression analysis revealed the hypothesized main effect of diversity structure, $b = .39, SE = .16, t(235) = 2.36, p = .02, d = .31$. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, women who read that the company had received a diversity award ($M = 3.76, SD = 1.37$) perceived the company as more procedurally just for women compared to those in the control condition ($M = 3.36, SD = 1.20$). There was also a marginal main effect of benevolent sexism such that the more women endorsed benevolent sexism the more procedurally just they perceived the company to be, $b = .131, SE = .07, t(235) = 1.88, p = .06$.

These main effects were qualified by the predicted two-way interaction in Step 2, which accounted for an additional 2.6% of the variance in procedural justice $F(1, 234) = 6.46, p = .01, b = .35, SE = .14$. Consistent with Hypothesis 4, among women high in benevolent sexism (1SD above the mean), the presence of a diversity structure led them to perceive the company as being more procedurally just for women, $b = .81, SE = .23, t(234) = 3.49, p < .001$. However, for women low in benevolent sexism (1SD below the mean), the presence (vs. absence) of a diversity structure did not affect their perceptions of procedural justice, $b = -.03, SE = .23, t(234) = -.12, p = .90$.

Perceived discrimination. The overall regression model predicting perceived discrimination was significant, $F(2, 235) = 4.12, p = .02$ and accounted for 3.4% of the variance in perceived discrimination. This step revealed the hypothesized main effect of diversity structure, $b = -.34, SE = .15, t(235) = -2.20, p = .03, d = -.29$. Consistent with Hypothesis 3, women who read about a company's diversity structure ($M = 4.99, SD = 1.24$) perceived the company as less discriminatory compared to those in the control condition ($M = 5.33, SD = 1.13$). There was a marginal main effect of benevolent sexism, such that women who more strongly endorsed benevolent sexism perceived the company as less discriminatory, $b = -.12, SE = .06, t(235) = -1.81, p = .07$.

These main effects were again qualified by a marginally significant two-way interaction at Step 2 that accounted for an additional 1.3% of the variance in perceived discrimination, $F(1, 234) = 3.12, p = .08, b = -.23, SE = .13, t(234) = -1.77, p = .08$. Consistent with Hypothesis 4, for women high in benevolent sexism (1SD above the mean), the presence (vs. absence) of a diversity structure led them to perceive the company as being less discriminatory, $b = -.61, SE = .22, t(234) = -2.81, p = .005$. However, for women low in benevolent sexism (1SD below the mean), the presence vs. absence of a diversity structure did not affect their perceptions of discrimination, $b = -.07, SE = .22, t(234) = -.30, p = .76$.

Mediation

We used Hayes' (2014) PROCESS macro to conduct a moderated mediational analysis to examine whether perceptions of procedural justice mediated the relationship between the presence of a diversity structure (absent = 0, present = 1) and perceptions of discrimination and whether women's endorsement of benevolent sexism moderated this relationship. The overall model was significant (see Table 4). The index of moderated mediation (-.17) was contained

within a 95% confidence interval that did not include zero (-.32, -.04). When diversity condition and procedural justice were entered simultaneously, the effect of diversity structure was no longer significant, $b = -.15$, $SE = .13$, $p = .27$, but the effect of procedural justice remained significant, $b = -.49$, $SE = .05$, $p < .001$, suggesting that procedural justice mediated the relationship between diversity structure and perceived discrimination.⁵

We used 10,000 bootstrapped samples to estimate the indirect effect of diversity structure on perceived discrimination through procedural justice for women 1SD below the mean, at the mean, and 1SD above the mean of benevolent sexism. This analysis revealed that the predicted mediational model characterized only the responses of women at the mean or 1SD above the mean of benevolent sexism but not women 1SD below the mean. The unstandardized indirect effects for women at the mean (-.19) and 1SD above the mean of benevolent sexism (-.40) were contained within 95% confidence intervals that did not contain 0 (-.36, -.04 and -.66, -.18 respectively), demonstrating a significant indirect effect. However, the unstandardized indirect effect for women 1SD below the mean of benevolent sexism (.01) was contained within a 95% confidence interval that did include 0 (-.21, .23), indicating a lack of mediation for this group.

We also ran a moderated mediational analysis switching the mediator and dependent variable (see Table 4). This model was not significant overall; the index of moderated mediation (.13) was contained within a confidence interval that included zero (-.02, .29).

Discussion

Experiment 3 expands our understanding of how diversity structures shape women's perceptions of fairness. As predicted, the presence (vs. absence) of a diversity structure increased women's perceptions of procedural fairness, and this effect was particularly pronounced among

⁵Procedural justice and perceived discrimination were negatively correlated, $r(236) = -.54$, $p < .001$.

women who strongly endorsed benevolent sexism. This moderation is consistent with research by Becker and Wright (2011) showing that endorsing benevolent sexism increases women's complacency with gender inequality. For women who endorse benevolent sexism, the presence of a diversity structure led them to believe that a company treated women fairly and thereby led them to legitimize the company's potentially sexist actions. However, women who were low in benevolent sexism were not affected by the presence (versus absence) of a diversity structure. This suggests that legitimizing ideologies are indeed relevant in explaining why women so readily believe the simple presence of diversity structures creates fairness for their group.

General Discussion

This research deepens our understanding of how diversity structures shape low status group members' perceptions of fairness and discrimination. Three experiments demonstrate that the mere presence of diversity structures causes women to believe that women are treated more fairly in the workplace. This belief in fairness, in turn, leads women to minimize discrimination against women and to be less supportive of women's mobilization against discrimination. We observed these effects with two different types of diversity structures (diversity training and diversity awards), and with two instantiations of unfair procedures (adverse impact in hiring and unequal pay and promotion) and across undergraduate and non-student samples (See Table 5 for a summary of findings across all studies). Further, women in these studies behaved similarly to men in our prior research (Kaiser et al., 2013), showing that both men and women are susceptible to falling prey to the illusion of fairness. However, the studies also demonstrate that although women on average believe that diversity structures create fair outcomes for their group, women's endorsement of legitimizing ideologies shapes the extent to which they legitimize gender inequality. However, not all legitimizing ideologies operated similarly; only benevolent

sexism, a legitimizing ideology directly tied to women's relationships with men, proved influential.

These data are consistent with theories of legitimacy that argue that low status group members sometimes support systems that disadvantage members of their group (e.g., Jost & Banaji, 1994; Ridgeway, 2011), especially when they perceive these systems as having fair procedures (Tyler, 2001), and especially when they chronically endorse beliefs that legitimize inequality (Major, 1994). Rather than supporting members of their group, women in the current studies sided with workplaces that disadvantaged their group when these workplaces had diversity structures that gave the semblance of fair procedures. Only women who rejected benevolent sexism showed a different pattern of responding.

These findings also build upon research by Dover and colleagues (2014) demonstrating that diversity structures increase perceptions of fairness among Latinos who believe the status system is fair, but not among those who perceive the status system as unfair. Our studies extend this research by showing that diversity structures can cause low status groups to justify inequality, even in situations in which the low status group experiences a lack of distributive justice. Further, these studies provide three separate investigations into this phenomenon, with larger samples than those employed by Dover et al. (2014), providing important insights into the nature of low status group members' responses to diversity structures.

The current studies also point to group-specific processes that resulted in divergent findings between women in these studies and Latinos in Dover and colleagues' study (2014). Among Latinos, general status legitimizing beliefs moderated reactions to diversity structures. This same belief system did not contribute toward understanding women's reactions to diversity structures in Experiment 2. Instead, a gender-specific legitimizing ideology, benevolent sexism,

proved important for women in Experiment 3. This suggests that the same legitimizing ideologies do not operate similarly for all low status groups. We suspect that divergent historical and contemporary factors that characterize sexism and racism in the United States may explain this divergence. Because ethnic minorities and Whites experience intergroup relations that play out in the context of intergroup strife (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998), general beliefs about status are relevant in understanding how Latinos make sense of their unequal relationship. In contrast, men and women often have positive intergroup interactions, making general beliefs about status potentially less relevant in understanding male-female inequalities. Rather, for women, their low status often happens in the context of benevolence, whereby women who do not question their disadvantaged status are beneficiaries of praise and paternalistic protection. This type of positivity leads women to trust men and can decrease their sensitivity to sexism (Becker & Wright, 2011; Saguy et al., 2009).

Practically speaking, our findings suggest that diversity structures have the potential to pose problems for women who confront unfair treatment in the workplace. Civil rights compliance systems rely on women, much like other low status groups, to identify and bring to light discrimination. If women have difficulty seeing through ineffective diversity structures, it may be especially difficult for them to identify and challenge unfair treatment in the workplace. Furthermore, if diversity structures make women less supportive of their group's efforts to mobilize against sexism, diversity structures may create an additional hurdle for women who confront sexism, as they must not only try to convince high status groups that they have been treated wrongfully (Kaiser et al., 2013), but also convince members of their *own* group to support their efforts to gain restitution.

Although we suggest that diversity structures cause women to legitimize inequality against their group, we did not have enough power to compare whether White women and women of color responded similarly to diversity structures. Future research could benefit from examining legitimizing responses at the intersection of race and gender, as White women and women of color might have different responses in situations involving sexism (Settles, Pratt-Hyatt, & Buchanan, 2008)

This research points to a need for empirically-based strategies to help people accurately evaluate diversity structures and to help companies pursue diversity goals without obscuring unfair treatment. One troublesome interpretation of this research is that companies may intentionally or unintentionally use diversity structures to divert attention from discriminatory practices. Some research suggests that diversity structures are often the creation of human resource managers attempting to create a more positive image of a company following discrimination lawsuits (Marques, 2010) or even to prevent discrimination lawsuits from occurring (Dobbin, 2009). However, in many cases, companies implement diversity structures because they genuinely wish to diversify their workforces and reap the potential benefits that can come from consideration of many different perspectives. To this end, companies could improve the outcomes of their diversity efforts by changing the way they approach and implement diversity management initiatives. Beyond simply professing a commitment to workplace equality and diversity, companies could devote resources to developing, testing, and implementing efficacy-based approaches to diversity management and monitoring the outcomes of these diversity efforts (see Kaiser & Quintanilla, in press, for a fuller discussion of policy implications). Moving toward an evidence-based model of diversity practices may reduce the prevalence of ineffective diversity structures and expose the weaknesses of existing structures.

References

- Ashmore, R. D., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 130*(1), 80-114.
- Becker, J. C., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Yet another dark side of chivalry: Benevolent sexism undermines and hostile sexism motivates collective action for social change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(1), 62-77.
- Cohen, G. L., Steele, C. M., & Ross, L. D. (1999). The mentor's dilemma: Providing critical feedback across the racial divide. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*(10), 1302-1318.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 386-400.
- Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review, 96*(4), 608-630.
- Cross, S. E., Bacon, P. L., & Morris, M. L. (2000). The relational-interdependent self-construal and relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(4), 791-808.
- Dasgupta, N. (2004). Implicit ingroup favoritism, outgroup favoritism, and their behavioral manifestations. *Social Justice Research, 17*(2), 143-169.
- Dixon, J., Tropp, L. R., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2010). "Let them eat harmony": Prejudice-reduction strategies and attitudes of historically disadvantaged groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 19*(2), 76-80.
- Dobbin, F. (2009). *Inventing Equal Opportunity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Dover, T., Major, B., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Diversity structures, status and system-justifying beliefs: When diversity initiatives backfire. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 17(4), 485-493.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Edelman, L. B., Fuller, S. R., & Mara-Dittra, I. (2001). Diversity rhetoric and the managerialization of law. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106, 1589-1641.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491-512.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as contemporary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56(2), 109-118.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D. Masser, B. ... Lopez, W. L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 763-775.
- Gurin, P. (1985). Women's gender consciousness. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 49(2), 143-163.
- Hayes, A. F. (2014). *SPSS, SAS, and Mplus Macros and Code*. Retrieved from <http://afhayes.com/spss-sas-and-mplus-macros-and-code.html>
- Higginbotham, E., & Webber, L. (1999). Perceptions of workplace discrimination among black and white professional-managerial women. In I. Browne (Ed.). *Latinas and African American women at work: Race, gender, and economic inequality* (pp. 327-354). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jost, J., & Banaji, M. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*, 1-27.
- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2002). The psychology of system justification and the palliative function of ideology. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *13*, 111-153.
- Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and contemporary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*(3), 498-509.
- Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013). Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *104*(3), 504-519.
- Kaiser, C. R. & Quintanilla, V. D. (in press). Access to counsel: Psychological science can improve the potential of civil rights enforcement. *Policy Insights from Behavioral and Brain Sciences*.
- Kaiser, C. R., Vick, S. B., & Major, B. (2006). Prejudice expectations moderate preconscious attention to cues that are threatening to social identity. *Psychological Science*, *17*(4), 332-338.
- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, *71*, 589-617.

- Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. (1998). How affirmative action became diversity management: Employer response to antidiscrimination law 1961 to 1996. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41*, 960-984.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research* (pp. 27-55), New York: Plenum Press.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T.R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social comparisons, legitimacy appraisals, and group membership. In M. Zanna (Ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology*, (Vol. 26, pp. 293-355). NY: Academic Press.
- Major, B., & Kaiser, C. R. (2006). A social psychological perspective on perceiving and reporting discrimination. *Law & Social Inquiry, 31*(4), 801-830.
- Major, B., Sawyer, P. J., & Kunstman, J. W. (2013). Minority perceptions of Whites' motives for responding without prejudice: The perceived internal and external motivation to avoid prejudice scales. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*(3), 401-414.
- Major, B., & Schmader, T. (2001). Legitimacy and the construal of social disadvantage. In J. T. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations* (pp. 176-204). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224-253.

- Marques, J. F. (2010). Colorful window dressing: A critical review on workplace diversity in three major American corporations. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21(4), 435-446.
- O'Brien, L.T., & Major B., (2005). System-justifying beliefs and psychological well-being: The roles of group status and identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(12), 1718-1729.
- Oppenheimer, D. M., Meyvis, T., & Davidenko, N. (2009). Instructional manipulation checks: Detecting satisficing to increase statistical power. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(4), 867-872.
- Paluck, E. L. (2006). Diversity training and intergroup contact: A call to action research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62, 439-451.
- Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Dittmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 615-630.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2011). *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*. New York, NY: Oxford.
- Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Unpacking the gender system: A theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender and Society*, 18(4), 510-531.
- Ridgeway, C. L., & Smith-Lovin, L. (1999). The gender system and interaction. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 191-216.
- Rudman, L., & Glick, P. (2008). *The social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Saguy, T., Tausch, N., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2009). The irony of harmony: Intergroup contact can produce false expectations for equality. *Psychological Science, 20*(1), 114-121.
- Schmader, T., Major, B., & Gramzow, R. H. (2001). Coping with ethnic stereotypes in the academic domain: Perceived injustice and psychological disengagement. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(1), 93-111.
- Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. A. J., & Chavous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2*(1), 18-39.
- Settles, I. H., Pratt-Hyatt, J. S., & Buchanan, N. T. (2008). Through the lens of race: Black and White women's perceptions of womanhood. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*(4), 454-468.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidanius, J., & Veniegas, R. C. (2000). Gender and race discrimination. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination: The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & L. W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tyler, T. R. (2001). A psychological perspective on the legitimacy of institutions and authorities.

In J. T. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations* (pp. 176-204). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Unzueta, M. M., & Binning, K. R. (2011). Diversity in the eye of the beholder: How concern for the in-group affects perceptions of racial diversity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(1), 28-38.

Appendix A: Diversity and Managerial Training Program Descriptions

Diversity Training Program:

Smith and Simon Corp. considers its employees to be one of its greatest assets. All Smith and Simon Corp management-level employees are required to participate in a mandatory training program called FOSTERING WOMEN'S SUCCESS. The goal of this program is to foster improved communication among male and female employees, to develop increased sensitivity to managing gender diversity, and to establish ways of recognizing and rewarding good performance that do not discriminate against women.

Managerial (Control) Training Program:

Smith and Simon Corp. considers its employees to be one of its greatest assets. All Smith and Simon Corp management-level employees are required to participate in a mandatory training program called FOSTERING EMPLOYEE SUCCESS. The goal of this program is to foster improved communication among employees, to develop increased sensitivity to managing personnel, and to establish ways of recognizing and rewarding good performance.

Appendix B: Lawsuit Article

Novartis Bias Suit to Begin

By DUFF WILSON

A lawsuit alleging that Novartis Pharmaceuticals practiced sex discrimination against a female employee is set to go to trial on Wednesday in federal court in New York.

The suit alleges that Novartis, the United States subsidiary of the Swiss drug giant, discriminated against Lucy Gibbons, the plaintiff, in pay and promotions. Gibbons, who worked in a sales position at the company, received \$105 a month less than men in comparable sales positions, according to her lawyers.

Novartis denies the claims, Amy L. Bess, a lawyer for the company, said on Tuesday. [She noted that Novartis had been cited by Diversity Careers magazine as one of the 100 Best Workplaces for Women in the nation for 10 years in a row, through 2013.]

David W. Sanford, the lead lawyer for Gibbons who filed the suit in 2007, says Novartis discriminated against his client.

“We will have overwhelming evidence to show that managers knowingly paid Lucy Gibbons less than her male counterparts, even though her sales figures were excellent. Sanford said in an interview by phone on Tuesday. Additionally, his affidavit noted that she was repeatedly passed over for promotion in favor of men who had inferior sales numbers.

Gibbons is seeking back pay, plus compensatory and punitive damages, he said.

Ms. Bess, the Novartis lawyer, said the company looked forward to telling its story in court. Novartis will call as witnesses a number of female sales workers who had “incredibly positive” experiences at the company, she said. “Novartis is adamant that it has absolutely done the right thing,” Ms. Bess said in a telephone interview on Tuesday. “It doesn’t discriminate against women. Its policies and practices are absolutely cutting edge[, and it has been recognized repeatedly by Diversity Careers magazine as a top company for women].”

Novartis made \$8.5 billion in profit on \$44.3 billion in sales last year, led by the blood pressure drug Diovan and leukemia therapy Gleevec.

Note: Bracketed information was included only in the diversity structure condition.

Table 1: *Experiment 1 Mediation Analysis*

Path/effect	B	SE	95% Confidence Interval
<i>Predicted Model</i>			
<i>c</i> (diversity condition → litigation support)	-.36*	.15	
<i>a</i> (diversity condition → procedural justice)	.75***	.21	
<i>b</i> (procedural justice → litigation support)	-.28***	.07	
<i>c'</i>	-.14	.15	
<i>a</i> × <i>b</i> (mediation effect)	-.21**	.09	-.44, -.09
<i>Alternative Model</i>			
<i>c</i> (diversity condition → procedural justice)	.75***	.21	
<i>a</i> (diversity condition → litigation support)	-.36*	.15	
<i>b</i> (litigation support → procedural justice)	-.52***	.12	
<i>c'</i>	.57**	.20	
<i>a</i> × <i>b</i> (mediation effect)	.18*	.10	.04, .42

Note. Diversity condition was coded as 0 (control) or 1 (diversity structure). Estimates are unstandardized. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 2: *Recollection of Men and Women's Qualifications (means and standard deviations)*

Variable	Diversity Condition		Control Condition	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Years of Work Experience	7.82 (1.15)	7.18 (1.77)	8.16 (1.15)	7.39 (1.91)
Resume Score	4.50 (.63)	4.59 (.76)	4.66 (.72)	4.50 (.76)
Test Score	5.41 (.68)	5.48 (.74)	5.51 (.74)	5.56 (.78)
% High School Diploma	3.09 (1.52)	2.87 (1.73)	3.52 (2.67)	3.25 (2.86)
% Bachelor's Degree	7.46 (1.60)	7.70 (1.68)	7.60 (1.90)	7.74 (2.10)
% Master's Degree	2.59 (1.22)	2.61 (1.04)	3.02 (1.80)	2.98 (1.80)

Table 3: *Experiment 2 Mediation Analysis*

Path/effect	B	SE	95% Confidence Interval
<i>Predicted Model</i>			
<i>c</i> (diversity condition → perceived discrimination)	-.38**	.13	
<i>a</i> (diversity condition → procedural justice)	.70***	.19	
<i>b</i> (procedural justice → perceived discrimination)	-.25***	.06	
<i>c'</i>	-.20	.13	
<i>a</i> × <i>b</i> (mediation effect)	-.17**	.06	-.33, -.07
<i>Alternative Model</i>			
<i>c</i> (diversity condition → procedural justice)	.70***	.19	
<i>a</i> (diversity condition → perceived discrimination)	-.38**	.13	
<i>b</i> (perceived discrimination → procedural justice)	-.50***	.11	
<i>c'</i>	.51**	.19	
<i>a</i> × <i>b</i> (mediation effect)	.19*	.08	.06, .38

Note. Diversity condition was coded as 0 (control) or 1 (diversity structure). Estimates are unstandardized. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4: *Experiment 3 Moderated Mediation Analysis*

Path/effect	B	SE	95% Confidence Interval
<i>Predicted Model</i>			
<i>c</i> (diversity condition → perceived discrimination)	-.34*	.15	
<i>a</i> (diversity condition → procedural justice)	.39*	.16	
<i>b</i> (procedural justice → perceived discrimination)	-.49***	.05	
<i>c'</i>	-.15	.13	
<i>a</i> × <i>b</i> (mediation effect) for -1SD BS	.01	.11	-.21, .23
<i>a</i> × <i>b</i> (mediation effect) for mean BS	-.19	.08	-.36, -.04
<i>a</i> × <i>b</i> (mediation effect) for +1SD BS	-.40	.12	-.66, -.18
<i>Alternative Model</i>			
<i>c</i> (diversity condition → procedural justice)	.39*	.17	
<i>a</i> (diversity condition → perceived discrimination)	-.34*	.15	
<i>b</i> (perceived discrimination → procedural justice)	-.58***	.06	
<i>c'</i>	.20	.14	
<i>a</i> × <i>b</i> (mediation effect) for -1SD BS	.04	.12	-.20, .26
<i>a</i> × <i>b</i> (mediation effect) for mean BS	.19	.09	.03, .38

$a \times b$ (mediation effect) for +1SD BS .35 .14 .09, .64

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Table 5: *Descriptive Statistics (means and standard deviations)*

	Diversity Condition	Control Condition
<i>Experiment 1</i>		
Procedural Justice	5.60 (1.14)	4.85 (1.06)
Support for Sexism Litigation	-.18 (.66)	.18 (.94)
<i>Experiment 2</i>		
Procedural Justice	3.89 (1.19)	3.19 (1.08)
Perceived Discrimination	4.70 (.73)	5.08 (.86)
Status Legitimizing Beliefs	2.68 (.68)	2.81 (.62)
<i>Experiment 3</i>		
Procedural Justice	3.76 (1.37)	3.36 (1.20)
Perceived Discrimination	4.99 (1.24)	5.33 (1.13)
Benevolent Sexism	2.94 (1.27)	2.90 (1.11)

Highlights:

- The mere presence of diversity structures shapes women's reasoning about justice.
- Diversity structures cause women to perceive organizations as procedurally fair.
- Diversity structures cause women to perceive sexist outcomes as justified.
- Diversity structures can ironically make it more difficult to remedy injustice.
- Diversity structures' effects are larger among women high in benevolent sexism.