

GENDER AND RACE/ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN CONSEQUENCES OF
DISCRIMINATION: A MULTIVARIATE EXAMINATION

by

CARRIE NOBLE BYRUM

(Under the Direction of Lillian T. Eby)

ABSTRACT

The aim of the current study was to investigate the race/ethnic and gender subgroup differences in subjective outcomes after treatment discrimination in the workplace. Individuals responded to a series of questions intended to measure their subjective work and non-work outcomes (e.g., supervisor satisfaction, coworker satisfaction, work satisfaction, physical health, psychological health). They also responded to 12 questions intended to ascertain their experience of specific discriminatory events at work (e.g., unable to get answers regarding promotion, unjustified negative comments on evaluation, excluded from career-enhancing social events). Results indicated that individuals who experience discrimination at work have less positive outcomes than individuals who do not. Moreover, the differences between specific subgroups both experiencing and not experiencing discrimination followed the same general pattern such that Black and non-Hispanic White men had similar outcomes, Hispanic men and non-Hispanic White women had similar outcomes, and Black and Hispanic women had similar outcomes. In addition, the results of this study demonstrated similarity in outcomes for non-Hispanic Whites compared to Blacks and Hispanics as well as for men compared to women. Implications of these results are that the experience of discrimination is uniformly negative for all who experience it but also that the outcomes of members of specific subgroups are, for the most part, reflective of their position within none, one or two low status social groups.

INDEX WORDS: Discrimination, race, ethnicity, gender, MANOVA, standpoint theory, work outcomes, nonwork outcomes

GENDER AND RACE/ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN CONSEQUENCES OF
DISCRIMINATION: A MULTIVARIATE EXAMINATION

by

CARRIE NOBLE BYRUM

B.A., Agnes Scott College, 1993

A.B., The University of Georgia, 1997

M.S., The University of Georgia, 2002

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2006

© 2006

Carrie Noble Byrum

All Rights Reserved

GENDER AND RACE/ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN CONSEQUENCES OF
DISCRIMINATION: A MULTIVARIATE EXAMINATION

by

CARRIE NOBLE BYRUM

Major Professor: Lillian T. Eby

Committee: Gary Lautenschlager
Garnett Stokes
Kecia Thomas

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2006

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my parents, John and Carole Noble. Your love, unfailing support, and steadfast belief in me have been the greatest gift I have ever received and serve as an inspiration for me as a parent.

Also, this work is dedicated to my husband, Robert Derek Byrum. Without your love, encouragement, and patience I would not have been able to reach my goal.

Finally, this work is dedicated to my children. I hope that this accomplishment demonstrates to you that through determination, hard work, and support from your family you can achieve what your heart desires. I love you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my sister, Rachel Noble Lipari, whose assistance and encouragement throughout this process have been invaluable.

Thank you to Suzanne Tsacoumis for the mentoring and guidance she provided over the past three years. I also would like to thank my colleagues at Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO).

Thank you to Lillian T. Eby, my mentor and advisor since 1997. Her intelligence and enthusiasm for industrial/organizational psychology inspired me to pursue this field. It has been my privilege to work with her.

Thank you to my committee members: Gary Lautenschlager, Garnett Stokes, and Kecia Thomas. Their knowledge and expertise were inestimable.

Thanks to my family: John, Carole, Josh, Rachel, William, and Nelle for believing in me and supporting me in this academic endeavor and throughout my life.

Finally, thank you to Derek, Tessa, and Noah for your patience and unconditional love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Discrimination.....	5
Outcomes of Discrimination.....	9
Critique of Discrimination Literature.....	18
Standpoint Theory as a Conceptual Framework.....	24
Experiences of Distinct Social Group Members.....	28
2 METHOD.....	37
Survey.....	37
Participants.....	39
Measures.....	40
Analyses.....	49
3 RESULTS.....	59
MANOVA.....	59
Descriptive Discriminant Analysis (DDA).....	62

4	DISCUSSION	86
	Function 1	87
	Interpretation of Function 1 Results for Hypotheses 1a and 1b.....	91
	Function 2	95
	Interpretation of Function 2 Results	97
	Function 3	100
	Interpretation of Function 3 Results	102
	Contributions of Current Study.....	104
	Implications of Current Study.....	106
	Limitations	113
	Future Research	118
5	SUMMARY	121
	Conclusion	122
	REFERENCES	124
	APPENDICES	146
	A MEASURES USED TO ESTABLISH SUBGROUPS	147
	B OUTCOME VARIABLE MEASURES	149

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Gender and Race/Ethnicity Subgroup Sizes	51
Table 2: Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroup and Education.....	52
Table 3: Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroups and Marital Status.....	53
Table 4: Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroups and Service	54
Table 5: Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroup and Pay grade	55
Table 6: Factor Analysis of Discrimination Scale	56
Table 7: Reliability of Discrimination Scale and Subscales by Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroups.....	57
Table 8: Reliability of Study Variables by Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroups	58
Table 9: Correlations among Study Variables for Total Sample.....	70
Table 10: Correlations among Study Variables for Non-Hispanic White Men.....	71
Table 11: Correlations among Study Variables for Non-Hispanic White Women	72
Table 12: Correlations among Study Variables for Hispanic Men.....	73
Table 13: Correlations among Study Variables for Hispanic Women	74
Table 14: Correlations among Study Variables for Black Men.....	75
Table 15: Correlations among Study Variables for Black Women	76
Table 16: Log Determinants across Presence/Absence of Discrimination Race/Ethnic and Gender Subgroups	77

Table 17: Descriptive Statistics and Univariate F Values for Differences between Subgroups	78
Table 18: Error Correlations for Differences between Subgroups	79
Table 19: Test of Dimensionality	80
Table 20: F-to-Remove for Outcome Variables	81
Table 21: Standardized LDF Weights and Structure r Correlations	82
Table 22: Group Means on LDF ₁	83
Table 23: Group Means on LDF ₂	84
Table 24: Group Means on LDF ₃	85

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

One of the most controversial social issues that the United States has struggled with in the past 140 years is the pervasive and divisive effect of racial/ethnic and gender discrimination. An area in which racial/ethnic and gender discrimination has been especially prevalent is employment. In fact, as recently as 2004, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) received over 24,000 charges of sex-based discrimination and recovered over 100 million dollars in monetary benefits (not including financial benefits received from litigation) for aggrieved individuals (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2005a). Further, in the same year, for race-based charges of discrimination, the EEOC reported resolving over 29,000 race-based discrimination charges and recovered 61.1 million dollars in non-litigation related monetary benefits for charging parties. What is more, the EEOC reports that the number of race-based charges is increasing; since the mid-1990's the number of race-based charges has increased by 125% (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2005b).

Moreover, increasingly members of the traditionally advantaged non-Hispanic White male population are attributing negative outcomes in the workplace to discrimination perpetrated upon their social group (e.g., Nathanson & Young, 2001; Roberts & Stratton, 1995). For example, the Federal Aviation Administration was recently ordered through a consent decree from the EEOC to place a non-Hispanic White male employee in a managerial and supervisory position after he claimed he was denied

numerous promotions because he was neither a woman nor a minority (Pulliam, 2004). Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Justice recently agreed to pay \$11.5 million to non-Hispanic White male claimants involved in a class action lawsuit; the suing parties had alleged that they were passed over as immigration judges during the mid-nineties on the basis of gender and race (McAree, 2004). Clearly, discrimination based on gender and racial/ethnic status in the workplace is an unresolved and contentious topic facing employers, employees, and policy makers.

Studying and understanding workplace discrimination becomes even more critical when coupled with the recent and predicted changes in the composition of the workforce. The Bureau of Labor Statistics recently projected that by the year 2012 the number of women in the workforce will increase by 14.3 percent in comparison to a 10 percent increase in the number of men. Further, while women's share of the workforce is projected to increase one percent by 2012, men's share of the work force is projected to decline by one percent. Moreover, current population projections indicate that minorities will comprise 47% of the U.S. population by the year 2050, up from 25% of the current population (Roberts, Swanson, & Murphy, 2004). Hispanics are projected to represent 22.5% of the population of the United States by 2050; this increase in the Hispanic population will make them larger than all other minority groups summed together (Fine, 1995). As such, organizations will face challenges and opportunities associated with managing a diverse workforce and maintaining competitiveness in a fast-paced, global economy. Rising to these challenges is critical to organizational success because being able to effectively harness the talents of a diverse workforce has been associated with lower turnover, increased organizational flexibility, and increased productivity (Cox, 1993).

Understanding the experiences and perceptions of diverse employees would contribute to the ability to tailor corporate policies and practices to encourage the recruitment, selection, and retention of subordinate subgroup members (e.g., White non-Hispanic women, Black men, Black women, Hispanic men, Hispanic women). Recognizing the influence of membership in race/ethnic and/or gender subgroups is critical to understanding the experiences of individual employees; for example, membership in a gender and/or racial/ethnic subgroup determines how an individual's life and organizational experiences are shaped by racism, sexism, or perhaps both. Because racism and sexism are "socio-political systems of domination that come with expected performances, attitudes, and behaviors, which reinforce and reinscribe unjust hierarchies" (p. 33), the location of an individual in a race/ethnic and/or gender subgroup influences his/her actions and interpretations of the events he/she experiences (Bailey, 1998).

One mechanism for understanding the influence of membership in an oppressed group in society is standpoint theory. Standpoint theory emerged from feminist discourse as a means to describe the association between knowledge and power (Harding, 2004). In fact, the concept of the standpoint refers to the idea that groups share unique histories that are formed on the subordination of their group to the dominant group (Collins, 1997).

Standpoint theory proposes that:

owing to its structural situation in the social order and to the specific forms of oppression and exploitation unique to that situation, each group lives the world in a phenomenologically specific way that allows it to see, or better still, that makes it unavoidable for that group to see and to know, features of the world that remain obscure, invisible, or merely occasional and secondary for other groups (Jameson, 2004, p. 144).

The location of a group in the hierarchy of power in society determines what the group experiences and how they interpret what they have experienced. Another byproduct of a

distinct vantage point in the power hierarchy is that people of different standpoints experience the same events differently. In fact, Weis (2001) demonstrated that Black and White women who experienced similar incidents of domestic violence often perceived and reacted to those events differently. Moreover, Bell and Nkomo's (2001) research with Black and White women executives revealed differences in awareness of and reactions to discrimination in the corporate environment. As such, differences in subgroup reactions to similar events might arise from the influence of unique histories shared only by members of different social categories; one such event is workplace discrimination.

Social and industrial/organizational psychologists recognize the pervasive negative influence of racial/ethnic and gender discrimination on individual and group outcomes and many studies exist on the topic. The present study is intended to contribute to the growing body of research that attempts to understand how workplace discrimination affects members of different social groups. The goal of the current research is to enhance understanding of the psychology of gender and race/ethnic subgroups by studying the impact of discrimination on work and non-work-related outcomes for members of distinct social categories. As such, the general hypothesis of the current investigation is that members of distinct race/ethnic and gender social groups will have different work and non-work subjective outcomes after experiencing workplace discrimination.

This study contributes to answering the call for literature that studies the intersection of race and gender on organizational behavior (Cox & Nkomo, 1990; Rosenstein & Hitt, 1986) and discrimination (Cleveland, Vescio, & Barnes-Farrell, 2005). In addition, it responds to the appeal for literature that helps increase understanding of the consequences of discrimination outcomes in both work (Foley,

Kidder, & Powell, 2002; Shaffer, Joplin, Bell, Lau, & Oguz, 2000) and non-work arenas (Pavalko, Mossakowski, & Hamilton, 2003).

Discrimination

Stereotyping is a cognitive heuristic that is closely related to the concept of prejudice. Prejudice refers to the “attitudinal bias and means to prejudge something or someone on the basis of some characteristic” (Cox, 1993, p. 64). While stereotypes are a component of the categorical characterization of a social group, prejudice relates primarily to negative cognitive and affective reactions to members of socially defined groups. Stereotypes can inform a person’s prejudice but stereotypes are not in and of themselves prejudicial.

Discrimination and prejudice are conceptually linked constructs. The linkage between discrimination and prejudice is most clearly seen in the following definition of prejudice from Brown (p. 66 as cited in Aboud & Amato, 2003): prejudice is the “holding of derogatory social attitudes or cognitive beliefs, the expression of negative affect, or the display of hostile or discriminatory behavior towards members of a group on account of their membership in that group.” As such, discrimination refers to the actions that emerge from prejudice felt toward a social group or category. While discrimination can be positive, it is more typically negative and entails “behaving toward others exclusively on the basis of their category membership, in a negative manner, and without the consent or desire of the group being discriminated against” (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994, p. 171).

Discriminatory behaviors can manifest at multiple social levels; the type of discrimination that emerges is contextually dependent. Three broad types of discrimination have been outlined by Pincus (1996). First, individual discrimination is defined as “the

behavior of individual members of one race/ethnic/gender group that is intended to have a differential and/or harmful effect on the members of another race/ethnic/gender group” (Pincus, 1996, p. 186). This type of discrimination refers to behaviors that occur at the interpersonal level and typically encompasses the intentionally harmful acts of a dominant group member toward a member of a subordinate group that are not embedded within larger organizational or institutional practices or policies. For example, behavior on the part of an individual such as the refusal to provide advantageous relocation opportunities to women employees and the rejection of Hispanics who apply for a newly created position are examples of this type of discrimination. Research has indicated that individual discrimination is still relatively widespread (Karlsen & Nazroo, 2002; Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999; Krieger, 1990). In fact, research on discrimination conducted by Krieger (1990) indicates that 80% of a sample of Black and non-Hispanic White women report experiencing individual discrimination at some point during their lives. Further, a study by Broman, Mavaddatt, and Hsu (2000) reports that 60% of African Americans sampled perceived that they had been subjected to discrimination within the past 3 years. Individual discrimination is directly experienced and therefore easily perceived by the target; it encompasses behaviors that are typically envisioned as manifestations of sexist and racist behavior. Finally, members of any race/gender/ethnic group engage in individual discrimination (Pincus, 1996).

A more subtle form of discrimination that is practiced by members of the dominant social group upon members of minority social groups is institutional discrimination. Institutional discrimination refers to the “policies of the dominant race/ethnic/gender institutions and the behavior of individuals who control these

institutions and implement policies that are intended to have a differential and/or harmful effect on minority race/ethnic/gender groups” (Pincus, 1996, p. 186). Institutional discrimination involves the biased procedures and policies that are entrenched in a societal or organizational structure. For example, institutional discrimination is apparent in the income differential between women and men of equal qualifications and in the racial segregation of the housing market. Because institutional discrimination is intertwined with status quo practices in organizations, it is significantly more difficult to identify its effects than it is to identify the effects of individual discrimination. However, both interpersonal and institutional discrimination share one important characteristic; they are both, on some level, intentional forms of discrimination.

The final type of discrimination to be discussed, structural discrimination, is unique in that it is not necessarily an intentional form of discrimination. Structural discrimination refers to the “policies of the dominant race/ethnic/gender institutions and the behavior of the individuals who implement these policies and control these institutions, which are race/ethnic/gender neutral in intent but which have a differential and/or harmful effect on minority race/ethnic/gender groups” (Pincus, 1996, p. 186). Structural discrimination involves the broad guidelines and practices that are intended to be devoid of racist and sexist content or motivation but which have discriminatory outcomes for women and minorities. For example, governmental policies that determine the development of public transportation in a city and organizational practices that eliminate the most recently hired when making cutbacks are examples of structural discrimination. While perhaps innocent in motivation, structural discrimination is not benign in its effect. In fact, because proponents of policies that have structurally

discriminatory effects can argue that they are race and/or gender neutral in purpose, this type of discrimination is perhaps the most difficult to recognize and eradicate.

All three types of discrimination may have negative effects on the work and non-work outcomes for minority group members. The current study attempts to understand the effects of discrimination that occurs in organizations and, therefore, focuses on workplace behaviors that may be perceived as resulting from individual, institutional, or structural discrimination.

Workplace Discrimination

The three broad types of discrimination reviewed above, individual, institutional, and structural, all occur within societal structures such as organizations. Discrimination that occurs in the workplace has been subdivided further into two types: access discrimination and treatment discrimination (Brown & Ford, 1977; Levitin, Quinn, & Staines, 1971). Access discrimination refers to behaviors that prevent members of subordinate groups from entering into a particular job or organization. As such, access discrimination refers to the initial stages of employment. A review of research revealed that access discrimination is the more thoroughly researched type of workplace discrimination; perhaps because access discrimination is well suited for study in a controlled, experimental context (Rosenstein & Hitt, 1986).

In contrast, treatment discrimination refers to the types of behaviors that occur within the organization. These behaviors typically result in subordinate group members receiving fewer organizational rewards and having reduced access to valuable resources. Treatment discrimination in the workplace occurs when conduct toward a minority group employee is influenced by prejudice toward or stereotypes about his or her social group and

is not based on the individual's merit or past accomplishments. This type of discrimination can have an effect on outcomes such as assignments, salary increases, promotions, and access to training (Ilgen & Youtz, 1986). Just as important in terms of work and non-work related consequences, it can also affect how well a minority group member is accepted into a work group as well as the accessibility of support from supervisors and peers (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990; Ilgen & Youtz, 1986).

A growing body of literature exists that examines the outcomes of discriminatory events that occur in a variety of situations. Research indicates that social group members living in the same society may experience different outcomes to discrimination possibly as a consequence of the particular histories of each group and the different stereotypes of and attitudes toward specific groups (Dion, Earn, & Yee, 1978). This literature will be briefly reviewed.

Outcomes of Discrimination

Prevalence of Discrimination

The majority of studies on the prevalence of discrimination indicate that Blacks and Hispanics report more frequent occurrences of discrimination than do non-Hispanic Whites (e.g., Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999; Roberts, Swanson, & Murphy, 2004). In fact, a recent study by Roberts, Swanson, and Murphy (2004) indicates that while 19.4% of Blacks and 13.4% of Hispanics from a national sample reported experiencing race/ethnic discrimination at work, only 2.1% of non-Hispanic Whites reported suffering from this type of discrimination.

However, perceptions of the prevalence of discrimination can differ by subgroup. For example, Blacks were more likely to indicate that discrimination existed in the

workplace and that both women and minorities were discriminated against than were non-Hispanic Whites and Hispanics (Brown & Minor, 1991). What is more, Kessler, Mickelson, and Williamson (1999) reported that while gender was unrelated to reported major lifetime discrimination, men were twice as likely to report experiencing daily discrimination. Research by Klonoff and Landrine (1995) revealed that women of color were more likely to report occurrences of sexist discrimination than were non-Hispanic White women. In fact, some research has demonstrated that ethnicity plays a larger role in expectations of discrimination than gender (Levin, Sinclair, Veniegas, & Taylor, 2002). Levin, Sinclair, Veniegas, and Taylor (2002) demonstrated that Hispanic and Black women did not differ from Hispanic and Black men in expectations of general discrimination because their assessment of the likelihood of discrimination was shaped more by their race/ethnic discrimination expectations than their gender discrimination expectations.

However, research by Ensher, Grant-Vallone, and Donaldson (2001) did not demonstrate differences by race on a general measure of perceived discrimination at work. Moreover, Blacks, Hispanics, and non-Hispanic Whites in this study who did perceive discrimination all had similar negative outcomes. This suggests the possibility that discrimination creates a negative work environment for all employees who perceive it (Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Donaldson, 2001).

Physical and Psychological Outcomes of Discrimination

Research on the effects of discrimination on psychological and physical health generally indicates that the experience of discrimination is negatively related to physical and mental health (e.g., Bond, Punnett, Pyle, Cazeca, & Cooperman, 2004; Broman, Mavaddat, & Hsu, 2000; Foster, 2000; Gee, 2002; Karlsen & Nazroo, 2002; Kessler,

Mickelson, & Williams, 1999; Klonoff, Landrine, & Ullman, 1999; Roberts, Swanson, & Murphy, 2004; Williams, Neighbors, & Jackson, 2003; Williams & Williams-Morris, 2000). For example, research by Goldenhar, Swanson, Hurrell, Ruder, and Deddens (1998) demonstrated that women who had experienced sexual harassment and gender discrimination from supervisors also reported higher incidents of physical ailments, such as headaches and nausea. Moreover, research conducted using a sample of Mexican-origin individuals in the U.S. demonstrated that discrimination has an effect, mediated through depression, on self-reported physical health as well as morbidity (e.g., heart disease, ulcers, hypertension, thyroid disease) (Finch, Hummer, Kolody, & Vega, 2001). Also, stressful racism and race-based discrimination at work have been shown to be associated with increased likelihood of hypertension in African-Americans (Din-Dzietham, Nembhard, Collins, & Davis, 2004). In addition, a recent review examining the link between racial/ethnic discrimination and health revealed that discrimination is associated with poorer health status and has a positive relationship with a variety of other health complaints (e.g., hypertension) (Williams, Neighbors, & Jackson, 2003). Finally, higher rates of sexual harassment, regardless of respondent's gender, are related to increasingly negative perceptions of physical health (Bergman & Drasgow, 2003; Fitzgerald, 1993; Magley, Waldo, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 1999).

Higher incidents of sexual harassment, regardless of respondent's gender, also are related to reduced levels of psychological well-being (e.g., anxiety, depression) (Bergman & Drasgow, 2003; Fitzgerald, 1993; Magley, Waldo, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 1999). Moreover, research has demonstrated that perceptions of race/ethnic discrimination are linked to negative mental health outcomes for members of different social groups (e.g.,

non-Hispanic Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics) (Roberts, Swanson, & Murphy, 2004; Williams, Neighbors, & Jackson, 2003; Williams & Williams-Morris, 2000). In addition, research on reactions to 'reverse discrimination' revealed that non-Hispanic White men in the reverse discrimination group reported feeling a loss of personal mastery or control over the failures and successes in their lives (Johnson, 1980). This reaction to discrimination is similar to reactions reported by minority group members (Broman, Mavaddat, & Hsu, 2000).

However, not all of the extant literature posits similar psychological outcomes of discrimination for different social groups. Negative psychological effects of discrimination (e.g., lower self-esteem, increased depression and anxiety) have been repeatedly demonstrated in the literature for women (e.g., Amaro, Russo, & Johnson, 1987; Foster, 2000; Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999; Klonoff, Landrine, & Campbell, 2000; Klonoff, Landrine, & Ullman, 1999; Magley, Waldo, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 1999; Pavalko, Mossakowski, & Hamilton, 2003; Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz, & Owen, 2002). For example, Amaro, Russo, and Johnson's (1987) research revealed that the experience of discrimination at work for Hispanic women is related to increased role stress, lower personal life satisfaction, and increased psychological stress. In contrast, research by Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz, and Owen (2002) found that while women demonstrated negative outcomes, the experience of discrimination was not related to well-being for men. Results such as these imply that the experience of discrimination may be more damaging for women than men.

Further, research indicates that it is possible for members of distinct social groups to experience identical discriminatory behaviors differently (Foster, Arnt, & Honkola,

2004). For example, research has revealed that the link between discrimination and psychological outcomes was stronger for Blacks than for non-Hispanic Whites (Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999). Research has also shown that gender contributes to negative psychological symptoms such that being a woman is related to more negative outcomes than is being a man (Klonoff, Landrine, & Ullman, 1999). The demonstration of this link might indicate that some social groups are “doubly disadvantaged” or have more negative psychological and physical outcomes to discrimination because they not only experience more discrimination but they are also more negatively affected by discrimination than other groups when it is experienced (Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999, p. 226). However, some research has shown a striking similarity in the perceptions of discrimination among Hispanic participants to that of non-Hispanic White participants, which may imply a more comparable experience of discrimination between these two groups (Brown & Minor, 1991).

It is also possible for the experience of racism to be more damaging than the experience of sexism. In fact, in a study of discrimination and psychological outcomes, the experience of racism was shown to be the strongest predictor of psychological symptoms over both gender and stress (Klonoff, Landrine, & Ullman, 1999). For example, Broman, Mavaddat, and Hsu (2000) demonstrated that Blacks who perceive that they are victims of discrimination report lower levels of perceived control and higher levels of psychological distress than do non-Hispanic Whites. Moreover, negative psychological symptoms (e.g., anxiety symptoms) were linked to the experience of long term sex discrimination for women of color but not for non-Hispanic White women (Landrine, Klonoff, Gibbs, Manning, & Lund, 1995).

In sum, research has shown that while discrimination generally is related to negative physical and mental health outcomes for members of all subgroups, the relationship between specific race/ethnic and gender subgroups and physical and mental health outcomes of discrimination is more complex. The current study adds to the literature by attempting to further understand the role that the combination of race/ethnicity and gender has on these outcomes.

Work Outcomes of Discrimination

Research designed to study the effects of racial/ethnic and gender treatment discrimination in the workplace is characterized by the study and comparison of outcomes of different social group members. As stated in Cleveland, Vescio, and Barnes-Farrell (2005), “if job-related reasons (such as differences in job qualifications) cannot account for gender differences in outcomes, the most viable explanation for those differences is gender discrimination” (p. 151). Though the above statement refers specifically to outcomes related to gender discrimination, the same rationale and means of study have been applied to research on outcomes related to race/ethnic discrimination.

While gender differences in labor force participation have declined in recent decades, a number of important objective outcome differences still remain. For example, research indicates that the wage gap between men and women still exists, even after controlling for relevant human capital, occupational, and family variables (e.g., Blau, 1998; Budig, 2002). Moreover, Gattiker and Larwood (1988) report that gender significantly predicted salary level and position tenure such that men receive higher salaries and have longer tenure than do women. This earning differential persists despite the superior occupational education obtained by women over men (Miech, Eaton, & Liang, 2003).

In terms of race differences in wages and occupational education, a longitudinal study by Miech, Eaton, and Liang (2003) revealed that non-Hispanic Whites earned more and had higher occupational education over time than both Blacks and Hispanics. Lowest earnings and occupational education were found for Blacks. More specifically, research by Rosenfeld (1980) demonstrated that in terms of a wage hierarchy, non-Hispanic White men have the highest wages followed by men of color, non-Hispanic White women, and finally women of color. Moreover, these differences increased over time.

Racial/ethnic differences in other work outcomes have also been studied. Research has demonstrated that Blacks have been shown to have more limited promotion potential than do non-Hispanic Whites (Baldi & McBrier, 1997; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1993; Hite, 2004; James, 2000; Landau, 1995; Maume, 1999). For example, research by Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley (1990) demonstrated that Blacks received lower job performance evaluations and promotability assessments, were more likely to be plateaued in their careers, and were more dissatisfied with their careers than non-Hispanic Whites. Black managers have also reported receiving less psychosocial support than non-Hispanic White managers (James, 2000). Research by Powell and Butterfield (1997) indicated that Blacks in the federal government have significantly slower career progression than do non-Hispanic Whites. Moreover, research by James (2000) that found differences in work outcomes between Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites also demonstrated that being Hispanic was not predictive of promotion rate, career-related support, or psychosocial support. Results such as these suggest that work-related differences between non-

Hispanic Whites and Blacks may be related to being Black in the U.S. and not related to minority status only (James, 2000).

Likewise, women have been shown to have less promotion potential than men (Landau, 1995). Research has demonstrated that women are promoted at a slower rate, earn less at job entry, occupy lower status jobs, and are less likely to benefit from relocation or job changes than are men (Brett & Stroh, 1997; Cleveland, Vescio, & Barnes-Farrell, 2005; Reskin & Ross, 1992). However, research conducted by Nkomo and Cox (1990) did not reveal any significant differences in promotion rate between Black men and women. Furthermore, research by Powell and Butterfield (1994) with a sample of federal employees demonstrated that women had an advantage in promotion referral decisions and evaluations. Results such as those reviewed above suggest that the different career outcomes of men and women warrant further investigation.

Studies examining gender- and race/ethnicity-related differences in work attitudes have revealed inconsistent results. Some research on work attitudes indicates that non-Hispanic Whites have more positive work attitudes than Blacks (e.g., Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990; Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1995; Slocum & Strawser, 1972), other research indicates that Blacks have more positive work attitudes than non-Hispanic Whites (e.g., Brenner & Fernstein, 1984; Friday & Friday, 2003; Gavin & Ewen, 1974), and some research indicates no significant differences in work attitudes between non-Hispanic Whites and Blacks (e.g., Brown & Ford, 1977; Somers & Birnbaum, 2001). In the few existing studies that examine work attitudes of other minority groups, results have also been inconsistent (e.g., Lankau & Scandura, 1996; Moch, 1980). Similar patterns of inconsistent results can be found in studies of the

relationship between work attitudes and gender (e.g., Andrisani, 1978; Burke & McKeen, 1996; Dodd-McCue & Wright, 1996; Smith, Smits, & Hoy, 1998; Tsui & Gutek, 1984; Van der Velde, Bossink, & Jansen, 2003).

Regardless, both gender and race/ethnic discrimination have been shown to be related to work attitudes such as job satisfaction, turnover, organizational commitment, work tension, and organizational withdrawal cognitions (e.g., Blau, Tatum, & Ward-Cook, 2003; Bond, Punnett, Pyle, Cazeca, & Cooperman, 2004; Ragins, Townsend, & Mattis, 1998; Sanchez & Brock, 1996; Shaffer, Joplin, Bell, Lau, & Oguz, 2000). Moreover, sexual harassment research indicates that the negative effects of sexual harassment on organizational commitment, work satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisors and coworkers, and productivity were similar for both men and women who experienced it, assuming that the severity of the harassment was the same (Magley, Waldo, Dragow, & Fitzgerald, 1999). Further, Levitin, Quinn and Staines (1971) demonstrated that women who experienced higher amounts of discrimination were less satisfied with their jobs than women who had experienced lower amounts of discrimination.

In contrast, research by Roberts, Swanson, and Murphy (2004) indicated that among people who reported race discrimination at work, Blacks and Hispanics had lower levels of job satisfaction than non-Hispanic Whites but also lower levels of burnout and stress. Moreover, research by Shaffer, Joplin, Bell, Lau, and Oguz (2000) indicated that gender was negatively related to job satisfaction and affective commitment and positively related to turnover intentions among women. Among women and men who experienced gender discrimination in the Navy, only women were less satisfied with and more likely to leave the Navy (Rosenfeld, Newell, & Le, 1998). Again, the literature indicates that gender

and race/ethnic discrimination can have deleterious consequences at work for any social group who experiences it but additional research is needed to increase understanding of the idiosyncratic consequences of discrimination for members of different social groups.

Clearly, discrimination generally has negative effects on the physical, psychological, and work outcomes of those who experience it, though arguably some social group members suffer more as a result of discrimination than others. Unfortunately, research on the effects of discrimination has not been devoid of shortcomings. Some of these limitations include confusion regarding the definition of discrimination, a variety of measurement problems, lack of diversity in populations studied, and a focus on the perpetrator of discrimination (Cohorn, Ormerod, & Fitzgerald, in press). Each of these will be briefly reviewed in the paragraphs to follow.

Critique of Discrimination Literature

Scope of Discrimination

While the broad definitions of discrimination are well known and documented (e.g., Pincus, 1996), the application of those definitions to the study of both race/ethnic and gender discrimination has been somewhat problematic. For example, in the case of gender discrimination, the focus of research has been on sexual harassment, often to the exclusion of a more pervasive and arguably more damaging form of discrimination that, while not explicitly sexual in nature, targets a specific gender. This type of nonsexual workplace discrimination would best be characterized as decisions regarding the distribution of resources and opportunities that are made, either consciously or unconsciously, using gender as a determining factor. In fact, Murrell, Olson, and Frieze (1995) commented that a preponderance of gender discrimination research has targeted sexual harassment and

subsequently paid little to no attention to other aspects of gender discrimination. As such, viewing gender discrimination through the lens of sexual harassment is likely to be inadequate for understanding its complexity and establishes sexual harassment as the benchmark for understanding the experiences and consequences of discrimination.

Measurement of Discrimination

Some of the confusion regarding the scope of discrimination for women and minorities is apparent when the measurement of discrimination is reviewed. First, many studies determine the presence of discrimination by using an objective, but indirect measure (e.g., Blau, 1998; Brown & Ford, 1977; Budig, 2002). For example, researchers might examine the salary differences between members of certain subgroups and members of the majority group while statistically controlling for the effect of other potentially relevant variables (Cleveland, Vescio, & Barnes-Farrell, 2005).

Thus, research of this type is based on the fundamental premise that discrimination has occurred if group differences are found. Social group membership is used as the explanatory variable for group outcome differences. Rarely does this research include an assessment of the discriminatory events experienced by the participants as evidence that discrimination has occurred. While an objective, indirect measure does provide some insight into the presence of discrimination on job-related outcomes for subgroup members, it infers the presence of discrimination by demonstrating a link between group membership and differential outcomes for group members. It does not allow researchers to demonstrate the connection between specific discriminatory behaviors and actual outcomes for individuals (Broman, Mavaddat, & Hsu, 2000).

Moreover, the absence of an assessment of the experience of specific discriminatory acts does little to substantiate the claim that discrimination has occurred. The lack of this type of assessment may be a factor in the refusal of dominant group members to acknowledge the presence and deleterious consequences of discrimination (Broman, Mavaddat, & Hsu, 2000). Without direct evidence of discriminatory acts experienced by minority group members, members of the majority group may avoid confronting the possibility of prejudicial actions that result from the behaviors of their own group. Investigating the consequences of discrimination using a subjective, but event-based direct measure of perceived discrimination is important for understanding the link between the experience of discrimination and individual-level outcomes for members of different social groups.

Second, research on discrimination often uses measures of discrimination that are future-oriented (e.g., Foley & Kidder, 2002). For example, Foley and Kidder (2002) investigated anticipated work discrimination in a sample of Hispanic law students. This type of measure does not assess the amount of discrimination actually experienced nor does it measure the amount of discrimination perceived by the respondent; rather, it captures the respondents' estimation of the amount of discrimination at work that is probable. As such, it is not a satisfactory measure of the experience of discrimination at work. Using a direct measure of discrimination that assesses the subjective assessment of the experience of discriminatory acts is better suited for understanding the occurrence and consequences of discrimination at work.

Third, measures of discrimination are frequently single-item and are therefore unable to be tested for measurement reliability (e.g., Bond, Punnett, Pyle, Cazeca, &

Cooperman, 2004; Levin, Sinclair, Veniegas, & Taylor, 2002; Pavalko, Mossakowski, & Hamilton, 2003; Roberts, Swanson, & Murphy, 2004). For example, in a study by Bond et al. (2004) personal experience with discrimination was assessed by asking “Over the last year have YOU been treated unfairly or harassed at the university because of your gender?” (p. 33). Moreover, the use of single-item measures of discrimination is thought to encourage people’s tendency to deny the occurrence of discrimination (Corning, 2000). The use of a multi-item measure of discrimination would contribute to a more accurate assessment of people’s experiences of discrimination as well as allow for the assessment of measurement reliability. This type of examination would better enable a researcher to determine the effect of discrimination on work and non-work outcomes.

The third measurement issue relates to the use of multiple item measures that attempt to assess discrimination in more than one social domain simultaneously (Broman, Mavaddat, & Hsu, 2000; Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999). For example, Broman, Mavaddat, and Hsu’s (2000) study of the effects of perceived discrimination included a measure of discrimination that assessed discrimination when attempting to obtain a job, while at work, while shopping, and while interacting with the police. While these researchers did examine the relationships of each of these types of discrimination to outcomes, this type of measure operates at a more general level of analysis because it does not address specific discriminatory behaviors that occur when in specific contexts (e.g., applying for a job or while working, shopping, or interacting with law enforcement). The use of a more fine-grained approach that incorporates multiple items exemplifying the types of behaviors that represent workplace discrimination would allow for a more in-depth examination of the phenomena.

Diversity of Samples

Another weakness of the discrimination literature relates to the samples typically investigated. An examination of social psychological literature reveals that 63.84% of the articles reviewed examined discrimination based on gender, to the exclusion of other category variables such as race, class and age (Lott & Maluso, 1995). The focus on gender discrimination reduces the ability to draw any definitive conclusions about racial/ethnic discrimination. Clearly more research focused on race/ethnic discrimination is needed.

The focus on gender discrimination is compounded by a tendency among researchers to use non-Hispanic White samples when studying gender. A review of the industrial/organizational literature on gender in the workplace yielded results indicating that of the 186 individual studies published between 1985 and 1997, only 19 studies included non-Whites in their sample (Cooper & Bosco, 1999). This focus on the dominant racial/ethnic group limits the conclusions that can be drawn about the experiences of racial/ethnic minorities in terms of gender discrimination. Gender researchers and theorists (e.g., Cox & Nkomo, 1990; Nkomo, 1992) have increasingly called for the inclusion of race and ethnicity as variables when studying gender in the workplace; the inclusion of race/ethnicity is required to acknowledge the complex interplay that racism and sexism may have on the targets of gender and racial/ethnic discrimination (Ferdman, 1999). The glut of non-Hispanic Whites in research on discrimination may curtail understanding of the impact of gender discrimination on the work and non-work experiences of minority men and women.

Moreover, when minority groups are studied, the most common group examined is Blacks and the most common mode of analysis is to compare their experiences with

non-Hispanic White samples (Cox & Nkomo, 1990). While studying the experiences of Blacks is of value, an exclusive focus on the experiences of Blacks is problematic because it neglects to examine the experiences of other racial/ethnic minority groups, such as Hispanics. This oversight implies that the experiences of other minority groups are either unworthy of examination or indistinguishable from that of Blacks. While more recent research has begun to include other minority groups (e.g., Foley & Kidder, 2002; Sanchez & Brock, 1996), the lack of discrimination research that includes different minority groups clearly prohibits any conclusion about the similarity in the consequences of discrimination for different subgroups.

Focus of Studies

A further limitation of the research on discrimination has been its narrow focus. The typical focus of discrimination research has been on understanding the perpetrator of discrimination and not on the consequences of discrimination for the target. Studies abound that examine individual differences in stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination (e.g., Allport, 1954; Banaji & Greenwald, 1994; Crosby, Bromely, & Saxe, 1980; Devine, 1989; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Krueger, 1996; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995) but researchers have only recently begun to investigate the effects of discrimination on the target (Broman, Mavaddat, & Hsu, 2000). While work of this nature is important to establishing and increasing understanding of the principles and mechanism of prejudice and discrimination, the nearly exclusive focus on the perpetrator of discrimination has led to a “psychology of the powerful” (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999, p. 135).

While work in this area has greatly contributed to understanding the target’s experience, additional research is needed to understand the complexity of

discrimination's consequences, particularly for members of distinct social groups. The research reviewed above demonstrates that discrimination in life and in the workplace generally is linked to negative outcomes. The current study aims to explore the relationship between discrimination and work and non-work outcomes for race/ethnic and gender subgroups at similar levels of workplace discrimination. Outcomes of discrimination may differ by race/ethnic and gender subgroup because of the distinct location of the group in culture, history, and society. Each group has its own unique socially constructed vantage point on workplace events. In the section to follow this concept will be more fully reviewed.

Standpoint Theory as a Conceptual Framework

Standpoint theory offers a paradigm for understanding why similar experiences of discrimination might have different ramifications depending on one's social categorization. Arising from work by theorists such as Sandra Harding (2004), Nancy Hartstock (2004), and Patricia Hill Collins (1986; 1997; 1999), the central tenet of standpoint theory is that knowledge is socially located and arises out of social positions that are formed by power relations. While standpoint theory derived from the examination of women's experiences in a patriarchal culture, it can be extended to incorporate the experiences of other marginalized groups (Collins, 1997; 1999). Hallstein (1999) states that the "rationality in feminist standpoint theories... is the collective knowledge produced by subordinate groups in social contexts-psychological, historical, sociological, political, and economic" (p. 43). As such, standpoint theory proposes that, as a result of experiences of marginalization and oppression, members of race/ethnic and/or gender subgroups in society experience reality differently from members of the

dominant group. Beliefs, attitudes, and values emerge from the social location or cultural experiences of a group (Harding, 2004).

The idea of a standpoint refers to “groups having shared histories based on their shared location in relations of power” (Collins, 1997, p. 376). Standpoint theory emphasizes the importance of the group over the individual in understanding the perceptions of and reactions to life events. Race/ethnic and gender groups emerge through common experiences and positions in the socio-historical and political arena and are more than defining aspects of individual identity; they are formed from structural and material relationships and serve as essential ingredients for perpetuating inequality (Collins, 1997). Individual members of distinct subordinate subgroups may have unique experiences, but the obstacles and barriers encountered by these individuals will be similar to those encountered by other members of that socially marginalized subgroup (Collins, 1997).

Though the distinct social contexts that structure the standpoints of different marginalized groups provide only a partial reality, the perspectives emerging from marginalized groups are thought to be less distorted than those of the dominant group because marginalized groups are not motivated to maintain the status quo (Collins, 1986; Harding, 2004; Hartstock, 2004). However, because standpoint theory posits that knowledge is socially constructed, it does not posit the existence of an absolute truth. The standpoints of marginalized groups are not more truthful than that of the dominant group; rather, they are simply less distorted because they see both what the dominant culture thinks of their group and the realities of membership in their group for individuals. These two visions do not always coincide, leading to the distinctive group-based realities that provide members of marginalized groups with unique vantage points from which they

observe and react to life events. Experiences of discrimination at work would be perceived and reacted to differently because of these unique vantage points.

Furthermore, standpoint theory argues that the unique relationship each oppressed group has to non-Hispanic White men and the social distance between the oppressed group and the dominant group shapes and informs the experiences and perspectives of the group. In support of this idea, research investigating the mentoring experiences of Black and non-Hispanic White women revealed that, despite having similar experiences, these groups had different subjective reactions to their mentoring experience (Blake-Beard, 1999). It is possible to interpret these differences as arising from the different realities emerging from group placement in the power hierarchy.

As such, research that generalizes the experiences of the different genders of one racial group to the experiences of the different genders of other racial groups ignores the distinct vantage points and realities of these group members. Moreover, research that addresses the experience of one racial/ethnic group and assumes it represents the experiences of both men and women within that racial/ethnic group also errs by dismissing the effect that manifest differences in social location has on these gender subgroups. Hurtado (1989) states that “each oppressed group in the United States is positioned in a particular and distinct relationship to white men, and each form of subordination is shaped by this relational position” (p. 833). As such, members of each marginalized group (e.g., Black women, Black men, non-Hispanic White women, Hispanic women, Hispanic men) share a common experience of disadvantage in relation to non-Hispanic White men. However, this common experience of disadvantage is uniquely shaped by the social context from which each group emerged. Therefore, using

standpoint theory as a paradigm for understanding the perceptions of and reactions to discrimination by non-Hispanic White men, non-Hispanic White women, Black men, Black women, Hispanic men, and Hispanic women allows for the expectation of differences by group as a reflection of their differing positions in the social and power hierarchy and their distinct perceptions arising out of a shared cultural history.

Standpoint theory has previously been used to understand experiences of Black women in organizations by focusing on their position as outsiders within in society and the workplace (e.g., Barrett, Cervero, & Johnson-Bailey, 2003; Blake-Beard, 1999; Collins, 1999). Outsiders within is a concept used to describe the “social location or border spaces occupied by groups of unequal power” (Collins, 1999, p. 86) who have a position both within and outside the dominant culture. As such, there are many race/ethnic and/or gender subgroups whose experiences can be viewed using the outsider within concept; Black women, Black men, White women, Hispanic men, and Hispanic women may all be seen as outsiders within in an organization though the group histories that make them outsiders within may vary considerably (Collins, 1999). In fact, the only group whose experiences preclude them from having outsider within status is non-Hispanic White men.

Standpoint theory offers an appropriate paradigm for understanding why differences may exist in the subjective outcomes of similar experiences of discrimination in the workplace. Moreover, standpoint theory is particularly useful as a theoretical framework to explore the experiences of individual subgroups in organizations because of its focus on the distinctiveness of the experiences of marginalized groups in society. The current study examines the intersection of race and gender by exploring the reactions to similar experiences of discrimination among six race/ethnic and gender subgroups (i.e.,

Black women, Black men, Hispanic women, Hispanic men, non-Hispanic White women, and non-Hispanic White men).

Experiences of Distinct Social Group Members

Clearly, there is a diversity of experience among individuals in the workplace. However, studies of members of distinct social groups reveal patterns of experience that unite members of certain groups and differentiate them from members of other social groups. In the paragraphs to follow these experiences will be briefly reviewed.

Non-Hispanic Whites

In 2002, 69% of the U.S. population was non-Hispanic White (McKinnon, 2003). However, recent Census Bureau projections indicate that non-Hispanic Whites in the U.S. will experience a decline in population. In fact, by the year 2030, it is estimated that non-Hispanic Whites will no longer contribute to population growth; rather, the non-Hispanic White population will be declining in size (Day, 1996).

Non-Hispanic White men. Non-Hispanic White men are the main proprietors of social, economic, and political power in the United States. Because non-Hispanic White males are at the top of the power hierarchy, they receive disproportionate advantages both inside and outside the workplace. For example, non-Hispanic White men have higher median annual earnings than non-Hispanic White women as well as men and women of all other races/ethnicities (Werschkul & Williams, 2004). In this way, non-Hispanic White men as a group have opportunities and rewards accorded them due to their political and economic power (Carter, 2000) and can be seen as having a double advantage in terms of the influence of race and sex in shaping their life experiences.

Non-Hispanic White women. The experiences of non-Hispanic White women, in part, are shaped by their roles as members of the most powerful racial group and by their close association with non-Hispanic White men (Hurtado, 1989). For example, non-Hispanic White women have higher median annual earnings than Black women and Hispanic men and women (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004a; Werschkul & Williams, 2004). Moreover, non-Hispanic White women are more likely to complete a bachelor's degree or higher education than Black or Hispanic men or women (Werschkul & Williams, 2004).

However, non-Hispanic White women are also marginalized in society due to their subordinate gender. In fact, Hurtado (1989) argues that White women “experience an individualized and internalized form of social control” (p. 850) that encourages “docility, passivity, and allegiance to white men” (p. 850). Bell and Nkomo's (2001) work with White female executives led them to conclude that the White women they studied were not prepared for the obstacle of gender discrimination in corporations. Moreover, recent examinations of wage inequality reveal that non-Hispanic White women earn 70 cents for every dollar earned by non-Hispanic White men while women of other races earn 85 cents for every dollar earned by their male counterparts (Spraggins, 2005).

Blacks

In 2002, 13% of the population was Black (McKinnon, 2003) and current population projections estimate that Blacks will more than double their current population by the mid-21st century (Day, 1996). Moreover, after the year 2016, more Blacks will be added to the population than will non-Hispanic Whites (Day, 1996). Currently, Blacks have lower levels of educational attainment than non-Hispanic Whites though their rates of educational attainment are higher than that of Hispanics (Stoops,

2004). Furthermore, Blacks continue to have lower occupational attainment, fewer members participating in the labor force, higher unemployment levels, and lower occupational earnings than non-Hispanic Whites (McKinnon, 2003).

Black American experiences are shaped by the particular history of this group within society; the legacy of slavery and oppression has placed Blacks at the lowest rung of the racial hierarchy and, for the most part, discrimination has kept them there (Williams & Williams-Morris, 2000). Recent research indicates that stereotypes of Blacks remain more negative than any other minority group (Davis & Smith, 1990). In fact, research investigating the stereotypes held by Blacks and Hispanics of other racial groups indicates that Hispanics have more prejudicial views and hold more negative stereotypes of Blacks than vice versa (Niemann, 1999). What is more, some research has implied that the negative outcomes experienced by Blacks at work occur because they are Black and are not parallel to experiences of minority group members in general (James, 2000). As such, Blacks may experience unique challenges to success in the labor force.

Black men. Black men are less likely to have completed a bachelor's degree than non-Hispanic White men and women and have lower labor force participation and earnings than non-Hispanic White men (McKinnon, 2003). However, Black men have greater labor force participation and higher earnings than non-Hispanic White, Black and Hispanic women as well as Hispanic men (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004a; McKinnon, 2003). Though Black men are disadvantaged compared to non-Hispanic White men, they have typically have advantages over women of all ethnicities. In contrast, Black men suffer from the most negative perceptions from non-Hispanic Whites than any other male racial/ethnic minority group (Davis & Smith, 1990).

Black women. In general, Black women are less likely than non-Hispanic White men and women to have completed a bachelor's degree (McKinnon, 2003). However, though Black men and women are equally likely to complete high school, Black women are more likely than Black men to have completed a bachelor's degree or higher education (McKinnon, 2003). In addition, Black women earn less than their Black male counterparts as well as non-Hispanic White men and women (Werschkul & Williams, 2004). The ratio of Black women's median annual earnings compared to non-Hispanic White men was 62.5% in 1999 (Werschkul & Williams, 2004).

Furthermore, though the percentage of Black women who are unemployed is greater than that of non-Hispanic White women, the labor force participation rate among Black women is higher than either non-Hispanic White and Hispanic women (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004). Black women's experience with discrimination has been characterized as one of double jeopardy, meaning that they are subject to disadvantages due to their membership in two low status social groups, women and Blacks. Additional research examining the experiences of Black women is needed before the complexities of this race and gender combination is fully understood.

Hispanics

In 2002, Hispanics made up 13% of the total U.S. population. However, this percentage is expected to grow substantially over the coming decades because, from 1996 to 2050, Hispanics are expected to contribute more people to the overall U.S. population than any other racial/ethnic group. By 2010, Hispanics are anticipated to become the second largest racial/ethnic group in the U.S., surpassing in population the Black racial group (Day, 1996). On most economic, education, and employment measures Hispanics

are shown to fare worse than non-Hispanic Whites and Blacks (Elliott, 2005; Ramirez, 2004). Hispanics are less likely than Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites to have completed high school or college, to be employed, and, when employed, are more likely to be in less prestigious jobs (Ramirez, 2004; Ramirez & de la Cruz, 2003; Stoops, 2004).

Because the Hispanic ethnic social group combines people from a variety of Spanish speaking countries (e.g., Cuba, Puerto Rico, Chile, Mexico) as well as native-born individuals of this descent, there is an inordinate amount of within group diversity. Generally speaking, Hispanics face three challenges to their success in the labor force: language problems, lack of education, and biculturalism (Knouse, Rosenfeld, & Culbertson, 1992). Many Hispanics are bilingual and the extent to which they are fluent in English varies widely. These language difficulties may be barriers to success in the workplace (Arbona, 1995). In addition, Hispanics have lower educational attainment than non-Hispanic Whites or Blacks (Ramirez & de la Cruz, 2003; Stoops, 2004); in fact, more than two out of five Hispanics aged 25 and older have not graduated from high school (Ramirez & de la Cruz, 2003). Lack of education may also be an impediment to positive work outcomes. Finally, the extent to which Hispanics have acculturated into the mainstream non-Hispanic White society has been shown to influence their success in the labor force (Arbona, 1995). This is complicated by the notion that identification with a social group is higher in collectivistic cultures and that Hispanics report higher levels of collectivism than non-Hispanic White Americans (Friedman & Davidson, 1999), which implies that Hispanics have stronger social group identity than do non-Hispanic Whites.

Hispanic men. Hispanic men aged 16 years or older are more likely to be in the labor force but have lower median annual earnings than non-Hispanic White and Black

men and women (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004). In fact, in 2002, 80.2% of eligible Hispanic men were participating in the labor force. However, only 14% of Hispanic men were in management positions in 2003 compared to 33.1% and 21.7% of non-Hispanic White men and Black men, respectively. In terms of education, Hispanic males are less likely to complete high school or college than either their Hispanic female counterparts or Black and non-Hispanic White males and females (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004b; U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

Similar to Black men and non-Hispanic White women, Hispanic men are members of one low status group (i.e., Hispanic) and one high status group (i.e., men). However, perceptions of Hispanic males have been shown to be more positive than their Black male counterparts (Davis & Smith, 1990). In fact, research has demonstrated that, in terms of some work outcomes, Hispanic men sometimes report outcomes that place them in a hierarchy of positive results between those reported by non-Hispanic White men and Black men (e.g., Brown & Minor, 1991; Landau, 1995; Miech, Eaton, & Liang, 2003). Furthermore, Hispanic men typically have more positive work outcomes than Hispanic women; for example, Hispanic men have been shown to have higher salaries than Hispanic women (Ramirez & de la Cruz, 2003).

Hispanic women. Hispanic women earn less than their male counterparts as well as Black and non-Hispanic men and women (Ramirez & de la Cruz, 2003). In fact, the ratio of Hispanic women's median annual earnings compared to non-Hispanic White men was only 52.5% in 1999 (Werschkul & Williams, 2004). Furthermore, Hispanic women are less likely to participate in the labor force than any of the other race/ethnic and gender subgroups previously discussed (Elliott, 2005; Ramirez & de la Cruz, 2003). While 80%

of Hispanic men participated in the labor force in 2002, only 57.5% of Hispanic women participated. With regard to education, Hispanic women are more likely than Hispanic men but less likely than the men and women of the Black and non-Hispanic White racial groups to have completed high school or college (Elliott, 2005; U.S. Census Bureau, 2004b; U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

Hispanic women, like Black women, have dual membership in two marginalized groups. The Glass Ceiling Commission Report (1995) indicated that Hispanic women executives felt that being a woman and a Hispanic in the labor force meant shouldering a double burden due to opposition to them as Hispanics first and then as women. Still, Catalyst, a non-profit research organization, reports that, despite facing similar barriers to advancement, Hispanic women are more satisfied with their jobs than are Black women (Advancing Women in Business, 1998). Unique to the Hispanic women's experience however, is the strong influence of a culture that stresses the importance of traditional gender roles as well as more restrictive sex role norms and expectations (Betz, 1993). Catalyst reported that Hispanic women cite family commitments as larger barriers to their career advancement than do either Black or non-Hispanic White women (Advancing Women in Business, 1998).

Each of these race/ethnic and gender social groups has been uniquely shaped by a variety of historical, social, and cultural influences. Moreover, the current educational, economic, and employment experiences of each of these groups are distinctly different not only from non-Hispanic White men but also from each other. These experiences impact the way groups react and respond to the events that occur at work and in the non-work arena, including discriminatory events in the workplace.

Having established standpoint theory as the theoretical framework for positing variation by subgroup and briefly reviewing some of the cultural, economic, and educational differences between subgroups, the suggestion that members of distinct social groups will have different work and non-work outcomes as a result of similar types of workplace discrimination is plausible. As standpoint theory posits, oppressed groups have distinct relationships to non-Hispanic White men shaped by the relative power each group has compared to this dominant group. Non-Hispanic White men benefit from membership in two dominant social groups: male and non-Hispanic White. Because none of the other subgroups to be investigated have membership in both dominant social groups, each encounters unique barriers and obstacles related to membership in either one or two subordinate social groups. For three of the subgroups to be investigated, individuals face obstacles related to membership in one high status group (dominant gender or dominant race/ethnicity) and one low status group (subordinate gender or subordinate race/ethnicity). While, for two of the subgroups to be investigated, obstacles relate to membership in two low status groups (subordinate gender and subordinate race/ethnicity). Membership in none, one, or two low status groups shapes the experiences of these group members. As such, as the number of low status group memberships increases, the more negative subjective work and non-work outcomes both in the presence of workplace discrimination and in the absence of workplace discrimination are expected.

Understanding the influence of discrimination on the work and non-work outcomes of distinct race/ethnic and gender subgroups would better equip organizations to handle the challenges associated with an increasingly diverse workforce. Moreover, organizations that recognize and act upon the knowledge that each race/ethnic and gender

subgroup is distinct will be able to better tailor policies, programs, and/or training for managers that will encourage them to consider differences across subgroups. In turn, increased awareness among managers of the differences across subgroups may result in greater sensitivity to employees which could encourage them to feel more valued, more satisfied with their organization, and less likely to leave the organization.

The present research attempts to increase understanding of the relationships between race/ethnicity, gender, and discrimination by testing the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Members of race/ethnic and gender subgroups who experience workplace discrimination will have more negative work and non-work outcomes than members of race/ethnic and gender subgroups who do not experience discrimination.

Hypothesis 1a: Among members of race/ethnic and gender subgroups who experience workplace discrimination, the following pattern is expected in terms of negative work and non-work outcomes: non-Hispanic White men < non-Hispanic White women, Black men, and Hispanic men < Black women and Hispanic women.

Hypothesis 1b: Among members of race/ethnic and gender subgroups who do not experience workplace discrimination, the following pattern is expected in terms of negative work and non-work outcomes: non-Hispanic White men < non-Hispanic White women, Black men, and Hispanic men < Black women and Hispanic women.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

In an attempt to more fully understand the likely complicated relationships between work and non-work outcomes and the experience of discrimination at work for members of different race/ethnic and gender subgroups, multivariate statistical analyses were performed. Multivariate statistical analyses are appropriate when the intent of the investigation is to examine all the study variables at the same time and to allow the outcome variables to be intercorrelated.

Survey

The data for the current study was obtained from the 2002 Status of the Armed Forces Survey-Workplace and Gender Relations (2002 WGR). The WGR is a Department of Defense (DoD)-wide survey that focuses on gender issues (especially sexual harassment) among active-duty military personnel. The purpose of the 2002 WGR was to “increase understanding of sexual harassment and of policies and programs that prevent it from occurring, as well as gather information on a variety of workplace issues” (Ormerod et al., 2003, p. 2). The 2002 WGR was the third administration of the survey to armed forces personnel.

The 2002 WGR has 16 pages of questions that can be grouped into six broad sections: background, workplace information, mentoring, readiness, health, and well-being, gender-related experiences in the military, and personnel policy and practices (Ormerod et al., 2003). The background section contains questions that pertain to the demographic

characteristics of the respondent such as race/ethnicity, gender, paygrade, and education. Furthermore, the background section contains questions relating to the respondent's attitudes toward the military and the workplace (e.g., intentions to stay, military life satisfaction). The workplace information section contains questions relating to the respondent's satisfaction with his/her supervisors, coworkers, and leadership. The mentoring section contains questions that relate to the respondent's mentoring experiences in the military, focusing on the effectiveness or utility of the mentor-protégé relationship. The readiness, health, and well-being section contains questions that pertain to the respondent's psychological and physical well-being. The gender-related experiences in the military section contains questions related to reporting of gender experiences (i.e., sexual harassment) and satisfaction with the reporting process. The discrimination scale is contained in this section. Finally, the personnel policy and practices section contains questions that pertain to the sexual harassment awareness training received and the respondent's assessment of the effectiveness and utility of that training. As can be noted from the description above, questions relating to workplace outcomes were assessed prior to questions relating to unprofessional, gender-related experiences, such as discrimination.

The content of the 2002 WGR was derived from military personnel focus group feedback, input from representatives of the individual Services, and input from representatives of the policy offices within the Office of the Under Secretary of the Defense for Personnel and Readiness (Ormerod et al., 2003). Scales that measured the content areas that emerged from the three sources above were obtained in three ways. First, a review of relevant psychological literature pinpointed many scales that were subsequently adapted for use with a military population. Second, scales were obtained from surveys previously used

in a military setting. Finally, scale development was undertaken by researchers at the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Scales developed by these researchers were pilot tested using a military sample and refined using the results of that pilot (Ormerod et al., 2003).

The population of interest for the 2002 WGR included all active-duty members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. Respondents represented all paygrades up to the O-6 (i.e., colonel) level. Furthermore, respondents were required to have at least six months of service at the time of the survey mail out. The initial sample for the 2002 WGR consisted of a “non-proportional stratified, single-stage random sample of 60,415 active-duty military personnel” (Ormerod et al., 2003, p. 2). The sample was stratified based on the categories of Service, gender, paygrade, and race/ethnicity. Of the initial sample, 56,521 people met the eligibility requirements listed above. All members of the sample were provided opportunities to take the survey via a paper and pencil booklet and a web-based version of the survey. Two thirds of all respondents took the paper and pencil version of the 2002 WGR. The response rate based on the number of eligible respondents was 36%, with completed surveys received from 19,960 active-duty members (women, $n = 9,725$; men, $n = 10,235$). Further information regarding the development of the 2002 WGR and survey administration can be found in Elig (2003), Ormerod et al. (2003), and Willis, Mohamed, and Lipari (2002). The sections to follow will report information pertaining only to the scales used in the current study.

Participants

Participants in the current study included a subsample of the 19,960 eligible respondents. Because part of the focus of the current investigation was on race/ethnic

differences, only those respondents who self-reported their race/ethnicity as Black, Hispanic, or non-Hispanic White were included in the study sample ($n = 17,874$). Furthermore, the method of handling missing data resulted in additional reduction of the sample. An examination of the proportion of missing data on the discrimination scale within each race/ethnic and gender subgroup did not reveal substantial differences across subgroups. Therefore, only those respondents who completed all 12 items on the discrimination scale were included in the sample ($n = 17,401$). Next, cases with missing data on the outcome measures were deleted from the sample resulting in a final sample of 15,660 respondents.

The final sample contained 8,013 males (51%) and 7,647 females and was 64.8% non-Hispanic White, 13.2% Hispanic, and 22% Black (see Tables 1-5 for sample characteristics). The race/ethnicity and gender breakdown of the sample was as follows: 34.1% non-Hispanic White males ($n = 5,344$), 30.7% non-Hispanic White females ($n = 4,809$), 9.8% Black males ($n = 1,529$), 12.2% Black females ($n = 1,914$), 7.3% Hispanic males ($n = 1,140$), 5.9% Hispanic females ($n = 924$). The majority of the sample was either married or separated and had obtained some college credits but no college degree. The Air Force had the largest number of respondents represented in the current study with 30.4% of the sample ($n = 4,764$). Finally, in terms of paygrade representation, the enlisted, warrant officer, and officer paygrades were represented by 69.1%, 3.9%, and 27% of the sample, respectively.

Measures

As previously indicated, all measures used in the current study came from the 2002 WGR. The data from the 2002 WGR has been previously analyzed by researchers working

for DMDC. A report of their analyses can be found in Ormerod et al. (2003). However, because the sample used for the current study is a subset of the sample used for the analyses reported in Ormerod et al. (2003), each scale used in the current investigation underwent an exploratory factor analysis and a reliability analysis. The results of these analyses are reported below. Items included to create grouping variables can be found in Appendix A and items included on each outcome measure can be found in Appendix B.

Predictor Measures

Race/ethnicity. Race/ethnicity was assessed with two items (see Appendix A). The first item asked “Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?” and allowed respondents to either indicate “No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino” or to choose from one of four options that specified a country of origin (e.g., “Yes, Puerto Rican”). The second item asked “What is your race?” and allowed respondents to choose from one of six options (i.e., White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, or some other race).

Race of respondent was constructed by combining the responses to the two items according to guidelines set forth by the Office of Management Budget (1977; 2000). For example, if a respondent indicated “yes” to the item that asked about Hispanic ethnicity, they were listed as Hispanic regardless of whether they subsequently responded to one of the race designators in the following item. As such, only those individuals who indicated they were not Hispanic were categorized according to their response to the race question. In this way, ethnicity took precedent over race. Race/ethnicity and gender subgroups were coded so that 1 = non-Hispanic White males, 2 = non-Hispanic White females, 3 = Hispanic males, 4 = Hispanic females, 5 = Black males, and 6 = Black females.

Gender. Gender was assessed by one item that asked respondents to indicate if they were male or female (see Appendix A). Gender was coded so that 1 = male and 2 = female.

Discrimination. A 12-item scale intended to measure discrimination was used in the study (see Appendix A). The discrimination scale was originally developed to measure perceived racial/ethnic discrimination at work in the areas of evaluations, assignments, and careers and was first implemented in the 1996 Equal Opportunity Survey (1996 EOS). The current discrimination scale is a gender version of the original 1996 EOS measure and contains some modifications to the original items. Though the scale was intended to measure the experience of discrimination, it is important to note that it does not ask respondents to indicate if they considered the event to be discriminatory.

In the current study, respondents were asked “During the past 12 months, did any of the following happen to you? If it did, do you believe your gender was a factor?” and were instructed to indicate a response to each of 12 events. Sample events on the discrimination scale include: “You were rated lower than you deserved on your last evaluation” and “You were unable to get straight answers about your promotion possibilities.” Respondents were asked to choose one of three response options for each situation listed. The response options were: “No, or does not apply,” “Yes, but your gender was NOT a factor,” and “Yes, and your gender was a factor.” It was possible to score this item in two ways; one way reflected gender-related discrimination and the other way reflected workplace discrimination regardless of gender. For use in the current study, items on the discrimination scale were scored regardless of gender because otherwise it was impossible to disentangle whether gender was the only factor influencing the discrimination. Furthermore, the cross-section of race/ethnicity and gender was of particular interest in the

current investigation. As such, the response option “No, or does not apply” was coded 0 and both “Yes, but your gender was NOT a factor” and “Yes, and gender was a factor” were coded 1 (Palmieri, Drasgow, & Ormerod, 2001). Items were summed to create a total discrimination score; higher scores indicate more experiences of discrimination.

As stated, the items that comprise the discrimination scale were intended to measure evaluation, assignment, and career-related discrimination. However, results of a parallel analysis using principal components analysis on the correlation matrix suggested the retention of two factors. To contribute to an accurate assessment of the number of factors, a scree test was conducted. The scree test also confirmed the presence of two factors.

Next, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the correlation matrix using principal axes extraction and oblique rotation was conducted to determine the factor structure underlying the data and to determine if all items should be included in further analyses. The factor pattern matrix of the two-factor solution was examined and items with pattern coefficients greater than or equal to .32 were considered for retention (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Two items did not meet this criterion (see Table 6). The two factors that emerged from the parallel analysis and EFA of the discrimination items appear to represent two types of discrimination; the eight items that assess Assignment/Career discrimination (Factor 1) explained 24% and the two items that assess Evaluation discrimination explained 5% of the variance in the data.

Next, a reliability analysis was conducted on the factors that emerged from the EFA. The 8-item Assignment/Career discrimination factor had a reliability of .74 while the two-item Evaluation Discrimination factor had a reliability of .52. Given the poor

reliability of the Evaluation Discrimination factor and the overall reliability of .75 for the original 12-item Workplace Discrimination scale, the analyses in the current study will be conducted using the entire discrimination scale. Table 7 contains race/ethnic and gender subgroup reliabilities for the 12-item Workplace Discrimination scale. The analyses of the investigation will focus on examining relationships between the work and non-work outcomes resulting from either the experience or non-experience of the events on 12-item Workplace Discrimination scale and work and non-work outcomes. As such, the 12-item Workplace discrimination scale was used to split the sample into 12 groups, one group for each subgroup that contains individuals who experienced workplace discrimination (e.g., Black men who experienced discrimination, Hispanic women who experienced discrimination) and one group for each subgroup that contains individuals who did not experience workplace discrimination (e.g., Black men who did not experience discrimination, Hispanic women who did not experience discrimination).

Work Outcome Measures

Pay satisfaction. Pay satisfaction was measured using a single item (see Appendix B). The item asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they are satisfied with their basic pay. Respondents used a five point scale with 1 = Very Dissatisfied to 5 = Very Satisfied. High scores indicate an individual was more satisfied with basic pay.

Intentions to stay. Intentions to stay also were measured using a single item (see Appendix B). The item asked “Assuming you could stay on active duty, how likely is it that you would choose to do so?” and employed a five point scale. Response options ranged from 1 = Very unlikely to 5 = Very likely. Higher scores indicate an individual was more likely to remain on active duty if allowed.

Service commitment. Service commitment consisted of four items derived from Mowday, Steers, and Porter's (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire and was intended to measure an individual's commitment to his/her Service (see Appendix B). Response options ranged from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. A sample item is "Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about your Service. Being a member of your Service inspires you to do the best job you can." Higher scores indicate a respondent is more committed to his/her Service.

Results of a parallel analysis using principal components analysis on the correlation matrix suggested the retention of one factor and the EFA of the correlation matrix using principal axes extraction revealed pattern matrix loadings well within the .32 criterion for retention for all items (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Reliability analyses of the service commitment scale across gender and race/ethnicity indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .80. Moreover, reliability coefficients for all subgroups were .75 or higher (see Table 8).

Supervisor satisfaction. Supervisor satisfaction was assessed using a 9-item scale intended to assess satisfaction with immediate supervisors and other leaders in the chain of command (see Appendix B). The supervisor satisfaction scale contains four items from an experimental measure of careerism and five items created for the 2002 WGR. The four items from the careerism scale were intended to measure the extent to which leaders put their personal career concerns above everything else and was originally created for the July 2002 Status of Forces Survey of Active-Duty Members. Items on the supervisor satisfaction scale are measured on a 5-point scale where 1 = Strongly disagree and 5 = Strongly agree. A sixth response option of "Don't know" was recoded to be 3 or "Neither agree nor disagree" as the two options are conceptually similar (Drasgow, Fitzgerald,

Magley, Waldo, & Zicker, 1999). A sample item is “To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your workgroup? The leaders in your workgroup set high standards for Service members in terms of good behavior and discipline.” Higher scores indicate higher satisfaction with supervisors.

Results of a parallel analysis using principal components analysis on the correlation matrix suggested the retention of one factor and the EFA of the correlation matrix using principal axes extraction revealed pattern matrix loadings well within the .32 criterion for retention for all nine items (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Reliability analyses of the supervisor satisfaction scale across gender and race/ethnicity indicated a Cronbach’s alpha of .89. Further, reliability coefficients for individual subgroups were .88 or higher (see Table 8).

Coworker satisfaction. Coworker satisfaction was measured using a 6-item scale that was intended to assess the extent to which an individual was satisfied with his or her experiences with coworkers (see Appendix B). The items in this scale were obtained from three sources. One item was created for the 2002 WGR, two items were modified from Spector’s (1997) Job Satisfaction Survey, and three items were revised from Edwards, Elig, Edwards, and Reimer (1997) 1995 Form B. Items on the coworker satisfaction scale were measured on a 5-point scale with 1 = Strongly disagree and 5 = Strongly agree. A sample item is “To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the people you work with: You like your coworkers.” Higher scores indicate more satisfaction with coworkers.

Results of a parallel analysis using principal components analysis on the correlation matrix suggested the retention of one factor and the EFA of the correlation matrix using

principal axes extraction revealed pattern matrix loadings well within the .32 criterion for retention for all items (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Reliability analyses of the coworker satisfaction scale across gender and race/ethnicity indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .91. Moreover, reliability coefficients for all subgroups were .90 or higher (see Table 8).

Work satisfaction. Work satisfaction was measured using a 6-item scale designed to assess the extent to which a person is satisfied with the work he/she does (see Appendix B). The items in this scale were modified from Edwards, Elig, Edwards, and Reimer (1997) 1995 Form B. Items on the work satisfaction scale were measured on a 5-point scale with 1 = Strongly disagree and 5 = Strongly agree. A sample item is "To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the work you do: Your work provides you with a sense of pride." Higher scores indicate more satisfaction with work.

Results of a parallel analysis using principal components analysis on the correlation matrix suggested the retention of one factor and the EFA of the correlation matrix using principal axes extraction revealed pattern matrix loadings well within the .32 criterion for retention for all items (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Reliability analyses of the work satisfaction scale across gender and race/ethnicity indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .91. Moreover, reliability coefficients for all subgroups were .90 or higher (see Table 8).

Non-work Outcome Measures

Physical health. Physical health was measured using four items based on the RAND-36 Short Form Health Survey of quality of life measures and can be found on the Medical Outcomes Study questionnaire (SF-36; Ware & Sherbourne as cited in Ormerod et al., 2003; see Appendix B). This scale was used on 1995 Form B and the items were revised for use on the 2002 WGR. This scale is intended to measure an individual's

perception of his/her overall health. The items are measured using a 4-point scale where 1 = Definitely false and 4 = Definitely true. A sample item is “How true or false is each of the following statements for you? I am as healthy as anybody I know.” Higher scores indicate positive perceptions of individual health.

Results of a parallel analysis using principal components analysis on the correlation matrix suggested the retention of one factor and the EFA of the correlation matrix using principal axes extraction revealed pattern matrix loadings well within the .32 criterion for retention for all items (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Reliability analyses of the physical health scale across gender and race/ethnicity indicated a Cronbach’s alpha of .75. Moreover, reliability coefficients for all subgroups were .70 or higher (see Table 8).

Psychological health. Psychological health was measured with a 5-item scale based on the RAND-36, which is a short form health survey (see Appendix B). The five items can be found in the Medical Outcomes Study questionnaire which is derived from work by the RAND corporation questionnaire (SF-36; Ware & Sherbourne as cited in Ormerod, 2003). This scale was used on the 1995 Form B and is intended to assess the amount of time a person has experienced psychological distress in the past four weeks. Items are measured using a 4-point response scale with 1 = Little or none of the time and 4 = All or most of the time. A sample item includes "How much time during the past 4 weeks have you, felt calm and peaceful?" All items were scored so that higher scores indicate more negative psychological health.

Results of a parallel analysis using principal components analysis on the correlation matrix suggested the retention of one factor and the EFA of the correlation matrix using principal axes extraction revealed pattern matrix loadings well within the .32 criterion for

retention for all items (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Reliability analyses of the psychological health scale across gender and race/ethnicity indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .83. Moreover, reliability coefficients for all subgroups were .80 or higher (see Table 8).

Covariates

Pedazur (1997) cautions against the use of covariates when studying differences between intact groups and indicates that their inclusion should not be considered a way of equating intact groups on outcome variables on which they are truly different. As such, no covariates were included in the current investigation.

Analyses

In order to investigate the hypotheses posed in the current research, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) followed by descriptive discriminant analysis (DDA) were conducted. Stevens (1996) indicates three reasons to choose a multivariate analysis over repeated univariate analyses. First, conducting multiple univariate tests leads to a highly inflated overall Type I error rate. Second, univariate tests do not take into account correlations among the variables. MANOVA incorporates the correlations among variables into the test statistic and, as such, is a more accurate reflection of the relationships between the outcome variables (Haase & Ellis, 1987). Finally, MANOVA presents an opportunity to discover whether the race and gender subgroups differ on the combined set of outcome variables, even if the groups do not significantly differ on any one of the outcome variables. Therefore, MANOVA offers a way to investigate group differences on outcome variables that are conceptually similar and, in the context of the current investigation, obtain a more holistic understanding of the phenomenon of workplace discrimination's effect on work and non-work outcomes.

In addition, Huberty (1994) indicates that MANOVA and DDA are useful techniques to employ if the “structure of interrelationships among multiple variables” and “linear representations or composites of relationships among variables” are of interest in a study (p. 32). Because the focus of the current study was on the possible differences between gender and race/ethnic subgroups on different yet related work and non-work outcomes, MANOVA and DDA were appropriate statistical tests.

Table 1

Gender and Race/Ethnicity Subgroup Sizes

Gender and Race/ethnic Subgroups	Sample size	Percentage
Non-Hispanic White Males	5,344	34.1
Non-Hispanic White Females	4,809	30.7
Hispanic Males	1,140	7.3
Hispanic Females	924	5.9
Black Males	1,529	9.8
Black Females	1,914	12.2
Total	15,660	100.00

Table 2

Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroup and Education

Subgroups	Education		
	Less than 12 years of school	Less than 2 years of college credits, but no college degree	4-year college degree/some graduate school
White Males (<i>n</i> = 5,306)	1,064 (20.1)	2,134 (40.2)	2,108 (39.7)
White Females (<i>n</i> = 4,775)	714 (15.0)	2,064 (43.2)	1,997 (41.8)
Hispanic Males (<i>n</i> = 1,129)	292 (25.9)	591 (52.3)	246 (21.8)
Hispanic Females (<i>n</i> = 916)	230 (25.1)	490 (53.5)	196 (21.4)
Black Males (<i>n</i> = 1,514)	350 (23.1)	825 (54.5)	339 (22.4)
Black Females (<i>n</i> = 1,896)	326 (17.2)	1,080 (57.0)	490 (25.8)
Total Sample (<i>n</i> = 15,536)	2,976 (19.2)	7,184 (46.2)	5,376 (34.6)

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses beneath the levels of education are percentages of the total distribution of education within each subgroup. One hundred twenty-four respondents had missing data for the education variable.

Table 3

Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroups and Marital Status

Subgroups	Marital Status	
	Married/Separated	Never Married/Divorced/Widowed
White Males (<i>n</i> = 5,325)	3,875 (72.8)	1,450 (27.2)
White Females (<i>n</i> = 4,788)	2,629 (54.9)	2,159 (45.1)
Hispanic Males (<i>n</i> = 1,135)	761 (67.0)	374 (33.0)
Hispanic Females (<i>n</i> = 922)	479 (52.0)	443 (48.0)
Black Males (<i>n</i> = 1,520)	1,071 (70.5)	449 (29.5)
Black Females (<i>n</i> = 1,908)	914 (47.9)	994 (52.1)
Total Sample (<i>n</i> = 15,598)	9,729 (62.4)	5,869 (37.6)

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses beneath the levels of marital status are percentages of the total distribution of marital status within each subgroup. Sixty-two respondents had missing data for the marital status variable.

Table 4

Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroups and Service

Subgroups	Service				
	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force	Coast Guard
White Males (<i>n</i> = 5,344)	1,260 (23.6)	1,155 (21.6)	1,054 (19.7)	1,263 (23.6)	612 (11.5)
White Females (<i>n</i> = 4,809)	1,009 (21.0)	1,107 (23.0)	618 (12.9)	1,519 (31.6)	556 (11.6)
Hispanic Males (<i>n</i> = 1,140)	240 (21.1)	185 (16.2)	162 (14.2)	492 (43.2)	61 (5.4)
Hispanic Females (<i>n</i> = 924)	294 (31.8)	189 (20.5)	169 (18.3)	225 (24.4)	47 (5.1)
Black Males (<i>n</i> = 1,529)	321 (21.0)	217 (14.2)	181 (11.8)	785 (51.3)	25 (1.6)
Black Females (<i>n</i> = 1,914)	841 (43.9)	356 (18.6)	187 (9.8)	480 (25.1)	50 (2.6)
Total Sample (<i>n</i> = 15,660)	3,965 (25.3)	3,209 (20.5)	2,371 (15.1)	4,764 (30.4)	1,351 (8.6)

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses beneath the types of Service are percentages of the total distribution of type of Service within each subgroup.

Table 5

Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroup and Pay grade

Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroup	Pay grade				
	E1-E4	E5-E9	W1-W5	O1-O3	O4-O6
White Males (<i>n</i> = 5,344)	1,093 (20.5)	2,115 (39.6)	275 (5.1)	808 (15.1)	1,053 (19.7)
White Females (<i>n</i> = 4,809)	1,291 (26.8)	1,736 (36.1)	163 (3.4)	773 (16.1)	846 (17.6)
Hispanic Males (<i>n</i> = 1,140)	410 (36.0)	534 (46.8)	23 (2.0)	100 (8.8)	73 (6.4)
Hispanic Females (<i>n</i> = 922)	420 (45.6)	341 (37.0)	26 (2.8)	91 (9.9)	44 (4.8)
Black Males (<i>n</i> = 1,528)	327 (21.4)	973 (63.7)	43 (2.8)	94 (6.2)	91 (6.0)
Black Females (<i>n</i> = 1,912)	520 (27.2)	1,069 (55.9)	79 (4.1)	131 (6.9)	113 (5.9)
Total Sample (<i>n</i> = 15,655)	4,061 (25.9)	6,768 (43.2)	609 (3.9)	1,997 (12.8)	2,220 (14.2)

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses beneath the pay grade levels are percentages of the total distribution of pay grade levels within each subgroup. Five respondents had missing data on the pay grade variable.

Table 6

Factor Analysis of Discrimination Scale

Discrimination Items	Pattern		Structure	
	A/C	EV	A/C	EV
You were rated lower than you deserved on your last evaluation	-.059	.660	.313	.627
Your last evaluation contained unjustified negative comments	-.064	.607	.278	.571
You were held to a higher performance standard than others	.149	.168	.243	.252
You did not get an award or decoration given to others in similar circumstances	.159	.293	.324	.383
Your current assignment has not made use of your job skills	.554	-.068	.516	.244
Your current assignment is not good for your career if you continue in the military	.589	-.107	.528	.224
You did not receive day-to-day, short-term tasks that would have helped you prepare for advancement	.582	-.020	.571	.308
You did not have a professional relationship with someone who advised (mentored) you on career development or advancement	.477	-.015	.469	.254
You did not learn-until it was too late-of opportunities that would have helped your career	.536	.080	.580	.381
You were unable to get straight answers about your promotion possibilities	.424	.195	.534	.434
You were excluded from social events important to career development and being kept informed	.365	.171	.461	.377
You did not get a job assignment that you wanted and for which you were qualified	.370	.112	.434	.321
Post-rotation eigenvalues for retained items	2.453	1.776		

Note. Primary factor coefficients are in bold. A/C = Assignment/Career Discrimination; EV = Evaluation Discrimination.

Table 7

Reliability of Discrimination Scale and Subscales by Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroups

Subgroups	Discrimination Scale		
	WP 12-item scale	A/C 8-item subscale	EV 2-item subscale
White Males (<i>n</i> = 5,344)	.73	.72	.49
White Females (<i>n</i> = 4,809)	.73	.72	.49
Hispanic Males (<i>n</i> = 1,140)	.77	.75	.60
Hispanic Females (<i>n</i> = 924)	.76	.75	.49
Black Males (<i>n</i> = 1,529)	.80	.77	.64
Black Females (<i>n</i> = 1,914)	.77	.76	.56
Total Sample (<i>n</i> = 15,660)	.75	.74	.52

Note. WP = Workplace Discrimination Scale; A/C = Assignment/Career Discrimination subscale; EV = Evaluation Discrimination subscale.

Table 8

Reliability of Study Variables by Gender and Race/Ethnic Subgroups

Gender & Race/Ethnic Subgroup	Work Outcomes ¹				Non-work Outcomes	
	Service Commitment	Supervisor Satisfaction	Coworker Satisfaction	Work Satisfaction	Physical Health	Psychological Health
White Males (<i>n</i> = 5,344)	.80	.89	.91	.90	.73	.82
White Females (<i>n</i> = 4,809)	.82	.90	.92	.91	.78	.84
Hispanic Males (<i>n</i> = 1,140)	.76	.88	.90	.92	.71	.80
Hispanic Females (<i>n</i> = 924)	.79	.91	.92	.91	.78	.84
Black Males (<i>n</i> = 1,529)	.76	.88	.91	.91	.70	.80
Black Females (<i>n</i> = 1,914)	.82	.89	.91	.92	.78	.85
Total Sample (<i>n</i> = 15,660)	.80	.89	.91	.91	.75	.83

Note. Reliability coefficients are not present for the two 1-item measures (i.e., Pay Satisfaction and Intentions to Stay).

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Table 9 provides the correlations among the study variables across all race/ethnic and gender subgroups. Tables 10-15 provide correlations among the study variables by presence/absence of discrimination race/ethnic and gender subgroups.

MANOVA

MANOVA Assumptions

Three assumptions must be met before conducting a MANOVA: (1) independence of observations, (2) multivariate normality in each group on the outcome variables, and (3) equality of population covariance matrices for the outcome variables (Huberty, 1994; Stevens, 1996). In the current study, observations were assumed to be independent because a stratified, random sampling technique was used for obtaining participants and because participants completed the survey by themselves.

Multivariate normality was examined by assessing univariate normality using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk nongraphical tests. Univariate normality is considered a necessary, though not sufficient, indicator of multivariate normality (Stevens, 1996). Furthermore, normal probability plots and skewness and kurtosis coefficients were evaluated for each variable by race/ethnic and gender subgroup. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk nongraphical tests were significant, which indicated that the variables in the current study were not normally distributed.

Furthermore, the skewness coefficients revealed that the majority of variables were negatively skewed and one variable contained moderate kurtosis.

However, a visual inspection of the normal probability plots revealed that the variables did not appear extremely non-normal. With respect to skewness and kurtosis, the Central Limit Theorem posits that in the univariate case the “sum of independent observations having any distribution whatsoever approaches a normal distribution as the number of observations increases” (Stevens, 2002, p. 262). Further, research indicates that samples with extreme departures from normality that have at least 50 cases will approximate normality (Bock as cited in Stevens, 2002). Given the multivariate extension of the Central Limit Theorem as well as the large size of the subgroups under investigation (e.g., the smallest group contains 238 cases), the non-normal distributions of the variables should not have a noticeable effect on Type I error. As such, no transformations were performed on the data and the assumption of multivariate normality was determined to reasonably satisfied.

Finally, the equality of population covariance matrices for the outcome variables were evaluated by examining the Box M statistic which tests whether the covariance matrices are equal (Stevens, 1996). In the current investigation, the Box M statistic was significant (Box $M = 2528.94$, $F_{(396,17108514)} = 6.36$, $p = .000$), indicating that the population covariance matrices were not equal. However, the Box M test is extremely sensitive to non-normal data. When sample sizes are unequal and a significant Box M test is found, Stevens (2002) recommends an examination of the determinants of the covariance matrices to determine whether multivariate statistical tests would be conservative or liberal. An inspection of the determinants of the covariance matrices

revealed a slight tendency for the larger determinant to be associated with the larger group size, indicating a conservative multivariate test statistic. Moreover, the dispersion of the sizes of determinants across all groups was such that the effect of heterogeneity of population covariances was determined not to be serious. Table 16 contains the determinants for each subgroup. Stevens (1996) indicates that coexisting liberal and conservative indicators tend to cancel each other out.

MANOVA Results

Because all three assumptions were reasonably satisfied, a MANOVA was conducted that tested the null hypothesis that no differences existed between presence/absence of discrimination race/ethnic and gender subgroups on the outcome variables. Criteria for testing the null hypothesis included Wilks lambda and τ^2 . The τ^2 index of association is recommended as it considers all possible canonical correlations (i.e., all relationships between the composite of the outcome variables and the composite of the grouping variable) (Huberty, 1994). Moreover, the τ^2 index of association is a more conservative index than η^2 and recommended when an evaluation of the dimensionality of group differences is of interest (Kline, 2004).

Results of the MANOVA indicated that there was a significant effect for discrimination and race/ethnic and gender subgroup on work and nonwork outcomes ($\Lambda = .83$; $F_{(88,102574)} = 34.48$, $p = 0.000$; $\tau^2 = .02$). Table 17 provides means, standard deviations, and univariate Fs for each outcome variable for each subgroup in the investigation. Further, Table 18 provides error correlations for each outcome variable and eigenvalues.

Given the large sample sizes in the current study, a significant F test was expected. A closer examination of the results from the MANOVA revealed that the eight

work and non-work outcome variables were not extremely effective in discriminating the presence/absence of discrimination race/ethnic and gender subgroups. Wilks lambda is an inverse statistic with a maximum value of 1.0; thus, values of this test statistic that approach zero indicate high discrimination among groups. The Wilks lambda in the current study was .83 which indicated that the subgroup centroids were similar on the functions. This was confirmed with an examination of the plot of the group centroids for individual groups on Functions 1 and 2.

However, the τ^2 index of association was greater than zero ($\tau^2 = .02$) which indicated there was an effect for subgroup membership on the work and non-work outcome variables. Though the magnitude of multivariate effect sizes are difficult to interpret given the scarcity of research in this area (Huberty, 1994), it can be stated that subgroup membership accounted for some of the variance in the work and non-work outcome variables under investigation. Moreover, small effect sizes are not uncommon in behavioral science research, particularly when investigating the influence of demographic variables such as race/ethnicity and gender (e.g., Cohen, 1988; Ford, Kraiger, & Schechtman, 1986; Kling, Hyde, Showers, & Buswell, 1999; Kraiger & Ford, 1985). Therefore, the results of the MANOVA warranted further investigation to understand the relationships between subgroups and the work and non-work outcome variables.

Descriptive Discriminant Analysis (DDA)

DDA Criteria

In order to investigate how well the work and non-work outcome variables differentiated individuals from different gender and race/ethnic subgroups who either experienced or did not experience discrimination, a number of criteria were evaluated

(Huberty, 1994). One criterion was the number of discriminant functions that were appropriate for explaining group differences. The number of possible discriminant functions is the minimum of either the number of outcome variables or the number of groups minus one (Huberty, 1994). In the current investigation, the number of possible discriminant functions was eight. The number of functions possible to interpret was determined by a significance test of the eigenvalues associated with each discriminant function. Only discriminant functions that were significant were even considered for interpretation.

Next, a determination of how well the significant functions discriminated participants from different presence/absence of discrimination and gender and race/ethnic subgroups was evaluated by examining squared canonical correlations. Squared canonical correlations reflect the proportion of shared variation between each discriminant function and the presence/absence of discrimination gender and race/ethnic subgroups (Huberty, 1994). The total percentage of shared variation between all of the discriminant functions and the groups can be seen in the τ^2 value. Of this total shared variance between the functions and the groups (τ^2), the percentage of shared variance between each function and the subgroups was also interpreted in order to compare how well each discriminant function differentiated the presence/absence of discrimination gender and race/ethnic subgroups. Only discriminant functions that accounted for variance greater than zero were interpreted, regardless of the significance test of the eigenvalue associated with that function.

The third criterion for investigating the discriminant functions was the interpretation of the underlying structure of each significant function. This required an

examination of the structure r coefficients associated with each outcome variable within each discriminant function. The structure r coefficients are the correlations between each of the outcome variables and the discriminant function. Function interpretations reflected first the larger (in absolute value) structure r 's and second by moderate structure r 's (Huberty & Lowman, 1997). Huberty (1994) states that the outcome variables that "share the most variation with a given linear discriminant function should define what attribute the linear discriminant function represents" (p. 209). Interpreting the structure r coefficients contributed to understanding of the constructs that differentiate the presence/absence of discrimination gender and race/ethnic groups. In the current study, structure r coefficients with absolute values greater than .25 were interpreted. The .25 cutoff was chosen because it appeared to represent the natural break in the distribution of structure r values across all interpreted functions; there was a substantial gap in absolute value between .25 and the next lowest value.

The fourth criterion evaluated was the assessment of each variable's importance for group differentiation. Huberty (1994) and Huberty and Lowman (1997) suggest using the F-to-remove coefficient, which reflects the effect of a variable on group separation above and beyond the effect of the other outcome variables. The F-to-remove coefficient is a transformation of a partial Wilks lambda and reflects the extent to which Wilks lambda changes when the effect of an outcome variable is removed from the analysis (Huberty, 1994). Therefore, a large F-to-remove value signified that an outcome variable was critical to group separation in addition to the other outcome variables. Conversely, a low F-to-remove value indicated that a variable did not contribute to group separation after the effect of the other outcome variables had been considered.

Finally, group centroids were interpreted to determine the relationship of each presence/absence of discrimination race/ethnic and gender subgroup to the interpreted functions.

DDA Results

Because an effect for gender and race/ethnic subgroup membership and presence/absence of discrimination was determined, DDA was conducted to ascertain which of the outcome variables contributed to differences between subgroups. Five discriminant functions emerged as significant (see Table 19). Based on the F-to-Remove statistic, Supervisor Satisfaction, Work Satisfaction, and Pay Satisfaction were important to group separation above and beyond the other variables (see Table 20).

Function 1 had 63.4% of the discriminating power in the current analysis. The proportion of variance in Function 1 explained by the presence/absence of discrimination race/ethnic and gender subgroups was .11 (see Table 19). As such, approximately 11% of the variance in Function 1 was accounted for by the presence/absence of discrimination race/ethnic and gender subgroups. Based on the structure r coefficients, Function 1 was defined positively by Supervisor Satisfaction (.86), Work Satisfaction (.77), Coworker Satisfaction (.63), Service Commitment (.40), Physical Health (.32), and Intentions to Stay (.32) and negatively by Psychological Health (-.53) (higher scores indicate more negative mental health) (see Table 21). As can be seen in Table 22, individuals who did not experience discrimination at work scored higher on this function than did individuals who experienced discrimination at work. Therefore, Hypothesis 1, which proposed that members of race/ethnic and gender subgroups who experienced workplace discrimination

would have more negative work and non-work outcomes than members of race/ethnic and gender subgroups who did not experience discrimination, was supported.

As can be seen in Table 22, among race/ethnic and gender subgroups that experienced discrimination at work, Black and Hispanic women scored lowest on Function 1 with means of -.40 and -.45, respectively. Non-Hispanic White women (-.28) and Hispanic men (-.21) who experienced discrimination at work had mean scores on Function 1 which placed them between the highest and lowest scoring groups. Black men (-.10) and non-Hispanic White men (-.10) who experienced discrimination at work had the least negative scores on this function. Therefore, Hypothesis 1a, which proposed that among members of race/ethnic and gender subgroups who experienced workplace discrimination, the following pattern was expected in terms of negative work and non-work outcomes: non-Hispanic White men < non-Hispanic White women, Black men, and Hispanic men < Black women and Hispanic women, was partially supported.

Among race/ethnic and gender subgroups that did not experience discrimination at work, Black and Hispanic women again scored lowest on the function with means of .36 and .28, respectively (see Table 22). Again, Hispanic men and non-Hispanic White women had mean scores placing them in the middle range of subgroup scores; their means were .42 and .55, respectively. Black men who did not experience discrimination had the highest mean (.60) while non-Hispanic White men (.54) had the third highest mean on the function. As such, Hypothesis 1b, which proposed that among members of race/ethnic and gender subgroups who did not experience workplace discrimination, the following pattern was expected in terms of negative work and non-work outcomes: non-

Hispanic White men < non-Hispanic White women, Black men, and Hispanic men < Black women and Hispanic women, was also partially supported.

Function 2 had 22.7% of the discriminating power in the analysis. It had a squared canonical correlation of .04 and, therefore, approximately 4% of the variance in Function 2 was accounted for by the presence/absence of discrimination race/ethnic and gender subgroups (see Table 19). Using the structure *r* coefficients, Function 2 was defined positively by Pay Satisfaction (.59), Psychological Health (.38), Service Commitment (.32), and Supervisor Satisfaction (.26) but negatively by Intentions to Stay (-.29) (see Table 21). Non-Hispanic White women who both did (.26) and did not (.22) experience discrimination scored highest on Function 2 while Black women (-.33) and Black men (-.37) who experienced discrimination scored lowest (see Table 23).

As shown in Table 23, the distribution of race/ethnic and gender subgroup means for Function 2 did not appear to reflect the experience of discrimination and/or address study hypotheses for two reasons. First, Function 2 was defined by both positive and negative outcomes. As such, it was not possible to say definitively that subgroups that had experienced workplace discrimination had more negative work and non-work outcomes than subgroups that had not experienced workplace discrimination. Second, the distribution of subgroup means on the function was such that non-Hispanic Whites, regardless of gender and experience of discrimination, scored positively on the function while Black and Hispanics, regardless of gender and experience of discrimination, scored negatively. Therefore, none of the hypotheses were supported by the results associated with Function 2.

Function 3 had 10.5% of the discriminating power in the analysis. The squared canonical correlation for Function 3 was .02 which indicated that 2% of the variance in the function was accounted for by the presence/absence of discrimination race/ethnic and gender subgroups (see Table 19). Examination of the structure coefficients revealed that the function was defined positively by Service Commitment (.44) and Coworker Satisfaction (.30) but negatively by Pay Satisfaction (-.50) and Work Satisfaction (-.29) (see Table 21). Non-Hispanic White (.20) and Hispanic (.09) men who had experienced discrimination scored highest on Function 3 while Black (-.33) and Hispanic (-.20) women who had not experienced discrimination scored lowest (see Table 24).

Similar to Function 2, the distribution of race/ethnic and gender subgroup means for Function 3 did not appear to reflect the experience of discrimination and/or address study hypotheses for two reasons. First, Function 3 was defined by both positive and negative outcomes. Therefore, it was not possible to definitively say that subgroups that had experienced workplace discrimination had more negative work and non-work outcomes than subgroups that had not experienced workplace discrimination. Second, the distribution of subgroup means on the function was such that men regardless of race/ethnicity and experience of discrimination scored positively on the function while women regardless of race/ethnicity and experience of discrimination scored negatively. Consequently, none of the study hypotheses were supported by the results associated with Function 3. Given the characteristics of DDA and the dominance of the experience of discrimination on defining group differences on Function 1, the derivation of additional functions that maximize the difference between groups without relating to the experience of discrimination was not surprising.

Finally, though Function 4 and Function 5 were statistically significant, an examination of each function's percentage of discriminating power and the squared canonical correlations associated with each function revealed that neither function discriminated among the subgroups well enough nor shared enough variation with the presence/absence of discrimination race/ethnic and gender subgroups to warrant interpretation (see Table 18). Function 4 had 2% of the discriminating power in the analysis and had a squared canonical correlation less than .01. Function 5 had .9% of the discriminating power in the analysis and had a squared canonical correlation less than .01. Therefore, the contribution of these two functions to understanding the differences between subgroups was negligible and interpretation of these functions would not contribute to the understanding of the phenomena under investigation.

Table 9

Correlations among Study Variables for Total Sample

Study Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Race/ethnicity and Gender	—	.02**	.01	-.07**	-.11**	-.11**	-.07**	-.01	-.02**	-.03**
2. Discrimination Scale		—	-.10**	-.09**	-.11**	-.27**	-.20**	-.26**	-.10**	.18**
3. Intentions to Stay			—	.17**	.35**	.25**	.18**	.32**	.12**	-.25**
4. Pay Satisfaction				—	.21**	.21**	.15**	.16**	.09**	-.13**
5. Service Commitment					—	.36**	.29**	.42**	.19**	-.30**
6. Supervisor Satisfaction						—	.57**	.48**	.14**	-.37**
7. Coworker Satisfaction							—	.37**	.12**	-.33**
8. Work Satisfaction								—	.16**	-.36**
9. Physical Health									—	-.32**
10. Psychological Health										—

Table 10

Correlations among Study Variables for Non-Hispanic White Men

Study Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Discrimination Scale	—	-.11**	-.11**	-.12**	-.24**	-.17**	-.27**	-.10**	.18
2. Intentions to Stay		—	.18**	.35**	.28**	.20**	.32**	.09**	-.24**
3. Pay Satisfaction			—	.20**	.23**	.18**	.16**	.10**	-.16**
4. Service Commitment				—	.40**	.32**	.42**	.18**	-.32**
5. Supervisor Satisfaction					—	.55**	.51**	.13**	-.36**
6. Coworker Satisfaction						—	.39**	.13**	-.36**
7. Work Satisfaction							—	.17**	-.37**
8. Physical Health								—	-.30**
9. Psychological Health									—

Table 11

Correlations among Study Variables for Non-Hispanic White Women

Study Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Discrimination Scale	—	-.11**	-.09**	-.11**	-.29**	-.22**	-.28**	-.12**	.17**
2. Intentions to Stay		—	.17**	.37**	.24**	.18**	.31**	.12**	-.24**
3. Pay Satisfaction			—	.20**	.22**	.17**	.16**	.12**	-.13**
4. Service Commitment				—	.35**	.27**	.43**	.20**	-.29**
5. Supervisor Satisfaction					—	.58**	.49**	.14**	-.36**
6. Coworker Satisfaction						—	.36**	.11**	-.31**
7. Work Satisfaction							—	.15**	-.35**
8. Physical Health								—	-.32**
9. Psychological Health									—

Table 12

Correlations among Study Variables for Hispanic Men

Study Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Discrimination Scale	—	-.10**	-.06*	-.08**	-.24**	-.16**	-.21**	-.09**	.16**
2. Intentions to Stay		—	.14**	.37**	.28**	.19**	.34**	.11**	-.28**
3. Pay Satisfaction			—	.20**	.22**	.12**	.16**	.06**	-.15**
4. Service Commitment				—	.36**	.29**	.42**	.17**	-.28**
5. Supervisor Satisfaction					—	.57**	.50**	.17**	-.39**
6. Coworker Satisfaction						—	.39**	.14**	-.30**
7. Work Satisfaction							—	.16**	-.32**
8. Physical Health								—	-.35**
9. Psychological Health									—

Table 13

Correlations among Study Variables for Hispanic Women

Study Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Discrimination Scale	—	-.08*	-.07*	-.06	-.25**	-.18**	-.22**	-.06**	.15**
2. Intentions to Stay		—	.23**	.43**	.20**	.12**	.37**	.18**	-.26**
3. Pay Satisfaction			—	.22**	.18**	.10**	.18**	.09**	-.15**
4. Service Commitment				—	.28**	.19**	.43**	.18**	-.29**
5. Supervisor Satisfaction					—	.55**	.42**	.13**	-.33**
6. Coworker Satisfaction						—	.31**	.10**	-.28**
7. Work Satisfaction							—	.15**	-.35**
8. Physical Health								—	-.33**
9. Psychological Health									—

Table 14

Correlations among Study Variables for Black Men

Study Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Discrimination Scale	—	-.07**	-.08**	-.14**	-.30**	-.21**	-.25**	-.09**	.18**
2. Intentions to Stay		—	.20**	.27**	.19**	.13**	.26**	.12**	-.20**
3. Pay Satisfaction			—	.17**	.22**	.11**	.17**	.08**	-.14**
4. Service Commitment				—	.32**	.27**	.37**	.17**	-.30**
5. Supervisor Satisfaction					—	.54**	.45**	.15**	-.38**
6. Coworker Satisfaction						—	.41**	.12**	-.33**
7. Work Satisfaction							—	.19**	-.31**
8. Physical Health								—	-.29**
9. Psychological Health									—

Table 15

Correlations among Study Variables for Black Women

Study Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Discrimination Scale	—	-.06**	-.11**	-.11**	-.26**	-.19**	-.26**	-.07**	.18**
2. Intentions to Stay		—	.17**	.36**	.22**	.20**	.29**	.17**	-.26**
3. Pay Satisfaction			—	.24**	.20**	.17**	.17**	.06**	-.14**
4. Service Commitment				—	.33**	.30**	.40**	.18**	-.34**
5. Supervisor Satisfaction					—	.58**	.43**	.11**	-.33**
6. Coworker Satisfaction						—	.36**	.12**	-.33**
7. Work Satisfaction							—	.15**	-.36**
8. Physical Health								—	-.36**
9. Psychological Health									—

Table 16

Log Determinants across Presence/Absence of Discrimination Race/Ethnic and Gender Subgroups

Race/ethnic and Gender Discrimination Subgroup	Sample size	Log Determinant
1. Non-Hispanic White Men – Experienced Discrimination	3,517	15.89
2. Non-Hispanic White Women – Experienced Discrimination	3,486	16.56
3. Hispanic Men – Experienced Discrimination	802	16.07
4. Hispanic Women – Experienced Discrimination	686	17.19
5. Black Men – Experienced Discrimination	1,004	15.94
6. Black Women – Experienced Discrimination	1,376	17.17
7. Non-Hispanic White Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	1,827	13.35
8. Non-Hispanic White Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	1,323	14.08
9. Hispanic Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	338	14.23
10. Hispanic Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	238	15.29
11. Black Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	525	13.81
12. Black Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	538	15.25

Table 17

Descriptive Statistics and Univariate F Values for Differences between Subgroups

Outcome Variables	Group Means/(s.d.'s)												Univariate <i>F</i> ^a
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
1. Intentions to Stay	3.61 (1.44)	3.42 (1.49)	3.60 (1.36)	3.38 (1.43)	3.83 (1.33)	3.62 (1.43)	3.95 (1.34)	3.79 (1.43)	3.89 (1.34)	3.63 (1.43)	4.03 (1.28)	3.81 (1.40)	25.68
2. Pay Satisfaction	3.03 (1.14)	3.31 (1.09)	2.91 (1.16)	3.04 (1.11)	2.89 (1.19)	2.94 (1.15)	3.29 (1.08)	3.52 (1.03)	3.06 (1.11)	3.21 (1.10)	3.10 (1.19)	3.23 (1.17)	40.12
3. Service Commitment	16.45 (2.82)	16.26 (2.83)	16.18 (2.89)	15.82 (3.03)	16.16 (2.77)	15.33 (3.12)	17.11 (2.41)	16.93 (2.44)	16.70 (2.71)	16.23 (2.70)	16.98 (2.56)	16.05 (2.88)	41.85
4. Supervisor Satisfaction	30.82 (7.45)	29.57 (7.73)	29.04 (7.38)	27.77 (8.38)	29.67 (7.30)	27.74 (8.03)	34.49 (6.38)	34.65 (6.54)	33.12 (7.45)	32.50 (7.05)	34.35 (6.40)	32.41 (6.87)	139.22
5. Coworker Satisfaction	22.14 (4.46)	21.17 (4.96)	21.30 (4.61)	20.41 (5.33)	21.83 (4.75)	20.64 (5.21)	23.65 (3.79)	23.54 (4.20)	22.96 (4.52)	22.59 (4.74)	23.83 (3.78)	22.80 (4.67)	75.73
6. Work Satisfaction	20.87 (5.60)	20.47 (6.01)	21.06 (5.99)	20.29 (6.24)	21.48 (5.66)	20.42 (6.20)	24.05 (4.33)	24.13 (4.44)	23.72 (5.40)	23.36 (4.94)	24.40 (4.74)	23.88 (4.75)	111.45
7. Physical Health	13.47 (2.14)	13.27 (2.31)	13.76 (2.11)	13.26 (2.37)	13.65 (2.11)	13.21 (2.41)	13.92 (1.92)	13.85 (2.03)	14.16 (1.69)	13.58 (2.30)	14.03 (1.85)	13.58 (2.07)	22.93
8. Psychological Health	8.97 (3.01)	9.36 (3.20)	8.94 (3.15)	9.57 (3.44)	8.33 (2.89)	9.00 (3.38)	7.90 (2.43)	8.16 (2.67)	7.89 (2.48)	8.45 (2.80)	7.27 (2.23)	7.69 (2.72)	61.55
<i>n</i>	3,517	3,486	802	686	1,004	1,376	1,827	1,323	338	238	525	538	

^adf₁ = 11, df₂ = 15648.

Table 18

Error Correlations for Differences between Subgroups

Outcome Variables	Error Correlations						
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Intentions to Stay	.17	.35	.23	.16	.30	.11	-.23
2. Pay Satisfaction		.20	.20	.14	.14	.09	-.13
3. Service Commitment			.34	.27	.40	.18	-.29
4. Supervisor Satisfaction				.54	.44	.11	-.34
5. Coworker Satisfaction					.34	.10	-.30
6. Work Satisfaction						.14	-.32
7. Physical Health							-.31
8. Psychological Health							
Eigenvalues	.13	.05	.02	.00	.00	.00	.00

Table 19

Test of Dimensionality

Number of Dimensions	Lambda	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	Eigenvalue	Percent Variance	Canonical Correlation
1	.83	34.48	.000	.13	63.4	.34
2	.93	16.17	.000	.05	22.7	.21
3	.97	8.03	.000	.02	10.5	.14
4	.99	2.68	.000	.00	2.0	.06
5	1.0	1.65	.02	.00	.9	.04
6	1.0	1.01	.45	.00	.3	.03
7	1.0	.74	.68	.00	.2	.02
8	1.0	.53	.72	.00	.1	.01

Note. The first three dimensions were interpreted.

Table 20

F-to-Remove for Outcome Variables

Outcome Variable	F-to-Remove
Supervisor Satisfaction ^a	36.97
Work Satisfaction ^a	36.33
Pay Satisfaction ^a	33.72
Service Commitment	22.91
Psychological Health	17.34
Intentions to Stay	12.03
Physical Health	7.66
Coworker Satisfaction	5.67

^aThese variables were identified as important to group separation above and beyond other outcome variables.

Table 21

Standardized LDF Weights and Structure r Correlations

Outcome Variable	LDF ₁		LDF ₂		LDF ₃	
	Standardized LDF weight	Structure correlation	Standardized LDF weight	Structure correlation	Standardized LDF weight	Structure correlation
1. Intentions to Stay	.02	.32 ^a	-.45	-.29 ^a	.13	.13
2. Pay Satisfaction	.02	.23	.61	.59 ^a	-.64	-.50 ^a
3. Service Commitment	-.08	.40 ^a	.51	.32 ^a	.64	.44 ^a
4. Supervisor Satisfaction	.54	.86 ^a	.41	.26 ^a	.23	.19
5. Coworker Satisfaction	.15	.63 ^a	-.08	.04	.34	.30 ^a
6. Work Satisfaction	.44	.77 ^a	-.26	-.13	-.67	-.29 ^a
7. Physical Health	.15	.32 ^a	-.05	-.12	.22	.19
8. Psychological Health	-.13	-.53 ^a	.52	.38 ^a	.21	.04

^aBasic construct identifier.

Table 22

Group Means on LDF₁

Subgroup	1	2	3
Black Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	.60	.60	
Non-Hispanic White Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	.55	.55	
Non-Hispanic White Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	.54	.54	
Hispanic Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	.42	.42	
Black Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	.36	.36	
Hispanic Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	.28	.30	
Non-Hispanic White Men – Experienced Discrimination	-.10		-.10
Black Men – Experienced Discrimination	-.10		-.10
Hispanic Men – Experienced Discrimination	-.21		-.21
Non-Hispanic White Women – Experienced Discrimination	-.28		-.28
Black Women – Experienced Discrimination	-.40		-.40
Hispanic Women – Experienced Discrimination	-.45		-.45

Note. 1 = Presence and absence of discrimination subgroups combined. 2 = Presence of discrimination subgroups only. 3 = Absence of discrimination subgroups only.

Table 23

Group Means on LDF₂

Subgroup	1	2	3
Non-Hispanic White Women – Experienced Discrimination	.26	.26	
Non-Hispanic White Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	.22		.22
Non-Hispanic White Men – Experienced Discrimination	.04	.04	
Non-Hispanic White Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	.02		.02
Hispanic Women – Experienced Discrimination	-.00	-.00	
Hispanic Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	-.03		-.03
Hispanic Men – Experienced Discrimination	-.18	-.18	
Hispanic Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	-.22		-.22
Black Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	-.27		-.27
Black Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	-.28		-.28
Black Women – Experienced Discrimination	-.33	-.33	
Black Men – Experienced Discrimination	-.37	-.37	

Note. 1 = Presence and absence of discrimination subgroups combined. 2 = Presence of discrimination subgroups only. 3 = Absence of discrimination subgroups only.

Table 24

Group Means on LDF₃

Subgroup	1	2	3
Non-Hispanic White Men – Experienced Discrimination	.20	.20	
Hispanic Men – Experienced Discrimination	.09	.09	
Black Men – Experienced Discrimination	.07		.07
Black Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	.07	.07	
Non-Hispanic White Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	.05		.05
Hispanic Men – Did Not Experience Discrimination	.05		.05
Non-Hispanic White Women – Experienced Discrimination	-.07	-.07	
Hispanic Women – Experienced Discrimination	-.10	-.10	
Non-Hispanic White Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	-.14		-.14
Black Women – Experienced Discrimination	-.18	-.18	
Hispanic Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	-.20		-.20
Black Women – Did Not Experience Discrimination	-.33		-.33

Note. 1 = Presence and absence of discrimination subgroups combined. 2 = Presence of discrimination subgroups only. 3 = Absence of discrimination subgroups only.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to contribute to understanding of the psychology of race/ethnic and gender subgroups by studying the influence of discrimination on work and non-work outcomes. In the sections to follow, the MANOVA and DDA results will be evaluated. Moreover, study contributions, implications, and limitations will be discussed. Finally, suggestions for future research will be presented.

The results of the MANOVA indicated that the presence/absence of discrimination race/ethnic and gender subgroups had different work and non-work outcomes. Though the size of the effect was .02, given the small effect sizes associated with race/ethnicity and gender found in social science research, as well as the limited research on interpreting multivariate effect sizes (e.g., Cohen, 1988; Ford, Kraiger, & Schechtman, 1986; Huberty, 1994; Kling, Hyde, Showers, & Buswell, 1999; Kraiger & Ford, 1985), the findings were considered to be worthy of further consideration. This omnibus test indicated that race/ethnic and gender subgroups that either do or do not experience discrimination at work had different work and non-work outcomes. As such, the broad premise of the study was supported by the MANOVA results.

Of particular interest in the current study, however, was the information on the differences between the subgroups offered by DDA. However, as is characteristic of multivariate analyses with more than two groups, interpretation of the differences revealed by the functions was complex and required a substantial amount of judgment and decision-

making on the part of the researcher. For example, only Function 1 of the DDA could be unambiguously interpreted to represent positive outcomes. As such, Function 1 was most directly relevant to the study hypotheses. Functions 2 and 3 will also be interpreted but it is important to note that the amount of shared variation between the second and third function with the race/ethnic and gender discrimination subgroups was not substantial. The interpretation of these functions was deemed appropriate because the pattern of means across subgroups provided potentially important information about the different outcomes of subgroups in the U.S. military, as well as in society. Finally, because Hypotheses 1a and 1b posited directionality of the group centroids within presence and absence of discrimination subgroups, the magnitude of these means was interpreted. It is critical to understand, however, that the magnitude of the mean differences between groups was often miniscule and under other circumstances these differences would not be interpreted.

Function 1

Hypothesis 1

As stated earlier, the results for Function 1 supported the first hypothesis. Based on the structure r coefficients, Function 1 was defined positively by Supervisor Satisfaction, Work Satisfaction, Coworker Satisfaction, Service Commitment, Intentions to Stay, Physical Health, and negatively by Psychological Health (higher scores indicate more negative mental health) (see Table 21). It was interesting to note that Function 1 was not defined by pay satisfaction. Because the survey asked the respondent about his or her satisfaction with basic pay which is equal across all individuals of similar rank, respondents may not have considered basic pay as within the scope of individual influence. It is possible that different results might have been found if the pay satisfaction

variable included bonus and/or special duty pay, which is more influenced by individual action. However, the structure r coefficient for pay satisfaction was positive, which was in line with the direction of the other outcome variables.

As such, subgroups with positive means on Function 1 reported more satisfaction with their supervisors, work, and coworkers than subgroups with negative means. They reported more commitment to their respective Service and lower intention of leaving the military. Finally, they reported more positive physical and mental health. The subgroups in the current analysis with positive means on this function were all of the race/ethnic and gender subgroups that had not experienced discrimination (see Table 22).

In contrast, when compared to subgroups with positive means, groups with negative means on Function 1 reported lower satisfaction with supervisors, work, or coworkers than groups with positive means. They reported lower commitment to and some intentions to leave their Service. Finally, they reported better physical and psychological health than subgroups with positive means. All of the subgroups who had experienced discrimination had negative means on Function 1. Results for the test of Hypothesis 1 in Function 1 revealed that the experience of discrimination influenced the work and non-work outcomes of members of race/ethnic and gender subgroups similarly; the experience of discrimination at work led to more negative work and non-work outcomes for all individuals who experienced it.

Hypothesis 1a

An examination focusing solely on the scores of subgroups that experienced discrimination at work provided partial support for Hypothesis 1a (see Table 22). Black and Hispanic women who experienced discrimination scored lowest on this function

which indicated that they were the least satisfied with supervisors, work, and coworkers. They were the least committed to and had some intentions to leave their Service. Moreover, they experienced more negative physical and psychological health. Also in support of Hypothesis 1a, non-Hispanic White women and Hispanic men who experienced discrimination had more positive work and non-work outcomes than did Black and Hispanic women who experienced discrimination.

However, contrary to Hypothesis 1a, non-Hispanic White men who experienced discrimination did not score higher on Function 1 than any other race/ethnic and gender subgroup that experienced discrimination. Rather, Black men and non-Hispanic White men scored approximately identically on this function which indicated that, of the groups who experienced discrimination at work, they were the most satisfied with their supervisors, work, and coworkers. They felt most committed to and intended to remain within their Service. Finally, Black and non-Hispanic White men who experienced discrimination at work had the least negative physical and psychological health of all the groups who experienced discrimination at work.

In sum, Black and Hispanic women who experienced discrimination had the poorest work and non-work outcomes, non-Hispanic White women and Hispanic men who experienced discrimination at work had less poor work and non-work outcomes, and Black men and non-Hispanic White men who experienced discrimination at work had the least poor work and non-outcomes of all the groups who experienced discrimination.

Hypothesis 1b

Limiting an examination of the subgroup means to only those subgroups that did not experience discrimination revealed partial support for Hypothesis 1b (see Table 22).

Similar to the outcomes for subgroups that experienced discrimination, Black and Hispanic women who did not experienced discrimination had the least positive scores on Function 1 and Hispanic men and non-Hispanic White women had more positive outcomes than Black and Hispanic women. The scores of each these four subgroups provided partial support for Hypothesis 1b.

At odds with Hypothesis 1b was the Black male subgroup's placement as the group with the most positive work and non-work outcomes. Non-Hispanic White men had the third most positive score on Function 1 following Black men and non-Hispanic White women. As such, Black men who did not experience discrimination scored highest on this function which indicated that, of the subgroups that did not experience discrimination at work, they were the most satisfied with their supervisors, work, and coworkers. They felt most committed to and intended to remain within their Service. Finally, Black men who did not experience discrimination at work had more positive physical health and less negative psychological health than all the subgroups that did not experience discrimination at work.

In sum, Black and Hispanic women who did not experience discrimination at work had the least positive work and non-work outcomes, non-Hispanic White women and men and Hispanic men who did not experience discrimination at work had more positive work and non-work outcomes, and Black men who did not experience discrimination at work had the most positive work and non-work outcomes of all the subgroups that did not experience discrimination.

Interpretation of Function 1 Results for Hypotheses 1a and 1b

Social Identity Theory

One explanation for the findings associated with Hypotheses 1a and 1b can be found in social identity theory which attempts to explain the consequences of categorization of individuals into social groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Social categorization is a critical mechanism by which individuals understand the world around them and is essential to the ability to interpret and react to incoming social stimuli received from and about others. More importantly, social categories play a role in informing our understanding of ourselves. In fact, social categories serve to “create and define the individual’s place in society” (Oakes, 2003, p. 3).

The role that social categories have in defining and understanding individual social identity relates to the awareness an individual has of group membership as a primary ingredient in the formation of a social identity. Social identity can be defined as the combination of the characteristics of the self that are rooted in group membership; it can be contrasted with personal identity which involves the aspects of the self that are rooted in individual differences such as personality (Stephan & Stephan, 1996). Because race/ethnic and gender subgroup membership are readily apparent, these social identities may be more salient to members of these groups. In fact, research has shown that, for minority group members, group membership is more essential in defining the self than it is for majority group members (McGuire & McGuire as cited in Simon, Aufderheide, & Kampmeier, 2003). Thus, Black and Hispanic women who did not experience discrimination at work may have had the least positive work and non-work outcomes among subgroups that did not experience discrimination because the individuals in these groups were strongly

identified with their racial/ethnic and gender group membership and their social group was in a low status position in the military. In fact, the size of the Black and Hispanic female populations within the Services is small relative to non-Hispanic White women and men as well as Black and Hispanic men (Department of Defense, 2004), which may have increased the salience of that particular social group identity as well as contributed to accentuating the marginalized status of these groups in the Services.

Moreover, studies have demonstrated that individuals may identify more with a social group if that social grouping has been the source of discrimination against them (Elsass & Graves, 1997; Wharton, 1992). Identification with a social group may have deleterious consequences if, in general, that social group occupies a position of low status across multiple life domains and is perceived to be the basis for discrimination. In fact, research indicates that the consequences of discrimination on self-esteem are dependent on perceptions of the pervasiveness of discrimination such that individuals who believe that discrimination is pervasive are more likely to experience negative consequences after a discriminatory event (Schmitt, Branscombe, & Postmes, 2003). Thus, Black and Hispanic women who experienced discrimination may have had more negative outcomes to discrimination than the other race/ethnic and gender subgroups because their groups may occupy marginalized status in the military and they may have perceived race and gender to be the basis for the discrimination they experienced.

In addition, individuals understand the status of their group through social comparison. Assessing the way the group compares with other societal groups determines the relative value placed on their group. This evaluation is used to determine the comparative standing of a group in the social hierarchy. Awareness of the evaluation of

his or her group by society via social comparison then contributes to an individual's understanding of the status obtained by belonging to a particular group (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994). As such, Black and Hispanic women may have experienced both the most negative work and non-work outcomes to discrimination and the least positive outcomes without reporting discrimination than any other race/ethnic and gender subgroup who did or did not experience discrimination because the scarcity of members of their social group may have increased the salience of that social identity to them individually and the content of stereotypes of the Black and Hispanic female social groups were more negative than the stereotypes of the other groups in the current occupational setting (Foster, Arnt, & Honkola, 2004).

Relative Deprivation Theory

A theory of intergroup relations that may shed light on the contradictory findings for Black and non-Hispanic White men is relative deprivation theory. Relative deprivation theory rests on the premise that relative status, not objective situations, in society contribute to subjective reactions to events (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994). Davis (as cited in Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994) proposed preconditions for the experience of relative deprivation: an individual must desire a resource, must compare himself to the group who possesses the resource, and must feel entitled to the resource. If these preconditions are met, recognition that there is a discrepancy in the rewards offered one social group over another then leads to a sense of relative deprivation.

Clearly, social groups in society have differing senses of entitlement. These differences may be due, in part, to the unique social and cultural backgrounds of the groups as well as the idiosyncratic histories the groups have in U.S. society. Dominant

group members have beliefs about the rewards and rights that should be accorded them (Bobo, 1999) and this sense of entitlement to good outcomes is inevitable given the position of these groups in society. Non-Hispanic Whites' feelings of entitlement are by-products of their positions of power at the top of the race/ethnic status hierarchy. As such, non-Hispanic White men's sense of entitlement may have led them to have almost identical outcomes after discrimination and less positive outcomes regardless of discrimination than Black men as a consequence of indignation at perceived injustices. This may have been exacerbated by the current context of the military as an organization which has been in the forefront of racial/ethnic integration (Segal, 1989).

Moreover, Black men's sense of entitlement may have led them to have approximately identical negative outcomes after discrimination and more positive outcomes regardless of discrimination than non-Hispanic White men. Research on the military has shown that Blacks find that the military offers social mobility benefits and opportunities for career advancement that are not as affected by race (Armor, 1996; Moskos & Butler, 1996; Segal, 1989). As such, Black men may have had more positive outcomes because they perceived the military (regardless of the experience of discrimination) to be more equitable than comparable experiences of Black men in non-military institutions.

Moreover, as noted in a recent article in the New York Times, research on Black men in society reveals an increasingly dire situation (Eckholm, 2006). For example, high rates of joblessness, incarceration, and high school drop outs among Black men are in contrast to increasingly positive experiences for other minorities and non-Hispanic Whites (Eckholm, 2006). Given the increasingly grim outcomes Black men in civilian

life, the Black men in the current study may have had similar outcomes after discrimination as non-Hispanic White men and more positive outcomes irrespective of discrimination because they felt that the choices for them in civilian life were limited. It is possible that when comparing their situations in the Services to the experiences of their racial counterparts outside the military they felt they had the greatest individual career opportunities and chance for success in their current occupational setting. In sum, social identity theory and relative deprivation theory provide a framework for understanding the Function 1 outcomes of the different race/ethnic and gender subgroups that either had or had not experienced discrimination.

Function 2

Discrimination and No Discrimination Subgroups Combined

The results for Function 2 did not clearly address the study hypotheses because the constructs that emerged as defining the function did not represent uniformly positive or negative outcomes (see Table 21). Indeed, Function 2 was defined positively by pay satisfaction, Service commitment, supervisor satisfaction, and psychological health (positive scores indicate more negative psychological health). It was also defined negatively by intentions to stay. Groups that scored positively on this function were more satisfied with pay and supervisors and were more committed to their Service than subgroups that scored negatively. However, they experienced higher levels of poor psychological health and were less inclined to remain in their Service than subgroups that scored negatively.

The overall distribution of subgroup mean scores on Function 2 appeared to be driven by race with the experience of discrimination having comparatively little influence on the direction of scores on this function (see Table 23). Non-Hispanic Whites scored

highest, Hispanics scored in the middle, and Blacks scored lowest on this function. As such, non-Hispanic Whites were the most satisfied with their pay and supervisor and were the most committed to their Service. However, they also experienced more negative psychological health and were less inclined to remain a member of their Service. In contrast, Blacks were the least satisfied with their pay and supervisor and were the least committed to their Service. Moreover, Blacks experienced the least negative psychological health and were more inclined to remain a member of their Service than the other two race/ethnic subgroups regardless of the experience of discrimination. Hispanics had scores on Function 2 that placed them in the middle of the two other racial groups, which was in accordance with literature that indicates that, at least among Hispanic men, work outcomes are reported that place that group between the outcomes of those reported by non-Hispanic White men and Black men (e.g., Brown & Minor, 1991; Landau, 1995; Miech, Eaton, & Liang, 2003).

Presence of Discrimination Subgroups Only

When inspecting the distribution of scores within race/ethnic and gender subgroups that experienced discrimination a pattern emerged that revealed that non-Hispanic White women and men were the only groups who scored positively on Function 2 (see Table 23). This indicated that all other subgroups that experienced discrimination were less satisfied with their pay and supervisor and had lower commitment to their Service compared to non-Hispanic White women and men. Moreover, all other subgroups that experienced discrimination reported less negative psychological health outcomes and were more inclined to remain in their Service in contrast to non-Hispanic men and women who had experienced discrimination.

Absence of Discrimination Subgroups Only

An examination of the distribution of means for the subgroups that did not experience discrimination revealed a pattern very similar to the one found for subgroups that experienced discrimination (see Table 23). Again, non-Hispanic Whites who had not experienced discrimination scored positively on Function 2 while all other race/ethnic and gender subgroups that had not experienced discrimination scored negatively. In this way, the experience of discrimination did not seem to influence a more general pattern of responses on Function 2 that distinguished non-Hispanic White outcomes from the outcomes of Hispanics and Blacks.

Interpretation of Function 2 Results

Relative Deprivation Theory

As with the results for Function 1, relative deprivation theory offers one possible explanation for the pattern of results found for presence/absence of discrimination race/ethnic and gender subgroups on Function 2. A fundamental premise of relative deprivation theory is that the individual's subjective assessment of his or her status (not his or her objective status as it is viewed by others) is combined with a comparison of his or her status with that of some other group to drive the perception of relative deprivation. The coefficients on Function 2 maximized the differences between the race/ethnic subgroups and called attention to the differences in work and non-work outcomes experienced by members of these subgroups without regard to the experience of discrimination. The differences in outcomes among the race/ethnic subgroups evidenced by Function 2 may be a reflection of the experience of relative deprivation among these groups using each other as the comparison other.

Non-Hispanic Whites, regardless of the experience of discrimination, had positive scores on Function 2. This reflected more positive work and non-work outcomes (higher levels of poor psychological health and higher intentions to leave the Service were the exceptions) than those reported by other subgroups. In this way, non-Hispanic Whites may have used Hispanics and Blacks as their comparison groups to interpret their experiences in the military. These comparisons to lower status groups may have manifested in more positive subjective work and non-work outcomes.

In contrast, Hispanics and Blacks had negative scores on Function 2 which reflected less positive work and non-work outcomes (lower levels of poor psychological health and lower intentions to leave the Service were the exceptions) than those reported by non-Hispanic Whites. As such, Hispanics may have been using Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites or one low status group and one high status group, respectively, as their comparison groups. Using these two groups as comparison others may have led to Hispanics' outcomes on Function 2 being less positive than non-Hispanic Whites but also more positive than Blacks. It is possible that Hispanics in this sample felt that their experiences in the military were more positive than the other low status group, Blacks, but not as positive as the high status group, non-Hispanic Whites.

Finally, Blacks also may have compared their experiences in the military to the experiences of one low status group, Hispanics, and one high status group, non-Hispanic Whites. The comparison with non-Hispanic Whites may have resulted in less positive work and non-work outcomes. However, for the Black subgroup, the comparison with the other low status group, Hispanics, may not have mitigated their interpretation of their experiences because they may have perceived their experiences to have been less positive

than the experiences of Hispanics. These comparisons resulted in Blacks having the least positive outcomes on Function 2.

It was interesting to note that the direction of scores on psychological health and intentions to stay were contrary to what might have been expected given the direction of scores on the other outcome variables for the race/ethnic subgroups. One possible explanation for the pattern of scores for non-Hispanic Whites was that members of this group may have been comparing their experiences with non-Hispanic Whites outside the military. In fact, a 1999 Defense Department annual report revealed that, when questioned regarding their lack of interest in serving in the armed forces, non-Hispanic White men and women indicated more often than Blacks and Hispanics that interest in other careers played a major role in reducing the appeal of military service, which may be a reflection of the increased career opportunities of non-Hispanic Whites in the civilian labor force.

Moreover, in the case of non-Hispanic White men, the military is no longer an appealing career option which is reflected in the decline in enlistment among non-Hispanic White men as well as the decreased levels of propensity to serve among both non-Hispanic White men and women (Moore, 1996; Segal & Segal, 2004). This loss of appeal may be in part because, in the aggregate, careers in the armed forces bring less economic benefit to non-Hispanic Whites than to minorities (Segal & Segal, 2004). As such, non-Hispanic White men and women in the military who compared their situations with their racial counterparts in the civilian workforce may have less positive psychological health outcomes and higher intentions to leave the armed forces, despite feeling satisfied with other work outcomes.

What was less clear was the relationship between more positive mental health scores and higher intentions to remain in the Service for Blacks and Hispanics and their

overall less positive work outcomes (i.e., less satisfied with pay and supervisor). It is possible that the comparison group for Blacks and Hispanics was not uniformly non-Hispanic Whites or military personnel. For some of the variables, Blacks and Hispanics may have compared their situations with those of Blacks and Hispanics outside the military. Historically, the military offers an opportunity for social mobility for racial minorities who have been traditionally disadvantaged in the civilian workforce (Armor, 1996; Moskos & Butler, 1996). For example, research indicates that Blacks report the military to be an institution in which their advancement is less affected by their race and, as a result, they have had disproportionately high enlistment and reenlistment rates (Armor, 1996; Moskos & Butler, 1996; Segal, 1989). Moreover, recent increases in enlistment of Hispanics may be a reflection of their perception of the military as a more racially fair employer than can be found in the civilian labor force (Segal, 1989). This was one possible explanation for the higher intentions to remain in the Service and, perhaps, more positive psychological health outcomes for members of minority groups despite their lower satisfaction evidenced on other work-related outcomes.

Function 3

Discrimination and No Discrimination Subgroups Combined

Similar to the results for Function 2, the results for Function 3 did not address the study hypotheses directly because the defining constructs were both positive and negative (see Table 21). In fact, Function 3 was defined positively by Service commitment and coworker satisfaction but negatively by pay and work satisfaction. Groups scoring positively on this function were more committed to their Service and more satisfied with coworkers but were less satisfied with pay and work than groups scoring negatively.

The overall distribution of subgroup mean scores on Function 3 appeared to be driven by gender with the experience of discrimination again having only moderate influence on the direction of subgroup scores on this function. Taken as a whole, men of all three race/ethnic subgroups scored highest on this function and women of all three race/ethnic subgroups scored lowest. As a result, irrespective of the experience of discrimination, men were more committed to their Service and more satisfied with their coworkers than women but were also less satisfied with their pay and work than were women regardless of the experience of discrimination.

Presence of Discrimination Subgroups Only

An examination of only the race/ethnic and gender subgroups that experienced discrimination revealed that all race/ethnic subgroups of men scored positively on this function while all race/ethnic subgroups of women scored negatively (see Table 24). This indicated that all female subgroups that had experienced discrimination were less committed to their Service and were less satisfied with their coworkers compared to their male counterparts. Furthermore, all female subgroups that had experienced discrimination were more satisfied with their pay and work compared to all male subgroups.

Absence of Discrimination Subgroups Only

An examination of the race/ethnic and gender subgroups that had not experienced discrimination revealed a pattern of results similar to that found among race/ethnic and gender subgroups that had experienced discrimination. As such, all men who had not experienced discrimination had positive scores while all women had negative scores on Function 3 (see Table 24). In this way, it appeared that the experience of discrimination

was less pertinent to the understanding of the placement of groups on the work and non-work outcomes defined in Function 3 than was gender.

Interpretation of Function 3 Results

Relative Deprivation Theory

Relative deprivation theorists propose that individuals are motivated to compare themselves with similar others to obtain a realistic evaluation of their current situation (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994). Furthermore, members of minority groups have been shown to incorporate minority group membership to a larger extent in defining the self than majority group members (McGuire & McGuire as cited in Simon, Aufderheide, & Kampmeier, 2003). As such, stigmatized social group membership may be more salient than other group memberships and comparisons of events would be made with individuals comprising this most salient group. Because the social group used for comparison largely determines whether relative deprivation occurs, it is possible that the pattern of results for subgroups on Function 3 was a reflection of their comparisons with relevant others outside the military context.

Men, regardless of race or the experience of discrimination, had positive scores on Function 3 which reflected less satisfaction with pay and work and more satisfaction with coworkers and more commitment to Service. As stated earlier, subgroups differ in how entitled they feel to the rewards and benefits offered by society; a sense of entitlement results from the distinct historical, social, and cultural experiences of the group. For men, a sense of entitlement to the rewards and benefits is a by-product of their position as the dominant gender in society. It is possible that men in this sample interpreted their situations in the military by comparing them with the situations of men outside the

military; this led to a mixture of positive and negative work and non-work outcomes. Men may have felt that their pay was not in accordance with that received by men outside the military and may not have felt as satisfied with their work as a result or as they believed that their non-military peers are. However, men may have appreciated the male-dominated work environment and Service culture of the military when compared to the experiences of non-military counterparts in a more gender proportioned work environment and non-male dominated organizational culture.

In contrast, women, regardless of race or experience of discrimination, had negative scores on Function 3 which reflected more satisfaction with work and pay but less satisfaction with coworkers and lower commitment to their Service than men. As such, women may have been using as their comparison groups working women outside the military environment. Using this group as a comparison other may have led to a combination of positive and negative outcomes on Function 3. It is possible that women in this sample felt that their pay and work experiences in the military were more positive than the experiences of women outside the military and as such were more satisfied with their pay and work than were their male counterparts. In fact, this finding was not unusual; research by Major (1994) discussed findings that members of low status groups (e.g., women) often state higher levels of job and pay satisfaction than members of high status groups (e.g., men). However, women may not have appreciated the male-dominated work environment and Service culture when compared to the experiences of non-military women in a gender-diverse work environment and non-male dominated organizational culture. These comparisons may have resulted in women having the pattern of work and non-work outcomes evidenced by Function 3.

Contributions of Current Study

There were several contributions made by the current study. First, the study focused on the intersection of race/ethnicity and gender on organizational behavior. As such, it answered a call for more literature that attempts to understand the unique organizational experiences of race/ethnic and gender subgroup members (Cox & Nkomo, 1990; Rosenstein & Hitt, 1986). Typically, researchers extrapolate the interpretation of their results for race/ethnicity (i.e., non-Hispanic Whites) to both genders or results for gender (i.e., men) across races/ethnicities. This propensity on the part of researchers disregards the distinct experiences, outcomes, and standpoints of women and minorities (Ferdman, 1999). Not until more research is conducted that focuses on the union of race/ethnicity and gender will the organizational lives of members of these race/ethnic and gender subgroups be fully understood.

Second, the current study responded to the request by discrimination researchers for literature that studies the intersection of race/ethnicity and gender on discrimination (Cleveland, Vescio, & Barnes-Farrell, 2005). Much of the current understanding of discrimination is rooted in literature that focuses on the experiences of non-Hispanic White men and women or upon the experiences of Blacks (Cleveland, Vescio, & Barnes-Farrell, 2005; Cooper & Bosco, 1999; Cox & Nkomo, 1990). The danger inherent in projecting the results from studies limited to non-Hispanic Whites and Blacks is that it constricts understanding of how multiple demographic groups interpret and react to discrimination across life domains. The inclusion of non-Hispanic White, Black as well as Hispanic men and women in the current study attempted to close the gap in understanding how discrimination affects varied subgroup members.

Third, the current study's focus on work and non-work outcomes responded to an appeal for literature that focuses on elucidating the outcomes after discrimination in the work and non-work life domains (Foley, Kidder, & Powell, 2002; Pavalko, Mossakowski, & Hamilton, 2003; Shaffer, Joplin, Bell, Lau, & Oguz, 2000). A preponderance of literature exists that examines the process by which individuals react to discrimination in terms of self-esteem and coping (e.g., Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Crocker & Major, 1989; Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, & Major, 1991; Leonardelli & Tormala, 2003; Ruggiero & Marx, 1999; Ruggiero & Taylor, 1995, 1997). Moreover, much of the focus of literature on discrimination has been on an examination of objective outcomes such as pay differentials, absenteeism, decreased productivity, and turnover (Cleveland, Vescio, & Barnes-Farrell, 2005). The literature on discrimination is lacking in studies that focus on the conjunction of race/ethnicity and gender in understanding the effect of discrimination on work and non-work subjective outcomes; the present research was an attempt to increase understanding of these complex relationships.

Finally, the current study revealed the complexity of the relationship between race/ethnicity and gender on work and non-work subjective outcomes, regardless of discrimination. Much of the literature in the area of work and non-work outcomes that examines differences across race/ethnicity and/or gender reveals inconsistent results; it was not clear from a review of the literature how these demographic variables relate to subjective outcomes. Acquiring a more complete picture of these relationships was a positive step toward understanding the different work and non-work outcomes of individuals who belong to under-researched populations.

Implications of Current Study

Implications for Theory

Multivariate nature of outcomes. One significant contribution of this research was the detection and definition of differences between race/ethnic and gender subgroups in their work and non-work outcomes after workplace discrimination. The results found for differences among the race/ethnic and gender subgroups were obtained using multivariate analyses. These differences between groups might not have been found using univariate analyses. In fact, it is possible that some of the inconsistencies in the literature on race/ethnic and gender differences in work and non-work outcomes are the result of using univariate analyses to understand multivariate phenomena. As such, future research should focus on the multivariate understanding of race/ethnic and gender subgroup outcomes to discrimination. Research should examine subgroup differences using multivariate statistics (e.g., MANOVA, DDA) that take into account the correlations among the work and non-work outcomes. Similarly, using multivariate analyses offers an opportunity to achieve a more realistic view of the intricate relationships between work and non-work outcomes for different race/ethnic and gender subgroups.

Importance of discrimination and subgroup membership. Another significant contribution of the current study was the identification that the pattern of work and non-work outcomes identified by the first function defined the differences between race/ethnic and gender subgroups that had either experienced or not experienced discrimination. Because the first function accounted for the largest amount of the variance between the groups the subsequent differentiation of the groups based on their experience of discrimination was noteworthy. It implied that experiencing discrimination

superseded the effect of race/ethnicity and gender on the work and non-work outcome variables. The results indicated that, in general, members of different race/ethnic and gender subgroups have similar outcomes to discrimination. All subgroups that experienced discrimination had less positive work and non-work outcomes while all subgroups that did not experience discrimination had more positive work and non-work outcomes. Future research should take into account that the subjective reaction to discrimination was similar across race/ethnic and gender subgroups and explore possible differences in the interpretation of specific discriminatory events. For example, specific events may be more likely to be perceived as discriminatory by certain race/ethnic and gender subgroups, the context of the event may influence interpretation, the organization's history of dealing with discrimination, the individual's past experiences within the organization as well as outside the organization with respect to discrimination are some possible influences on interpretation of discriminatory events.

Moreover, though the difference between the group means was often not substantial, a closer inspection of the magnitude of the group means on Function 1 indicated partial support for the hypotheses that posited a hierarchy of positive outcomes. For example, irrespective of the experience of discrimination, Black and Hispanic women consistently had the least positive work and non-work outcomes of any of the other race/ethnic and gender subgroups investigated. Future research should more fully investigate the origin and implication of these outcomes for Black and Hispanic women. Research intended to understand the consequences of double minority status in the workplace seems appropriate.

Likewise, Hispanic men and non-Hispanic White women also had means on Function 1 that placed them, as hypothesized, in the moderate range of work and non-work outcomes; these groups scored neither as low as Black and Hispanic women nor (generally) as high as non-Hispanic White men. This was in accordance with the idea that members of these groups suffer the consequences of belonging to one low status groups (i.e., Hispanic, women) while also benefit from belonging to one high status group (i.e., men, non-Hispanic White). Future research should explore more fully the implications for individuals who have membership in both high and low status groups on other important work and non-work outcomes as well as across multiple life domains.

Similarly, the lack of support for the hypothesis that non-Hispanic White males would have the most positive work and non-work outcomes should be investigated more fully. It was unusual that Black men, regardless of the experience of discrimination, would have equally or more positive outcomes than non-Hispanic White men, given their membership in a low status racial group. It is possible that the positive outcomes found for Black men were an artifact of the military setting. Because the military has a long history of racial integration and of being used by Blacks to achieve social mobility and pay equity (Armor, 1996; Moskos & Butler, 1996; Segal, 1989), it could be that these characteristics contributed to the positive outcomes for Black men in this study. If true, the military's policies and procedures may be helpful to organizations attempting to level the playing field for minorities. Future research should attempt to determine what organizational characteristics might encourage positive outcomes for minority men.

Race/ethnic differences in work and non-work outcomes. A further contribution of the current study was the delineation of the differences in work and non-work

outcomes among the different race/ethnic groups. It is important to note that the differences in outcomes on Function 2 were driven by membership in either the non-Hispanic White subgroup or the Hispanic and Black subgroups; Non-Hispanic Whites had a different pattern of outcomes than did either Hispanics or Blacks. It could be that the results for non-Hispanic Whites were related to the military sample used in the study. For example, because the military is a highly integrated institution, it could be that non-Hispanic Whites with longer tenure in the military have less desire to remain in the military due to high numbers of minorities in the Services. Future research should investigate the relationship that tenure and extent of racial integration has upon intentions to stay in the military.

In addition, the pattern of outcomes on Function 2 demonstrated that membership in the high status racial group was no guarantee of the most positive subjective work and non-work outcomes. Likewise, membership in a low status racial group was not inexorably linked with negative subjective work and non-work outcomes. Future research should acknowledge the complexity of the relationship between subjective outcomes and subgroup membership by studying it using multivariate statistical analyses.

Gender differences in work and non-work outcomes. Another contribution to theory was the description of differences in subjective work and non-work outcomes between genders. It is significant to note that the results for Function 3 differentiated the groups along gender lines with men and women having means in opposite directions. Researchers should use the results for Function 3 as further evidence that the subjective experience of the workplace differs across genders for all race/ethnic groups. The pattern of results found in Function 3 also provided support for the importance of membership in

the high status gender group on forming a sense of entitlement to the rewards and benefits in the workplace. Likewise, the results for women on Function 3 demonstrated the influence of membership in the subordinate gender group on subjective outcomes. Future research should investigate further the phenomenon demonstrated in the current study regarding the higher satisfaction with pay and work evidenced by women of all race/ethnicities compared to the lower satisfaction with pay and work of similarly situated men. Researchers should continue to attend to the different experiences of the genders but should include representatives of different race/ethnic subgroups.

Intersection of race/ethnicity and gender. Finally, the current study adds to the theoretical literature on the conjunction of race/ethnicity and gender. Research that focuses on the intersection of race/ethnicity and gender in various social arenas is lacking and simultaneous consideration of both variables has been advocated (Ferdman, 1999). It has been posited that the consideration of gender without including race/ethnicity or race/ethnicity without including gender is insufficient for understanding the experiences of these subgroup members (e.g., Ferdman, 1999). The results of the current study, however, indicated that membership in a combination of race/ethnic and gender subgroup was not the determining influence in work and non-work outcomes. Broadly speaking, the results of the DDA indicated that it was the experience of discrimination subgroup membership (i.e., Function 1), race/ethnic subgroup membership (i.e., Function 2), and gender subgroup membership (i.e., Function 3) that accounted for the differences in work and non-work outcomes. As such, the current study adds to the literature by proposing similarity in outcomes across race/ethnicity and gender in terms of discrimination, similarity in outcomes across gender and experience of discrimination in terms of

race/ethnicity, and similarity in outcomes across race/ethnicity and experience of discrimination in terms of gender.

It is important to note that, despite the broad similarities in outcomes by experience of discrimination, race/ethnicity, and gender, the specific race/ethnic and gender subgroups had different means on the interpreted functions. While it is important to attend to the similarity of experience across race/ethnic and gender subgroups, it is also critical to further investigate the differences that exist between groups. Moreover, the extent to which within group variability may have impacted the results for individual race/ethnic and gender subgroups should be studied. For example, it is possible that among Hispanic females other psychological differences exist that differentiate those group members who experienced discrimination from those that did not and that these differences may be related to work and non-work outcomes. As such, future research on race/ethnic and gender subgroups should not only investigate the differences between groups but also would benefit from an investigation of the within group differences as well. Though the differences in group means were often not substantial, the present research provided evidence that race/ethnic and gender subgroup members have different subjective work and non-work outcomes both after the experience of discrimination and irrespective of the experience of discrimination. Future research should continue to investigate the unique experiences of race/ethnic and gender subgroup members using a more fine-grained analysis technique or qualitative methods.

Implications for Practice

Human resource practitioners and managers should use this research to inform the development of procedures for interacting with individuals involved in discrimination

complaints in organizations. As indicated earlier there has been a dramatic increase in the number of race-based and sex-based discrimination lawsuits in the last few decades. The forecasted demographic changes in the composition of the workforce may exacerbate the tension between races/ethnicities and genders in the workplace. Information regarding the individual outcomes of discrimination may be used to mitigate the devastation caused by the experience of discrimination. For example, managers and human resource practitioners might use the knowledge that discrimination has negative outcomes on physical health, supervisor, coworker, and work satisfaction when counseling a disgruntled employee. Furthermore, the results of the current study could be used to generate ideas for practice-related and policy-related research. In this way, organizations may be able to use the results of this study to guide research with the goal of assisting individual employees who are dealing with discrimination in the workplace.

Moreover, demonstrating sensitivity to the victim of discrimination and incorporating knowledge of the subjective response to discrimination into counseling sessions could also potentially reduce the number of lawsuits filed. If this were the case, organizations might be able to save millions of dollars currently spent on legal proceedings. Likewise, given the negative effect of discrimination on physical and psychological health, it is possible that support from above might lessen the impact of discrimination on these non-work outcomes for individual employees, thereby potentially reducing health care costs for organizations. Money allocated to defending organizations from discrimination lawsuits or increased healthcare costs due to the poor physical and psychological health outcomes for employees who have experienced discrimination could be better spent. For example, using the money saved to train managers and employees on

diversity management or sensitivity to diverse others could be one way to allot these funds.

The future of the workforce depends on the effective management of diverse individuals. As the population of the U.S. changes in the coming decades, managers will encounter new challenges with regard to understanding the needs and reactions of employees who may have vastly different cultural backgrounds. Moreover, some old issues will have new participants. For example, a recent Wall Street Journal article indicated that there has been a rise in the number of race-based lawsuits filed by Blacks who feel that they have been discriminated against in favor of Hispanics (Jordan, 2006). This is a new paradigm that reflects changes in workforce dynamics and may portend areas of future problems for employees, employers, and policymakers. Knowledge regarding the different outcomes for race/ethnic and gender subgroups could be used to reduce conflict within a diverse workforce.

Limitations

Archival Data Set

One major limitation of the current study was its use of an archival data set. While the data set was rich with information regarding the experiences of military personnel in multiple life domains, the measures were not specifically designed to meet the current study's goals. As such, the current researcher had no control over the development of the scales and measures included in the study. Scales were selected from the ones available in the data set to best capture the work and non-work outcomes of interest as well as the experience of discrimination. All scales were subjected to an exploratory factor analysis,

parallel analysis, and reliability analysis to confirm to the extent possible the statistical soundness of each measure.

While the size of the current sample enabled the examination of specific race/ethnic and gender subgroups for which it is typically difficult to accumulate adequate sample size for multivariate analyses, the current researcher had no influence on the sampling design or survey administration. As such, decisions were made to include or not include individuals from the sample which might not have been made if under the auspices of the present researcher. However, given the Workplace and Gender Relations Survey's results were for consumption by high level politicians and military personnel as well as available for public use, it was determined that the sample characteristics were sufficient for testing the current study's hypotheses and no adverse impact would be obtained by the use of the data set.

Perceptions of Discrimination

Another limitation of the current study related to the use of an archival data set was the inability to determine whether the discriminatory events experienced by respondents were actually perceived as discrimination or rather were simply perceived as unfortunate occurrences in the workplace. The measure did not specifically ask the respondent to indicate whether the event was thought to be discrimination; rather, it asked the respondent to indicate whether the event had occurred. Because the measure was developed with the intention of capturing the most pertinent, relevant incidences of discrimination in the workplace, incorporated information obtained from a review of psychological literature and focus groups, and had been previously used successfully by

DMDC, it was determined that it measured the construct of interest sufficiently well for the current investigation.

In addition, the focus of the measure of discrimination was limited because it did not allow for a determination of whether the event, if it was perceived as discriminatory, was thought to be race-based or sex-based discrimination, discrimination based on both race and sex, or perhaps, discrimination based on some other individual difference variable. As a result, the study was focused solely on the experience of discrimination with no insight into the respondent's perception of what incited the event.

Furthermore, the measure of the experience of discrimination was structured for use in the current study to be a dichotomous measure of the presence or absence of discrimination. As such, an individual who reported experiencing one incident of discrimination was combined with individuals who had experienced up to 12 incidences of discrimination. However, an examination of the data indicated that within each subgroup the distribution of incidences of discrimination were of approximately equal proportion. Therefore, no race/ethnic and gender subgroup reported experiencing proportionally more incidences of discrimination than any other race/ethnic and gender subgroup.

Military Sample

Because the sample used in the current study was drawn from an active duty military population, the study results may not be generalizable to the civilian population. Unlike occupations for non-military individuals, the military occupation is a multiple life domain commitment in that a Service member, more often than not, works and lives in a military community among other military personnel. Moreover, the military is an all-

volunteer force to which individuals commit themselves to a predetermined length of service. For example, an individual may commit him or herself to two to six years of active duty military service followed by a commitment in the military reserves. In fact, most Service members have military careers of 10 years or less. This truncated career is fostered by the military's "up or out" policy which essentially indicates that, if a Service member does not get promoted within a specific timeframe, he or she must leave the military. Moreover, as federal employees, military pay is mandated by Congress to be equal across individuals at each pay grade (Segal & Segal, 2004). Almost all military recruits are high school graduates and almost all officers are college graduates (Segal & Segal, 2004). A career in the military provides job and financial security, access to health care, reduced costs for food, clothing, and other items on the military installation as well as a strong sense of belonging and community (Segal & Segal, 2004). The military is unique in that it encompasses more aspects of a Service member's life than simply work. These characteristics may inhibit the applicability of the current study's findings to the population at large.

However, the U.S. military makes a particularly interesting case for studying issues related to racial and gender harassment. The military has a long history of being at the forefront of racial and ethnic integration. Moreover, equality of treatment for women has also been a focus of much research and discussion both within the military environment and at the federal level. When juxtaposed against other social institutions, the military has been comparatively integrated (Antecol & Cobb-Clark, 2003). Moreover, the nature of military employment leads to "a blurring of professional and personal relationships as military personnel-particularly young enlisted men and women-live and

work in close proximity with others who may be outside their social group” (Antecol & Cobb-Clark, 2003, p. 28). These aspects of military employment may serve to increase the frequency of interactions between race/ethnic and gender subgroup members and lead to a reduction in prejudice and stereotyping. While it is still difficult to know exactly the extent to which these results for military personnel extend to other groups of workers, the differences in outcomes found across members of race/ethnic and gender subgroups both after discrimination as well as irrespective of discrimination actually may have been less than those that might be found outside the military context. As such, the large samples of racial/ethnic and gender minority group members and ample contextual material, including information on the social context, constituted data that was uniquely suited to the purpose of the current study.

Understanding Why Subgroups Differed

The current investigation was unable to specifically address why differences between race/ethnic and gender subgroups within each of the presence or absence of discrimination subgroups might exist. Though standpoint theory was proposed as a paradigm for understanding the potential for subgroup differences, the current study was not a test of this theory. Moreover, though research on the social psychological processes involved in intergroup relations (e.g., social identity theory, relative deprivation theory) was incorporated in an interpretation of subgroup differences, the study did not explicitly test the assumptions of these theories. As such, a caveat to the interpretation of any of the scores of subgroups on the functions using social comparison theories is that it was impossible in the context of the current study either to accurately know what social identity was salient to the individual or what comparison group may have been used to

evaluate his or her relative position in society. The inferences made by the researcher were intended to offer possible interpretations of the subgroups' differences on each of the interpretable functions but were not intended to be definitive statements of explanation.

Future Research

Research Design and Methodology

Due to the difficulties working with an archival data set, future researchers in the area of race/ethnic and gender subgroups, discrimination, and work and non-work outcomes are advised to design and implement both laboratory and field studies to better understand subgroup differences. Some suggestions for each type of study are to follow.

Laboratory. The current research was unable to determine why race/ethnic and gender subgroups had different outcomes to discrimination as well as different outcomes irrespective of the experience of discrimination. Researchers interested in understanding why differences in work and non-work outcomes exist across subgroups should attempt to pinpoint the social or cognitive mechanism by which individuals compare and evaluate their experiences. For example, varying the status position of an individual in a controlled experiment that allows for the manipulation of task failure or success would provide valuable information regarding the influence of social status. The controlled laboratory experiment is most appropriate for studying the underlying processes involved in the differentiation of race/ethnic and gender subgroup subjective outcomes.

Field. Given the present study's focus on work and non-work outcomes, future research investigating subgroup differences targeting those variables is most appropriately conducted in the field. While certain aspects of control are sacrificed when

using a field methodology, attempting to explore the issues of the current study using a laboratory methodology would be too contrived and artificial. Moreover, obtaining the necessary sample sizes of the populations of interest would also be difficult to accomplish in a laboratory setting. Field studies examining work and non-work outcomes among different race/ethnic and gender groups would greatly contribute to the literature.

One important contribution a field study could make is to include a measure of discrimination assessment on the current discrimination scale. By doing so, the researcher would gain insight into whether the respondent believed that the workplace event he or she experienced was in fact the result of discrimination. It is possible that some individuals do not attribute these workplace events to discrimination but rather to personal bad luck or circumstances of fate not driven by bias against them. It would be interesting to examine how much perception of discrimination affects work and non-work outcomes as well as how the outcomes of people who perceive discrimination differ from those individuals who acknowledge the event was experienced but deny that it was a discriminatory event.

It would increase understanding of attributions of discrimination and work and non-work outcomes to allow respondents to indicate their perception of why they have been discriminated against. It is possible that other individual difference variables drive the perception of discrimination instead of race, gender, or their combination. Information of this nature would provide insight into how members of two low status groups (e.g., Hispanic women) perceive the cause of discrimination against them and whether the attribution would change depending on the type of behavior or the context of the interaction. Analyses could then be conducted that created groups based on discrimination

attributions. This would allow the investigation of divergence in work and non-work outcomes resulting from different attributions of discrimination across race/ethnic and gender subgroups as well as within specific race/ethnic and gender subgroups.

Future research would benefit from a more fine-tuned examination of the experience of discrimination that did not group together individuals who experienced single or few incidences with those who experienced multiple or many incidences of discrimination. Grouping individuals with a range of incidences of discrimination presumes that each act is perceived similarly by the target. Subsequent field studies would benefit from pilot studies among the population of interest that provide an initial assessment of the severity of each discriminatory event. This would aid the researcher in determining whether one severe discriminatory experience is comparable to multiple less severe discriminatory experiences and would be useful for understanding the consequences of specific discriminatory events.

Finally, future research should investigate in more detail the circumstances, interpretation, and consequences of discrimination for each of the race/ethnic and gender subgroups separately. Research should not limit the interpretation of events for low status groups (Blacks, Hispanics, women) by always juxtaposing their outcomes with those of high status groups (i.e., non-Hispanic Whites, men). A closer examination of the multivariate outcomes associated with discrimination for each race/ethnic and gender subgroup would enhance understanding of the unique experiences of members of these subgroups in the workplace.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY

Industrial/organizational and social psychologists have long recognized the negative impact of discrimination. Much research has focused on understanding the individual difference variables of the discriminator, the negative consequences of discrimination to self-esteem, or on the role of coping for the target of discrimination (e.g., Banaji & Greenwald, 1994; Branscombe, Schmidt, & Harvey, 1999; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Crocker & Major, 1989; Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, & Major, 1991; Crosby, Bromely, & Saxe, 1980; Devine, 1989; Krueger, 1996; Leonardelli & Tormala, 2003; Ruggiero & Marx, 1999; Ruggiero & Taylor, 1995, 1997; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995). Industrial/organizational psychologists have studied discrimination in the workplace but often focused on access discrimination or employed a method that used differences in objective outcomes among members of race/ethnic and gender subgroups as evidence for the existence of treatment discrimination (e.g., Blau, 1998; Brown & Ford, 1977; Budig, 2002; Cleveland, Vescio, & Barnes-Farrell, 2005). Less understood are the subjective outcome differences among race/ethnic and gender subgroups after experiencing specific discriminatory events.

As such, the aim of the current study was to investigate the race/ethnic and gender differences in subjective outcomes after treatment discrimination in the workplace. Individuals responded to a series of questions intended to measure their subjective work and non-work outcomes (e.g., supervisor satisfaction, coworker satisfaction, work

satisfaction, physical health, psychological health). They also responded to 12 questions intended to ascertain their experience of specific discriminatory events at work (e.g., unable to get answers regarding promotion, unjustified negative comments on evaluation, excluded from career-enhancing social events). Results indicated that individuals who experience discrimination at work have less positive outcomes than individuals who do not. Moreover, the differences between specific subgroups that had experienced and not experienced discrimination followed the same general pattern such that Black and non-Hispanic White men had similar outcomes, Hispanic men and non-Hispanic White women had similar outcomes, and Black and Hispanic women had similar outcomes. In addition, the results of this study demonstrated similarity in outcomes for non-Hispanic Whites compared to Blacks and Hispanics as well as for men compared to women. Implications of these results were that the experience of discrimination is uniformly negative for all who experience it but also that the outcomes of members of specific subgroups were, for the most part, reflective of their position within none, one or two low status social groups.

Conclusion

As the demography of the workforce changes, new issues and conflicts will arise that may impede organizational and employee success. In order for organizations to remain competitive in a global economy the ability to effectively handle the challenges and opportunities inherent in managing diverse workforces will be increased through understanding of the differing workplace experiences and outcomes of employees.

The results of the current study can aid organizations in their management of diverse individuals by aiding the formation of procedures that will address employee concerns regarding equitable treatment. The ability to incorporate specific information

about the different experiences of subgroups of employees will enable organizations to tailor training and other interventions to concentrate on the organizational issues of most salience to individual employees. Moreover, results of the current study may contribute to the generation of ideas for practice and policy-related research.

This study was an important step toward a more complete understanding race/ethnic and gender subgroup differences in work and non-work subjective outcomes both to discrimination and irrespective of discrimination. The study findings may lead researchers to investigate more fully the implication of organizational experiences, such as discrimination, on the lives of employees. Moreover, the findings may lead organizations to a better understanding that race/ethnic and gender subgroups of employees differ in their responses to organizational events and policies that advocate uniform treatment of all groups may not address the specific needs of particular groups.

REFERENCES

- 1999 Survey of Active Duty Personnel* [Data file and documentation on CD-ROM]. (2001). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- 2002 Status of the Armed Forces: Workplace and Gender Relations Survey*. Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Aboud, F. E., & Amato, M. (2003). Developmental and socialization influences on intergroup bias. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 65-88). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Advancing women in business-the Catalyst guide: Best practices from the corporate leaders*. (1998). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Amaro, H., Russo, N. F., & Johnson, J. (1987). Family and work predictors of psychological well-being among Hispanic women professionals. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *11*, 505-521.
- Andrisani, P. J. (1978). Job satisfaction among working women. *Signs*, *3*(3), 588-607.
- Antecol, H., & Cobb-Clark, D. A. (2003). *Identity and racial harassment*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Arbona, C. (1995). Theory and research on racial and ethnic minorities: Hispanic Americans. In F. T. L. Leong (Ed.), *Career development and vocational behavior of racial and ethnic minorities* (pp. 37-66). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

- Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey* [Data file and documentation on CD-ROM].
Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Armor, D. J. (1996). Race and Gender in the U.S. Military. *Armed Forces and Society*.
Fall: 7-27.
- Bailey, A. (1998). Locating traitorous identities: Toward a view of privilege-cognizant
White character. *Hypatia*, 13(3), 27-41.
- Baldi, S., & McBrier, D. B. (1997). Do the determinants for promotion differ for Blacks
and Whites? *Work & Occupations*, 24(4), 478-497.
- Banaji, M., & Greenwald, A. G. (1994). Implicit stereotyping and prejudice. In M. P.
Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *Psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium*
(pp. 55-76). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Barrett, I. C., Cervero, R. M., & Johnson-Bailey, J., (2003). Biculturalism-outsiders
within: The career development experiences of Black human resource developers.
Journal of Career Development, 30(2), 109-128.
- Bell, E. L., & Nkomo, S. M. (2001). *Our separate ways*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business
School Press.
- Bergman, M. E., & Drasgow, F. (2003). Race as a moderator in a model of sexual
harassment: An empirical test. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8(2),
131-145.
- Betz, N. (1993). Women's career development. In F. L. Denmark & M. A. Paludi (Eds.),
Psychology of women: A handbook of issues and theories (pp. 627-684).
Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Blake-Beard, S. D. (1999). The costs of living as an outsider within: An analysis of the mentoring relationships and career success of Black and White women in the corporate sector. *Journal of Career Development, 26*(1), 21-36.
- Blau, F. D. (1998). Trends in the well-being of American women. *Journal of Economic Literature, 36*(1), 112-165.
- Blau, G., Tatum, D. S., & Ward-Cook, K. (2003). Correlates of professional versus organizational withdrawal cognitions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*, 72-85.
- Bobo, L. D. (1999). Prejudice as group position: Microfoundations of a sociological approach to racism and race relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(3), 445-472.
- Bond, M.A., Punnett, L., Pyle, J. L., Cazeca, D. & Cooperman, M. (2004). Gendered work conditions, health, and work outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9*(1), 28-45.
- Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Harvey, R. D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(1), 135-149.
- Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1994). Collective self-esteem consequences of outgroup derogation when a valued social identity is on trial. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 24*, 641-657.
- Brenner, O. C., & Fernstein, J. A. (1984). Racial differences in perceived job fulfillment of white collar workers. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 58*(2), 643-646.
- Brett, J. M., & Stroh, L. K. (1997). Jumping ship: Who benefits from an external labor market career strategy? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(3), 331-341.

- Broman, C. L., Mavaddat, R., & Hsu, S. (2000). The experience and consequence of perceived racial discrimination: A study of African Americans. *Journal of Black Psychology, 26*(2), 165-180.
- Brown, H. A., & Ford, D. L., Jr. (1977). An exploratory analysis of discrimination in the employment of Black MBA graduates. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62*(1), 50-56.
- Brown, D., & Minor, C. W. (1991). The opinions of minorities about preparing for work: Report of the second NCEA national survey. *Career Development Quarterly, 40*(1), 5-20.
- Budig, M. J. (2002). Male advantage and the gender composition of jobs: Who rides the glass escalator? *Social Problems, 49*(2), 258-277.
- Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1996). Do women at the top make a difference? Gender proportions and the experiences of managerial and professional women. *Human Relations, 49*(8), 1093-1104.
- Carter, R. T. (2000) Perspectives on addressing cultural issues in organizations. In R. T. Carter (Ed.), *Addressing cultural issues in organizations: Beyond the corporate context* (pp. 3-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cleveland, J. N., Vescio, T. K., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2005). Gender discrimination in organizations. In R. L. Dipboye & A. Colella (Eds.), *Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases* (pp. 149-176). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Cohorn, C., Ormerod, A. J., & Fitzgerald, L. R. (in press). *Racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination and organizational outcomes: Insights from relative deprivation theory*. Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social Problems*, 33(6), S14-S32.
- Collins, P. H. (1997). Comment on Hekman's "Truth and method: Feminist standpoint theory revisited": Where's the power? *Signs*, 22(2), 375-381.
- Collins, P. H. (1999). Reflections on the outsider within. *Journal of Career Development*, 26(1), 85-88.
- Cooper, E. A., & Bosco, S. M. (1999). Methodological issues on conducting research on gender in organizations. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 477-493). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Corning, A. F. (2000). Assessing perceived social inequity: A relative deprivation framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(3), 463-477.
- Cox, T., Jr. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research & practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Cox, T., & Nkomo, S. M. (1990). Invisible men and women: A status report on race as a variable in organization behavior research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 419-431.
- Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review*, 96(4), 608-630.

- Crocker, J., Voelkl, K. Testa, M., & Major, B. (1991). Social stigma: The affective consequences of attributional ambiguity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(2), 218-228.
- Crosby, F., Bromely, S. & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of Black and White discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin, 87*(3), 546-563.
- Davis, J. A., & Smith, T. W. (1990). *General Social Surveys, 1972-1990*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Day, J. C. (1996). *Population projections of the United States by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 1995-2050*. U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Series P25-1130, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.
- Department of Defense. (1999). Annual report to the President and the Congress. Retrieved February 6, 2006 from <http://www.defenselink.mil/execsec/adr1999/>
- Department of Defense. (2004). Population Representation in the Military Services: Fiscal Year 2002. Retrieved December 16, 2005 from <http://www.defenselink.mil/prhome/poprep2002/>
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Social Issues, 50*, 13-32.
- Din-Dzietham, R., Nembhard, W. N., Collins, R., & Davis, S. K. (2004). Perceived stress following race-based discrimination at work is associated with hypertension in African-Americans. The metro Atlanta heart disease study, 1999-2001. *Social Science & Medicine, 58*(3), 449-461.

- Dion, K. L., Earn, B. M., & Yee, P. H. N. (1978). The experience of being a victim of prejudice: An experimental approach. *International Journal of Psychology, 13*(3), 197-214.
- Dodd-McCue, D., & Wright, G. B. (1996). Men, women, and attitudinal commitment: The effects of workplace experiences and socialization. *Human Relations, 49*(8), 1065-1091.
- Dragow, F., Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Waldo, C. R., & Zicker, M. J. (1999). *The 1995 Armed Forces Sexual Harassment Survey: Report on scales and measures* (Report No. 98-004). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Edwards, J. E., Elig, T. W., Edwards D. L., & Reimer, R. A. (1997). *The 1995 Armed Forces Sexual Harassment Survey: Administration, datasets, and codebook for Form B* (Report No. 95-015). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Eckholm, E. (2006, March 20). Plight deepens for Black men, studies warn. *The New York Times*, pp. A18.
- Elig, T. W. (2003). *Sample design for the Status of the Armed Forces Surveys—Workplace and Gender Relations*. In B. J. George & K. R. Kroeger (Eds.), *2002 Status of the Armed Forces Surveys—Workplace and Gender Relations: Statistical methodology report* (Report No. 2003-014). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Elliott, M. (2005) *Hispanic women at work*. National Council of La Raza. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from <http://www.nclr.org/content/publications/detail/32940/>
- Elsass, P. M., & Graves, L. (1997). Demographic diversity in decision-making groups: The experiences of women and people of color. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(4), 946-973.

- Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *12*(1), 53-72.
- 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 Publications.
- Finch, B. K., Hummer, R. A., Kolody, B., & Vega, W. A. (2001) The role of discrimination and acculturative stress in the physical health of Mexican-origin adults. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *23*(4), 399-429.
- Fine, M. G. (1995). *Building successful multicultural organizations: Challenges and opportunities*. Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1993). Sexual harassment: Violence against women in the workplace. *American Psychologist*, *48*(10), 1070-1076.
- Foley, S., & Kidder, D. L. (2002). Hispanic law students' perceptions of discrimination, justice, and career prospects. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *24*(1), 23-37.
- Foley, S., Kidder, D. L., & Powell, G. N. (2002). The perceived glass ceiling and justice perceptions: An investigation of Hispanic law associates. *Journal of Management*, *28*(4), 471-496.
- Ford, J. K., Kraiger, K., & Schechtman, S. L. (1986). Study of race effects in objective indices and subjective evaluations of performance: A meta-analysis of performance criteria. *Psychological Bulletin*, *99*(3), 330-337.

- Foster, M. D. (2000). Positive and negative responses to personal discrimination: Does coping make a difference? *The Journal of Social Psychology, 140*(1), 93-106.
- Foster, M. D., Arnt, S., & Honkola, J. (2004). When the advantaged become disadvantaged: Men's and women's actions against gender discrimination. *Sex Roles, 50*(1/2), 27-36.
- Friday, S. S., & Friday, E. (2003). Racioethnic perceptions of job characteristics and job satisfaction. *Journal of Management Development, 22*(5), 426-442.
- Friedman, R., & Davidson, M. N. (1999). The Black-White gap in perceptions of discrimination: Its causes and consequences. In R. J. Bies, R. J. Lewicki, & B. H. Shepard (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (pp. 203-230). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61-89). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Gattiker, U. E., & Larwood, L. (1988). Predictors for managers' career mobility, success, and satisfaction. *Human Relations, 41*(8), 569-591.
- Gavin, J. F., & Ewen, R. B. (1974). Racial differences in job attitudes and performance: Some theoretical considerations and empirical findings. *Personnel Psychology, 27*, 455-464.
- Gee, G. C. (2002). A multilevel analysis of the relationship between institutional and individual racial discrimination and health status. *American Journal of Public Health, 92*(4), 615-623.

- Glass Ceiling Commission Report. (1995). *Good for business: Making full use of the nation's human capital*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Goldenhar, L. M., Swanson, N. G., Hurrell, J. J., Ruder, A., & Deddens, J. (1998). Stressors and adverse outcomes for female construction workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(1), 19-32.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1993). Job performance attributions and career advancement prospects: An examination of gender and race effects. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 55(2), 273-297.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S. & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 64-86.
- Haase, R. F., & Ellis, M. V. (1987). Multivariate analysis of variance. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34(4), 406-413.
- Hallstein, D. L. O. (1999). A postmodern caring: Feminist standpoint theories, revisioned caring, and communication ethics. *Western Journal of Communication*, 63(1), 32-56.
- Harding, S. (2004). Introduction: Standpoint theory as a site of political, philosophic, and scientific debate. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The feminist standpoint theory reader* (pp. 1-16). New York: Routledge.
- Hartstock, N. C. (2004). The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The feminist standpoint theory reader* (pp. 35-54). New York: Routledge.

- Hartstock, N. C. (2004). Comment on Hekman's "Truth and method: Feminist standpoint theory revisited": Truth or Justice? In S. Harding (Ed.), *The feminist standpoint theory reader* (pp. 243-246). New York: Routledge.
- Hite, L. M. (2004). Black and White women managers: Access to opportunity. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *15*(2), 131-146.
- Huberty, C. J. (1994). Applied discriminant analysis. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Huberty, C. J., & Lowman, L. L. (1997). Discriminant analysis via statistical packages. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *57*, 759-784.
- Hurtado, A. (1989). Relating to privilege: Seduction and rejection in the subordination of White women and women of color. *Signs*, *14*(4), 833-855.
- Ilgen, D. R., & Youtz, M. A. (1986). Factors affecting the evaluation and development of minorities in organizations. In K. Rowland & G. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management: A research annual* (pp. 307-337). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- James, E. H. (2000). Race-related differences in promotions and support: Underlying effects of human and social capital. *Organization Science*, *11*(5), 493-508.
- Jameson, F. (2004). History and class consciousness as an "unfinished project." In S. Harding (Ed.), *The feminist standpoint theory reader* (pp. 143-152). New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, S. D. (1980). Consequences of reverse discrimination. *Psychological Reports*, *47*, 1035-1038.
- Jordan, M. (2006, January 24). Blacks vs. Latinos at work. *The Wall Street Journal*, pp. B1, B2.

- Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D., Jr. (1995). An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 485-519.
- Karlsen, S., & Nazroo, J. Y. (2002). Relation between racial discrimination, social class, and health among ethnic minority groups. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92(4), 624-631.
- Kessler, R. C., Mickelson, K. D., & Williams, D. R. (1999). The prevalence, distribution, and mental health correlates of perceived discrimination in the United States. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 40(3), 208-230.
- Kline, R. B. (2004). *Supplemental chapter on multivariate effect size estimation*. Retrieved January 4, 2006 from <http://www.apa.org/books/resources/kline>
- Kling, K. C., Hyde, J., Showers, C. J., & Buswell, B. N. (1999) Gender differences in self-esteem: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(4),470-500.
- 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's Quarterly*, 19, 439-472.
- Klonoff, E. A., Landrine, H., & Campbell, R. (2000). Sexist discrimination may account for well-known gender differences in psychiatric symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 93-99.
- Klonoff, E. A., Landrine, H., & Ullman, J. B. (1999). Racial discrimination and psychiatric symptoms among Blacks. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 5(4), 329-339.

- Knouse, S. B., Rosenfeld, P. & Culbertson, A. L. (1992). *Hispanics in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kraiger, K., & Ford, J. K. (1985). A meta-analysis of rater race effects in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*, 56-65.
- Krieger, N. (1990). Racial and gender discrimination: Risk factors for high blood pressure? *Social Science & Medicine, 30*(12), 1273-1281.
- Krueger, J. K. (1996). Personal beliefs and cultural stereotypes about racial characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(3), 536-548.
- Landau, J. (1995). The relationship of race and gender to managers' ratings of promotion potential. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*(4), 391-400.
- Lankau, M., & Scandura, T. A. (1996). An examination of job attitudes of White, Black, and Hispanic nurses in a public hospital. *International Journal of Public Administration, 19*(3), 377-399.
- Landrine, H., Klonoff, E. A., Gibbs, J., Manning, V., & Lund, M. (1995). Physical and psychiatric correlates of gender discrimination: An application of the Schedule of Sexist Events. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*, 473-492.
- Leonardelli, G. J., & Tormala, Z. L. (2003). The negative impact of perceiving discrimination on collective well-being: The mediating role of perceived ingroup status. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 507-514.
- Levin, S., Sinclair, S., Veniegas, R. C., & Taylor, P. L. (2002). Perceived discrimination in the context of multiple group memberships. *Psychological Science, 13*(6), 557-560.
- Levitin, T., Quinn, R. P., & Staines, G. L. (1971). Sex discrimination against the American working woman. *American Behavioral Scientist, 15*, 238-254.

- Lott, B., & Maluso, D. (1995). *The social psychology of interpersonal discrimination*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Magley, V. J., Waldo, C. R., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). The impact of sexual harassment on military personnel: Is it the same for men and women? *Military Psychology, 1*(3), 283-302.
- Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social comparisons, legitimacy appraisals, and group membership. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Psychology* (pp. 293-355). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Maume, D. J., Jr. (1999). Glass ceilings and glass escalators: Occupational segregation and race and sex differences in managerial promotions. *Work & Occupations, 26*(4), 483-509.
- McAree, D. (2004). DOJ pays \$11.5M in reverse discrimination case. *The National Law Journal*. Retrieved January 30, 2005 from <http://www.civilrights.org>.
- McKinnon, J. (2003). The Black population in the United States: March 2002. U. S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Series P20-541. Washington, DC.
- Miech, R. A., Eaton, W., & Liang, K. (2003). Occupational stratification over the life course: A comparison of occupational trajectories across race and gender during the 1980s and 1990s. *Work & Occupations, 30*(4), 440-473.
- Moch, M. K. (1980). Racial difference in job satisfaction: Testing four common explanations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*(3), 299-306.
- Moore, B. L. (1996). *To Serve My Country, To Serve My Race*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Moskos, C. C. & Butler, J. S. (1996). *All That We Can Be*. New York: Basic Books.

- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*, 224-247.
- Murrell, A. J., Olson, J. E. & Frieze, I. H. (1995). Sexual harassment and gender discrimination: A longitudinal study of woman managers. *Journal of Social Issues, 51(1)*, 139-149.
- Nathanson, P., & Young, K. K. (2001). Spreading misandry: The teaching of contempt for men in popular society. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Neimann, Y. F. (1999). Social ecological contexts of prejudice between Hispanics and Blacks. In P. Wong (Ed.), *Race, ethnicity, and nationality in the United States: Toward the twenty-first century* (pp. 170-190). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Nkomo, S. M. (1992). The emperor has no clothes: Rewriting race in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 17(3)*, 487-513.
- Nkomo, S. M., & Cox, T., Jr. (1990). Factors affecting the upward mobility of Black managers in private sector organizations. *Review of Black Political Economy, 18(3)*, 39-58.
- Oakes, P. (2003). The root of all evil in intergroup relations? Unearthing the categorization process. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 3-21). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- OMB Bulletin No. 00-02. (2000). *Guidance on aggregation and allocation of data on race for use in civil rights monitoring and enforcement*. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Management and Budget.

- OMB Statistical Policy Directive No. 15. (1977). *Race and ethnic standards for federal statistics and administrative reporting*. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Management and Budget.
- Ormerod, A. J., Lawson, A. K., Sims, C. S., Lytell, M. C., Wadlington, P. L., Yaeger, D. W., Wright, C. V., Reed, M. E., Lee, W. C., Drasgow, F., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Cohorn, C. A. (2003). *2002 Status of the Armed Forces Surveys – Workplace and Gender Relations: Report of scales and measures* (Report No. 2002-031). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Palmieri, P.A., Drasgow, F., Ormerod, A.J. (2001). *The 1996 Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey: Report on scales and measures* (Contract No. DASW01-97-C-0076). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Pavalko, E. K., Mossakowski, K. N., & Hamilton, V. J. (2003). Does perceived discrimination affect health? Longitudinal relationships between work discrimination and women's perceived physical and emotional health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *44*(1), 18-33.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple regression in behavioral research*. (3rd ed.) Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Pincus, F. L. (1996). Discrimination comes in many forms: Individual, institutional, and structural. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *40*(2), 186-194.
- Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. (1994). Investigating the “glass ceiling” phenomenon: An empirical study of actual promotions to top management. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*(1), 68-86.

- Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. (1997). Effect of race on promotions to top management in a federal department. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *40*(1), 112-128.
- Pulliam, D. (2004). Reverse discrimination. Retrieved January 30, 2005 from <http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/1004/1022041b.htm>
- Ragins, B. R., Townsend, B., & Mattis, M. (1998). Gender gap in the executive suite: CEOs and female executives report on breaking the glass ceiling. *Academy of Management Executive*, *12*(1), 28-42.
- Ramirez, R. R. (2004). *We the people: Hispanics in the United States*. U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Special Reports, Series CENSR-18. Washington, DC.
- Ramirez, R. R., & de la Cruz, G. P. (2003). *The Hispanic population in the United States: March 2002*. Current Population Reports, Series P20-545, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.
- Reskin, B. F., & Ross, C. E. (1992). Jobs, authority, and earnings among managers: The continuing significance of sex. *Work & Occupations*, *19*(4), 342-265.
- Roberts, P. C., & Stratton, L. M. (1995). *The new color line: How quotas and privilege destroy democracy*. Washington, DC: Regenery.
- Roberts, R. K., Swanson, N. G., & Murphy, L. R. (2004). Discrimination and occupational mental health. *Journal of Mental Health*, *13*(2), 129-142.
- Rosenfeld, R. A. (1980). Race and sex differences in career dynamics. *American Sociological Review*, *45*(4), 583-609.

- Rosenfeld, P., Newell, C. E., & Le, S. (1998). Equal opportunity climate of women and minorities in the Navy: Results from the Navy Equal Opportunity/Sexual Harassment (NEOSH) survey. *Military Psychology, 10*(2), 69-85.
- Rosenstein, J., & Hitt, M. A. (1986). Experimental research on race and sex discrimination: The record and the prospects. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 7*, 215-226.
- Ruggiero, K. M., & Marx, D. M. (1999). Less pain and more to gain: Why high-status group members blame their failure on discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(4), 774-784.
- Ruggiero, K. M., & Taylor, D. M. (1995). Coping with discrimination: How disadvantaged group members perceive the discrimination that confronts them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(5), 826-838.
- Ruggiero, K. M., & Taylor, D. M. (1997). Why minority group members perceive or do not perceive the discrimination that confronts them: The role of self-esteem and perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(2), 373-389.
- Sanchez, J. I., & Brock, P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: Is diversity management a luxury or a necessity? *The Academy of Management Journal, 39*(3), 704-719.
- Schmitt, M. T., Branscombe, N. R., Kobrynowicz, D., & Owen, S. (2002). Perceiving discrimination against one's gender group has different implications for well-being in women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(2), 197-210.

- Schmitt, M. T., Branscombe, N. R., & Postmes, T. (2003). Women's emotional responses to the pervasiveness of gender discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 297-312.
- Segal, D. R. (1989). *Recruiting for Uncle Sam: Citizenship and Military Manpower Policy*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Segal, D. R., & Segal, M. W. (2004). America's military population. *Population Bulletin, 59(4)*, 1-40.
- Shaffer, M. A., Joplin, J. R. W., Bell, M. P., Lau, T., & Oguz, C. (2000). Gender discrimination and job-related outcomes: A cross-cultural comparison of working women in the United States and China. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 57*, 395-427.
- Simon, B., Aufderheide, B., & Kampmeier, C. (2003). The social psychology of minority-majority relations. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 303-323). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Slocum, J. W., & Strawser, R. H. (1972). Racial differences in job attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 56(1)*, 28-32.
- Smith, P. L., Smits, S. J., & Hoy, F. (1998). Employee work attitudes: The subtle influence of gender. *Human Relations, 51(5)*, 649-666.
- Somers, M. J., & Birnbaum, D. (2001). Racial differences in work attitudes: What you see depends on what you study. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 15(4)*, 579-591.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.
- Spraggins, R. E. (2005). *We the people: Women and men in the United States*. U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Special Reports, Series CENSR-20. Washington, DC.

- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1996). *Intergroup relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Stevens, J. P. (1996). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. (3rd ed.) Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. (4th ed.) Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Stoops, N. (2004). *Educational attainment in the United States: 2003*. U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Series P20-550. Washington, DC.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(2), 199-214.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*. (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1994). *Theories of intergroup relations: International social psychological perspectives*. (2nd ed.) Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Tsui, A. S., & Gutek, B. A. (1984). A role set analysis of gender differences I performance, affective relationships, and career success of industrial middle managers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(3), 619-635.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2004). *Current Population Survey*. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from <http://www.bls.gov/cps/#charemp>

- U.S. Census Bureau (2004a) *Current Population Survey: 2004 Annual Social and Economic Supplement*. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from http://pubdb3.census.gov/macro/032004/perinc/new01_001.htm
- U.S. Census Bureau (2004b), *Population Division, Education & Social Stratification Branch*. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from <http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/education/tabA-2.xls>
- U.S. Department of Education (2003), National Center for Education Statistics, *2001 Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study (B&B:2000/01)*. Retrieved September 11, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/das/library/tables_listings/show_nedrc.asp?rt=p&tableID=21
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2005a). *Race-based discrimination*. Retrieved August 4, 2005, from <http://www.eeoc.gov/types/race.html>.
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2005b). *Sex-based discrimination*. Retrieved August 4, 2005, from <http://www.eeoc.gov/types/sex.html>.
- Van der Velde, M. E. G., Bossink, C. J. H., & Jansen, P. G. W. (2003). Gender differences in the influence of professional tenure on work attitudes. *Sex Roles, 49*(3/4), 153-162.
- Weis, L. (2001). Race, gender, and critique: African-American women, White women, and domestic violence in the 1980s and 1990s. *Signs, 27*(1), 139-169.
- Werschkul, M., & Williams, E. (2004). *The status of women in the states*. Retrieved January 30, 2005, from <http://www.iwpr.org>.

- Wharton, A. (1992). The social construction of gender and race in organizations: A social identity and group mobilization perspective. In P. Tolbert, & S. Bacharach (Eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations* (Vol. 10, pp. 55-84). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Williams, D. R., Neighbors, H. W., & Jackson, J. S. (2003). Racial/ethnic discrimination and health: Findings from community studies. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*(2), 200-208.
- Williams, D. R., & Williams-Morris, R. (2000). Racism and mental health: The African American experience. *Ethnicity & Health, 5*(3/4), 243-268.
- Willis, E. J., Mohamed, S. G., & Lipari, R. N. (2002). *2002 Status of the Armed Forces Survey—Workplace and Gender Relations: Administration, datasets, and codebook* (Report No. 2002-010). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MEASURES USED TO ESTABLISH SUBGROUPS

Table A1

Race/ethnicity and Gender Measures

Question	Response Choices
Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?	No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
<i>Mark "No" if not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.</i>	Yes, Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano
	Yes, Puerto Rican
	Yes, Cuban
	Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
What is your race?	White
<i>Mark one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be.</i>	Black or African American
	American Indian or Alaska Native
	Asian
	(e.g., Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese)
	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (e.g., Samoan, Guamanian or Chamorro)
	Some other race (<i>Please specify below.</i>)
Are you...?	Male
	Female

Note. From 2002 Status of the Armed Forces: Workplace and Gender Relations Surveys (DMDC Survey No: 02-0001). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.

Table A2

Workplace Discrimination Measure

Question	Response Choices
During the past 12 months, did any of the following happen to you? If it did, do you believe your gender was a factor?	You were rated lower than you deserved on your last evaluation
<i>Mark only one answer for each statement.</i>	Your last evaluation contained unjustified negative comments
	You were held to higher performance standard than others
	You did not get an award or decoration given to others in similar circumstances
	Your current assignment has not made use of your job skills
	Your current assignment is not good for your career if you continue in the military
	You did not receive day-to-day, short-term tasks that would have helped you prepare for advancement
	You did not have a professional relationship with someone who advised (mentored) you on career development or advancement
	You did not learn-until it was too late-of opportunities that would have helped your career
	You were unable to get straight answers about your promotion possibilities
	You were excluded from social events important to career development and being kept informed
	You did not a job assignment that you wanted and for which you were qualified

Note. From 2002 Status of the Armed Forces: Workplace and Gender Relations Survey (DMDC Survey No. 02-0001). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center. R = reversed-coded item.

APPENDIX B

OUTCOME VARIABLE MEASURES

Table B1

Measures of Work Outcomes

Scale	Item(s)
Pay Satisfaction	Indicate the extent to which you are satisfied with your Basic Pay.
Intentions to Stay	Assuming you could stay on active duty, how likely is it that you would choose to do so?
Service Commitment	<p>Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about your Service.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Being a member of your Service inspires you to do the best.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">You are willing to make sacrifices to help your Service.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">You are glad that you are part of your Service.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">You are NOT willing to put yourself out to help your Service. (R)</p>
Supervisor Satisfaction	<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your workgroup?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The leaders in your work group set high standards for Service members in terms of good behavior and discipline.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The leaders in your work group are more interested in looking good than being good. (R)</p>

Table B1

Measures of Work Outcomes (Continued)

Scale	Item(s)
Supervisor Satisfaction	<p>You are impressed with the quality of leadership in your work group.</p> <p>You would go for help with a personal problem to people in your chain of command.</p> <p>The leaders in your work group are not concerned with the way Service members treat each other as long as the job gets done. (R)</p> <p>The leaders in your work group are more interested in furthering their careers than in the well-being of their Service members. (R)</p> <p>Leaders in your work group treat Service members with respect.</p> <p>Leaders most often get willing and whole-hearted cooperation from the Service members in your work group.</p> <p>The NCOs/petty officers in your chain of command are a good source of support for Service members.</p>
Coworker Satisfaction	<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the people you work with?</p> <p>There is very little conflict among your coworkers.</p> <p>You like your coworkers.</p> <p>Your coworkers put in the effort required for their jobs.</p> <p>You are satisfied with the relationships you have with your coworkers.</p> <p>The people in your workgroup tend to get along.</p> <p>The people in your workgroup are willing to help each other.</p>

Table B1

Measures of Work Outcomes (Continued)

Scale	Item(s)
Work Satisfaction	<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the work you do?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Your work provides you with a sense of pride.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Your work makes good use of your skills.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Your present assignment is good for your military career.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">You like the kind of work you do.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Your job gives you the chance to acquire valuable skills.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">You are satisfied with your job as a whole.</p>

Note. From 2002 Status of the Armed Forces: Workplace and Gender Relations Survey (DMDC Survey No. 02-0001). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center. R = reversed-coded item.

Table B2

Measures of Non-work Outcomes

Scale	Item(s)
Physical Health	<p>How true or false is each of the following statements for you? <i>Please mark one answer for each statement.</i></p> <p>I am as healthy as anybody I know.</p> <p>I seem to get sick a little easier than other people. (R)</p> <p>I expect my health to get worse. (R)</p> <p>My health is excellent.</p>
Psychological Health	<p>How much time during the past 4 weeks have you...<i>Please mark one answer for each statement.</i></p> <p>Felt calm and peaceful. (R)</p> <p>Been a very nervous person.</p> <p>Felt so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer you up.</p> <p>Felt downhearted and blue.</p> <p>Been a happy person. (R)</p>

Note. From 2002 *Status of the Armed Forces: Workplace and Gender Relations Survey* (DMDC Survey No. 02-0001). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center. R = reversed-coded item