ORIGINAL

FILED
MAR 21 1 12 PM '97
RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NO. DIST. OF CA.

James M. Finberg (State Bar No. 114850)
Kelly M. Dermody (State Bar No. 171716)
Jonathan D. Selbin (State Bar No. 170222)
Trina N. Parker (State Bar No. 168716)
LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
275 Battery Street, 30th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3339
Telephone: (415) 956-1000

Morris J. Baller (State Bar No. 048928)
David Borgen (State Bar No. 099354)
Michelle Alexander (State Bar No. 177089)
SAPERSTEIN, GOLDSTEIN, DEMCHAK & BALLER
A Professional Corporation
1300 Clay Street, 11th Floor
Oakland, California 94612
Telephone: (510) 763-9800

Plaintiff Class Counsel

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VICKI BUTLER, SUSAN ELLIS, FELICIA FUNDERBURK, JACQUELINE GENERO, SHERYLE JONES, KIMBERLY STODDARD, and CHERYL WILLIAMS, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, and JAMIE WILSON, as an individual,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HOME DEPOT, INC.,

Defendant.

TERESA FRANK, KATHERINE TOMA, and KATHLEEN YORK, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HOME DEPOT, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. C 94 4335 (SI)
C 95 2182 (SI)
Consolidated

REPORT OF PROFESSOR SUSAN T. FISKE ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS

Table of Contents

Summary of Opinion---------- 2
(I) Gender stereotyping plays a major role in Home Depot's hiring, placement, and promotion patterns---------- 3
(a) Background on Bias: Stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination---------- 3
(b) Background: Research on bias has a long history---------- 3
(c) Background: Nature of gender stereotypes---------- 4
(d) Overview of remainder of opinion---------- 7
(II) Much individual gender stereotyping is automatic and not fully conscious----- 7
(a) Decision-makers deny gender bias---------- 7
(b) What is meant by automatic?---------- 7
(c) Rapid and automatic categorization---------- 8
(d) Outgroup homogeneity---------- 11
(e) Biased information search---------- 11
(f) Biased attributions---------- 13
(g) Memory biases---------- 15
(h) Prejudice has automatic aspects---------- 16
(i) Discrimination has automatic aspects---------- 17
(j) Summary---------- 19
III. Bias can be socially convenient---------- 19
(a) Getting along with bias ----------19
(b) Biased ingroup norms ----------20
(c) Biased power structure ----------21
(d) Protecting against threat ----------23
IV. Organizations can control individuals' bias---------- 23
(a) Providing valid, standard, unambiguous information---------- 23
(b) Providing appropriate motivation to be accurate---------- 26
V. Organizations can reduce bias by how they structure themselves---------- 28
(a) Integrating previously segregated job categories---------- 28
(b) Numbers: Preventing tokenism and filling the pipeline---------- 29
(c) Power must be used positively---------- 29
(d) Organizational priorities must identify balance as a clear goal---------- 30
(e) Climate of mutual enthusiasm---------- 30
Appendix 1. Information Considered ----------32
Appendix 2. Overheads to Summarize Opinion ----------33
Appendix 3. Qualifications as an Expert Witness ----------39
Appendix 4. Publications in Last Ten Years ----------43
Appendix 5. Compensation ----------50
Appendix 6. Other Cases Qualified as an Expert in Last 4 Years ----------51

I, Susan T. Fiske, have been retained by Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann, & Bernstein, LLP and by Saperstein, Goldstein, Demchak, & Baller, counsel for the plaintiffs, to opine regarding whether gender stereotyping at Home Depot affects the female employees of Home Depot's West Coast Division.

I am currently Distinguished University Professor of Psychology, having joined the University of Massachusetts at Amherst faculty in 1986. A 1978 Harvard Ph.D., I received an honorary doctorate from the Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, in 1995. I have significant expertise in scientific research methods, having studied methods, taught methods, and reviewed methods as an editor. I have authored over 49 journal articles and 35 book chapters; I have 7 edited books and journal special issues. My graduate text with Taylor, Social Cognition (1984; 2nd ed., 1991), is viewed as defining the subfield of how people think about and make sense of other people. My federally funded social cognition research focuses on social structure, motivation, and stereotyping, which led to expert testimony cited by the U.S. Supreme Court in Price Waterhouse v Hopkins. I won the 1991 American Psychological Association Award for Distinguished Contributions to Psychology in the Public Interest, Early Career; was 1994 President of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (Division 8 of the American Psychological Association); won, with Glick, the 1995 Allport Intergroup Relations award from the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues for my work on ambivalent gender stereotyping; and just edited, with Gilbert and Lindzey, the Handbook of Social Psychology (4th ed.,1997). On campus, I teach undergraduate courses on social psychology and on racism, and I serve on various diversity and multiculturalism committees. See excerpts from my curriculum vita in this report's Appendix 3, Qualifications as an Expert Witness, and Appendix 4, Publications in the Last Ten Years.

Opinion

Summary. (I) Gender stereotyping plays a major role in Home Depot's hiring, placement, and promotion patterns. (II) Much of this stereotyping is automatic and not fully conscious at the individual level, (III) but it is convenient for individual decision-makers, so they do not examine it. (IV) Organizations can control these effects of stereotyping, through proper information and proper motivation, (V) and organizations can reduce bias by how they structure themselves, but Home Depot does not take adequate steps to control these biased individual practices.

Essentially, this opinion explains how managers, including apparently decent individuals, can discriminate against another whole group of people, unless checked by organizational interventions. The work reported here, the review of scientific evidence regarding the operation of gender stereotypes, is part of my scientific research as an academic, not work performed solely for the purposes of the litigation. In this report, I am applying that scientific knowledge base to the facts of this case, to provide a

framework for understanding what occurs at Home Depot. I rely on the scientific literature regarding the typical antecedents, indicators, and consequences of bias. The evidence from Home Depot bears out many of these antecedents, indicators, and consequences of bias.

(I) Gender stereotyping plays a major role in Home Depot's hiring, placement, and promotion patterns.

(a) Background on bias: Stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination. Both stereotyping and prejudice can underlie discrimination. Although people commonly assume that discrimination results only from prejudice, discrimination can also result from stereotyping. So it is useful to distinguish these terms: Stereotyping is cognition or thoughts about someone from a different group; prejudice is affect or feelings about such a person; discrimination is the legally proscribed behavior. Discrimination results from not just from prejudice, but also from stereotyping.[1/] Apparently decent people, who are not hostile bigots, can discriminate on the basis of stereotypes.

(b) Background: Research on bias has a long history. Social scientists have studied stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination for decades; the research is not a recent invention. For example, the first published mention of stereotyping occurred in 1922.[2/] Early measures of stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination were used in the 1920s and 30s.[3/] The topic has been reviewed in the field's earliest Handbooks, up through the present.[4/]

[1/] Dovidio, J. F., Brigham, J. C., Johnson, B. T., & Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination: Another look. In N. Macrae, C. Stanger & M. Hewstone (Eds.), Stereotypes and stereotyping (pp. 276-319). New York: Guilford.

[2/] Lippmann, W. (1922). Public opinion. New York: Harcourt Brace.

[3/] For prejudice: Bogardus, E. S. (1927). Race friendliness and social distance. Journal of Applied Sociology, 11, 272-287. For stereotyping: Katz, D., & Braly, K. W. (1933). Racial stereotypes of 100 college students. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 28, 280-290. For discrimination: LaPiere, R.T. (1934). Attitudes versus actions. Social Forces, 13, 230-237.

[4/] First edition: Harding, J., Kutner, B., Proshansky, H., & Chein, I. (1954). Prejudice and ethnic relations. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 1021-1061). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. Second edition: Harding, J. B., Proshansky, H., Kutner, B., & Chein, I. (1969). Prejudice and ethnic relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (2nd ed., vol. 5, pp. 1-76). Reading, MA: Addison. pp. 1-76). Reading, MA: Addison. Third edition: Stephan, W. G. (1985). Intergroup relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook

Research on stereotyping has been performed in the laboratory and in the field, and the laboratory research generalizes well to field settings. Reputable scientific journals publish research concluding that laboratory studies are applicable to field settings.

(c) Background: Nature of gender stereotypes. Gender stereotypes specifically are well-established as a scientific area of study.[5/] Gender is the most salient category that people use to stereotype other people.[6/] Accordingly, people often use stereotypes to categorize women; that is, people use categories such as housewife, sexy chick, career woman, and feminist.[7/] So, for example, women employed in visible locations, such as receptionists or cashiers, are often selected to be stereotypically attractive "sexy chicks," and treated as such. At Home Depot, the reports of managers having affairs

---

of social psychology (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 599-658). New York: Random House. Fourth edition: Fiske, S. T. (in press). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey (eds.) The handbook of social psychology (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

[5/] For example: Deaux, K. (1985). Sex and gender. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology (Vol. 36, pp. 49-81). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews; Deaux, K., & LaFrance, M. (in press). Gender. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey (eds.) The handbook of social psychology (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp.). New York: McGraw-Hill; Ruble, D. N., & Ruble, T. L. (1982). Sex stereotypes. In A. G. Miller (Ed.), In the eye of the beholder: Contemporary issues in stereotyping (pp. 188-252). New York: Praeger.

[6/] Fiske, A. P., Haslam, N., & Fiske, S. T. (1991). Confusing one person with another: What errors reveal about the elementary forms of social relations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 656-674. Mackie, D. M., Hamilton, D. L., Susskind, J., & Rosselli, F. (1996). Social psychological foundations of stereotype formation. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.). Stereotypes and stereotyping (pp. 41-78). New York: Guilford. Stangor, C., Lynch, L., Duan, C., & Glass, B. (1992). Categorization of individuals on the basis of multiple social features. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 207-218. van Knippenberg, D., & van Knippenberg, A. (1994). Social categorization, focus of attention, and judgements of group opinions. British Journal of Social Psychology, 33, 477-489.

[7/] Deaux, K., Winton, W., Crowley, M., & Lewis, L. L. (1985). Level of categorization and content of gender stereotypes. Social Cognition, 3, 145-167. Eckes, T. (1994). Features of men, features of women: Assessing stereotypic beliefs about gender subtypes. British Journal of Social Psychology, 33, 107-123. Noseworthy, C. M., & Lott, A. J. (1984). The cognitive organization of gender-stereotypic categories. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10, 474-481. Six, B., & Eckes, T. (1991). A closer look at the complex structure of gender stereotypes. Sex Roles, 24, 57-71.

with female employees exemplify this pattern Examples: (a) Melissa Aguirre's letter (D91949-55) testifies about "the group of single young women available to Ron [Geiger]," leading Aquirre to state: "Many of us had come to believe that upper management made allowances for the indiscretions of promiscuous yet important managers"; Human Relations Manager Pam Chudomelka's notes on their conversation indicates his several affairs with employees; (b) Similarly, Eric Noll's memo investigating management misconduct (D83953-61) concludes that Assistant Store Managers and Department Supervisors "verbally or physically harass female associates," including reports by male associates that Assistant Store Managers and Department Supervisors do "inappropriate things to females (i.e., hugging them, running their fingers through their hair, rubbing their backs)" and reports by female associates that manager Kip Armstrong ignored harassment complaints, allowed sexual comments daily, and made the women feel worthless. Several reports of lewd jokes and inappropriate sexual comments are provided in Noll's memo; (c) Kim Cordova's report of Department Head Mark Hanna's groping and sexual harassment at a 1993 Christmas party (pp. 3-4), which was initially ignored by management; (d) Susan Ellis's EEOC charge and deposition report indicating that a photo of managers with a nude woman was circulated during a sexual harassment training tape; (e) Shelley Edwards's report of being called "Blondie" (Edwards dep pp 301-302); (f) department head Michael Rodr described some managers sleeping with employees, counter to the rules (Rodr dep II pp 99-100); (g) assistant manager Kerry Ashby's description of managers joking about contractors wanting pretty cashiers on the front end (Ashby dep pp 20, 138) and wanting to hire pretty cashiers (Ashby dep pp 26-27); (h) store manager Alan Jang reported to "flirt with his girlfriend cashiers" instead of training an associate (Ashby dep p 32) and harassing employees (Ashby dep p 41, 44-45, 75-7 80, 84, 160-1), as well as (i) manager Steve Harada harassing employees (Ashby dep pp 46-49, 174) and (j) Perry Smiley discussing his sexual attraction to female employees (Ashby dep p 58) and making explicit sexual remarks to them (Ashby dep p 67); (k) other managers rubbing against cashiers or touching female employees (Ashby, pp 176, 180-1), all with no apparent consequences (Ashby dep pp 50-52, 67, 218-9); (l) manager Bill Butler favoring a female employee because she was attractive (Ashby dep p 115); (m) manager Terry Ouellette favoring employees with whom he had relations (Ashby dep pp 214-5); (n) a strip poker party involving managers and sales staff (Smith dep pp. 131-3, 136-144); (o) sexual incidents at a Christmas party, one involving a manager and an 18-year-old female cashier and one involving sexually explicit dancing (Smith dep pp 144-152); (p) a sexual incident involving unwanted sexual advances (Smith dep pp 153-164); (q) a bikini-clad woman promoting Mikita Tools (Smith dep pp 114-15); (r) a stripper hired to perform just outside the receiving dock for a male store manager (Smith dep pp 116-19); (s) supervisors' comments about female employee Patty's body, having a peep show to watch her, inviting her to Hawaii, and commenting about "a very lucky man to have bedded someone like Patty" (Smith dep pp 102-114).

On the other hand, women who aspire to nontraditional roles, such as expertise in

home improvement, may be stereotyped as objectionable feminists. An example that reflects this kind of hostility may include Shelley Edwards's report that manager Ron Welch said that another female should "get sawdust down her bra; that will fix her" (Edwards dep pp 294-5).

Stereotypers may treat the sexy traditional type (a female cashier) and the feminist nontraditional type (a female manager or sales associate) quite differently, perceiving the cashier as a legitimate target of sexual attention (but not respect)[8/] and perceiving the nontraditional job seeker as dislikable for intruding in a gender-inappropriate role.[9/] This ambivalence is an important--and unique--feature of gender bias, as compared to other kinds of bias; people with sexist attitudes may be genuinely fond of some kinds of women, while genuinely disliking others.[10/] Note that both men and women can be sexist. In particular, both men and women may feel hostility toward women stereotyped as unattractive, independent, nontraditional types (feminists, bossy women), while feeling benevolence toward attractive, dependent, traditional types (caretakers, sexy women). But in the case of men, "benevolent" stereotypes can lead to sexual harassment. In the eye of the stereotyper, there may be two kinds of women, those who are liked but not respected, and those who are respected but not liked.

In addition to stereotyping women, decision-makers can hold stereotyped images about different kinds of jobs, some jobs being seen as men's jobs and some as women's jobs.[11/] Examples at Home Depot include the idea that cashiering is a women's job (Ashby dep p 140) and that slamming freight is a man's job. Grouping applicants into potential cashiers and potential sales associates exaggerates this kind of gender-related categorization of jobs (Lutostanski dep p 197; Singletary dep III p 136). More

---

[8/] Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (1995). Ambivalence and stereotypes cause sexual harassment: A theory with implications for organizational change. Journal of Social Issues, 51, 97-115.

[9/] Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. Organizational Behavior, 5, 269-298. Also, references to dislike of nontraditional women in Fiske, S. T., Bersoff, D. N., Borgida, E., Deaux, K., & Heilman, M. E. (1991). Social science research on trial: The use of sex stereotyping research in Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins. American Psychologist, 46, 1049-1060.

[10/] Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 491-512.

[11/] Glick, P. (1991). Trait-based and sex-based discrimination in occupational prestige, occupational salary, and hiring. Sex Roles, 25, 351-378. Heilman (1983, op cit.). Ruble & Ruble (1982) op cit.

specific examples include the concentration of the few women sales associates in stereotypically female areas such as design, paint, kitchen cabinets, light cloud, and garden, as opposed to lumber, electrical, and plumbing (Birren dep pp 184-187; Lutostanski dep pp 202, 211; Popowtiz dep pp 41, 46, 54, 60, 61, 65; Singletary dep IV pp 141-2).

(d) Overview of remainder of opinion. This kind of gender bias persists at Home Depot, more than one might think, because (2) Much of this stereotyping is automatic and not fully conscious at the individual level, (3) but it is convenient for decision-makers, so they do not examine it. (4) Organizations could control these effects of individual stereotyping, by proper information and proper motivation, (5) and the right organizational structures can be particularly effective in doing so, but Home Depot does little to control these practices.

(II) Much individual gender stereotyping is automatic and not fully conscious at the individual level.

(a) Decision-makers deny gender bias. Decision-makers at Home Depot repeatedly assert that they hire and promote "the best person for the job" (Armstrong dep p 52), "the best qualified individual" (Birren dep p 135), "promote the most qualified person" (Singletary dep IV p 134), and that they do not consider gender in their decisions (e.g., Popowitz dep p 30, 222, 250). Social psychology suggests that they are not in a position to assert what they do not consider in their decisions.[12/] Critical, early stages of decision-making are largely automatic, and people cannot avoid considering gender. What managers do and say, their verbal stereotyping, as well as their biased decisions, are better indicators of gender bias. (Patterns of outcomes across the organization are also a good indicator.)

(b) What is meant by automatic? Automatic thoughts are defined as unintentional, involuntary, effortless, and outside conscious awareness at the individual level.[13/]

[12/] Bargh, J. A. (1989). Conditional automaticity: Varieties of automatic influence in social perception and cognition. In J. S. Uleman & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), Unintended Thought (pp. 3-51.) New York, NY: Guilford Press. Bargh, J. A. (in press). The automaticity of everyday life. In R. S. Wyer, Jr. (Ed.), Advances in social cognition, (vol.10). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Wilson, T. D., & Brekke, N. (1994). Mental contamination and mental correction: Unwanted influences on judgments and evaluations. Psychological Bulletin, 116, 117-142.

[13/] Bargh (1989, in press, op. cit.)

Certain kinds of thinking processes become automatic through practice[14]; for example, the first steps in forming impressions, a process highly practiced by virtually everyone, include the mental activation of social categories.[15] There are less automatic, more controllable processes relevant to forming impressions: these include how motivations and goals guide attention to valid information (see Sections IV & V, below).

(c) Rapid and automatic categorization. To gain perspective on how gender could automatically affect decision-makers at Home Depot, it is useful to understand how people automatically categorize other people, and the effects of that rapid and automatic categorization. Essentially, decision-makers are thinking in gendered terms when gender is irrelevant to job qualifications. Indicators of categorizing female employees by gender rather than job-relevant criteria include (a) referring to them as girls (Armstrong dep pp 80-81, 107); (b) Susan Ellis's report that she was asked to fetch everybody's lunch, in conjunction with insults about her as someone's overly talkative mother (Ellis dep II pp 372-6); (c) Shelley Edwards being told to make coffee, "that's your job, it's a woman's job" (Edwards dep pp 301-302); (d) department head Dave Harwood describing "The E factor is estrogen. When you have estrogen is when you have problems and you need [motivational] memos like this. When it was all men in the phone center, we didn't need signs like this. That was the T factor, for testosterone" (Smith dep pp 264-68); (e) Edwards reported that manager John Werner said "That's the trouble with you women; you get knocked up and then you're worthless" (Edwards dep p. 314), implying that traditional roles for women make them incompetent; (f) women supposedly preferring the vault jobs (Foster dep pp 116-19; Vosler dep pp 157-61). Of added relevance is all the evidence cited below in reference to ingroup norms (Section III). Finally, using the generic masculine to refer to associates and managers presupposes that they are male, categorically excluding women (Popowitz dep pp 205, 207; Singletary dep I pp. 158, 165, 222, 232; II 3, 22, 219; III 18, 80, 106, 117, 204; IV 33, 54, 64, 73, 112; assistant managers bring their "wives," Singletary dep I p 115); the generic masculine is not neutral.[16] Nor is the generic feminine, as applied to cashiers (Singletary dep III p 66).

---

[14] Smith, E. R. (in press). Mental representation and memory. In D.T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

[15] References follow throughout this section; for reviews, see Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1993). Stereotypes and evaluative intergroup bias. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), Affect, cognition, and stereotyping (pp. 167-193). San Diego: Academic Press; and Fiske, S. T. (in press, op. cit.).

[16] Banaji, M. R., & Hardin, C. (1996). Automatic stereotyping. Psychological Science, 7, 136-141.

Having categorized someone as coming from a different gender, race, or broad age group than oneself, a decision-maker will be automatically biased by the ingroup advantage,[17] which mentally says: "we" are automatically good (and "they" are not so good). This means that people automatically judge their own group as better, so male decision-makers have an automatic bias to view other men as better than women. Examples include (a) the previously cited comments of manager John Werner that only men could succeed at Home Depot; (b) manager Kip Armstrong saying that there are "jobs women aren't going to do as good as guys" and elaborating the reasons for his belief (Armstrong dep pp 134-137); (c) assistant manager Kerry Ashby stating people's concerns about a generic female employee, "whether she could handle the freight load and lifting. It was a gender discrimination situation more than anything" (Ashby dep p 29); (d) Ashby stating that women were seen to have a cashier "mentality," that they are better with their fingers (Ashby dep p. 20); (e) department managers reportedly not wanting women in their departments because they were allegedly incompetent (Ashby dep p 241-2); (f) assistant manager Brad Ihde going through a female employee's desk drawers and making derogatory comments about her having nail polish and a magazine: "I'm sure you guys have a lot of work to do" (Smith dep pp 284-85); (g) receiving manager Benny Herrera explaining why only the two women in receiving were asked to be back-up cashiers: "Bottom line, you want me to say it? It's because men produce more. They work harder. Men work harder than women." (Smith dep pp 273-76); (h) Dolline Murphy being told by her store manager that, as a woman, she would not be taken seriously (Murphy dep pp 69-73).

In addition, decision-makers are likely to have a bias to maintain their stereotypes. The

---

[17] On automatic bias toward "us," "ours," and "we," see Perdue, C. W., Dovidio, J. F., Gurtman, M. B., & Tyler, R. B. (1990). Us and them: Social categorization and the process of intergroup bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 475-486. On automatic gender ingroup bias, see Hardin & Banaji; Klinger, M. R., & Beall, P. M. (1992). Conscious and unconscious effects of stereotype activation. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Psychological Association, Chicago. Zárate, M. A., & Sandoval, P. (1995). The effects of contextual cues on making occupational and gender categorizations. British Journal of Social Psychology, 34, 353-362. Zárate, M. A., & Smith, E. R. (1990). Person categorization and stereotyping. Social Cognition, 8, 161-185. On automatic racial ingroup bias, see: Dovidio, J. F., Evans, N., & Tyler, R. B. (1986). Racial stereotypes: The contents of their cognitive representations. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 22, 22-37. Gaertner, S. L., & McLaughlin, J. P. (1983). Racial stereotypes: Associations and ascriptions of positive and negative characteristics. Social Psychology Quarterly, 46, 23-30. On automatic age-based ingroup bias, see Perdue, C. W., & Gurtman, M. B. (1990.) Evidence for the automaticity of ageism. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 26, 199-216.

stereotype-matching advantage indicates that information that fits one's stereotypes is automatically processed; it is easy to take in, making stereotypes seem to fit automatically.[18] Examples from Home Depot include accepted assumptions that women are reluctant to get dirty or climb on ladders and that they cannot work as flexibly because of family responsibilities (Stroud dep pp 208-13).

These automatic effects of categorization occur for women as targets more than for men as targets. Men are the cultural default, just as whites are. That is, "person" calls to mind a white male. (This is why women are described as a minority group, although they are numerical majority.) Because women are not the cultural "default," they are a "marked" group (people say "woman manager," but not "man manager" and "female sales associate," not male sales associate). (A similar pattern holds for blacks, compared to whites.) This results in a phenomenon termed the marked (dis)advantage. Thus, women are automatically judged as women more than men are judged as men.[19]

To summarize, because decision-makers are prone to categorizing on the basis of

---

[18] On gender stereotype-matching, see Banaji & Hardin (1996, op cit.); Banaji, M. R., Hardin, C., & Rothman, A. J. (1993). Implicit stereotyping in person judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 272-281. Blair, I. V., & Banaji, M. R. (1996). Automatic and controlled processes in stereotype priming. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 1126-1141. Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (1995). Implicit gender stereotyping in judgments of fame. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 181-198. Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. Psychological Review, 102, 4-27. Zárate, M. A., & Sandoval, P. (1995, op. cit.). On racial-stereotype matching, see Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 5-18. Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69, 1013-1027. Lepore, L., & Brown, R. (in press). Category and stereotype activation: Is prejudice inevitable? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Wittenbrink, W., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (in press). Evidence for racial prejudice at the implicit level and its relationship with questionnaire measures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Wittenbrink, W., Judd, C. M., Park, B., & Stone, M. H. (in press). The valenced content of racial stereotypes: Assessing prejudice at implicit and explicit levels. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.

[19] Zárate, M. A., Bonilla, S., & Luevano, M. (1995). Ethnic influences on exemplar retrieval and stereotyping. Social Cognition, 13, 145-162. Zárate, M. A., & Smith, E. R. (1990). Person categorization and stereotyping. Social Cognition, 8, 161-185.

gender and gender stereotypes, they are automatically biased to favor their ingroup and to view the outgroup as matching its stereotype; this bias is particularly for "marked" groups such as women. These processes are cognitively efficient, but they create a disadvantage for women being judged by men.

(d) Outgroup homogeneity. Having rapidly and automatically categorized other people as members of a group, decision-makers will see members of that group as resembling each other more than they actually do: "they" are all similar ("we" are more varied). The outgroup homogeneity effect[20/] creates a disadvantage for the people judged as "all alike," because their individual merits are neglected. The effect seems to depend on the decision-maker holding an abstract stereotype of the group, with a few examples of specific members of the group. Thus, general stereotypes of make them seem much more alike than they are. Examples of this outgroup homogeneity effect include the effects of categorizing by gender and ingroup favoritism (Sections II c & d).

(e) Biased information search. One might assume that automatic categorization and exaggerated homogeneity would create stereotypes only in initial judgments of people. Unfortunately, even as decision-makers gather additional information about targets, they are biased to perpetuate their stereotypes. This process is called a "stereotype-matching advantage," and it is evident in several respects. First, when information is ambiguous (and much of behavior is ambiguous), decision-makers are perceptually biased to fit information to stereotypic expectations, making it easy to think the information supports their stereotypes.[21/] Examples at Home Depot include assumptions that women applying for "any job" want to be cashiers and that female cashiers do not want to move to sales and are happy in the traditionally female job (Lutostanski dep pp

---

[20/] Brewer, M. B., & Brown, R. (In press). Intergroup relations. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (eds.), The handbook of social psychology (4th ed.). New York: Mcgraw-Hill. Mullen, B., & Hu, L. (1989). Perceptions of ingroup and outgroup variability: A meta-analytic integration. Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 10, 233-252. Ostrom, T. M., & Sedikides, C. (1992). Out-group homogeneity effect in natural and minimal groups. Psychological Bulletin, 112, 536-552.

[21/] For reviews, see Hilton, J. L., & Von Hippel, W. (1996). Stereotypes. In J. T. Spence, J. M. Darley, & D. J. Foss (Eds.), Annual review of psychology, (Vol. 47, pp. 237-271). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews. von Hippel, W., Sekaquaptewa, D., & Vargas, P. (1995). On the role of encoding processes in stereotype maintenance. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, (Vol. 27, pp.177-253.) San Diego: Academic Press. For examples, see Krueger, J., & Clement, R. W. (1994). Memory-based judgements about multiple categories: A revision and extension of Tajfel's accentuation theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 35-47. Macrae, C. N., Stangor, C., & Milne, A. B. (1994). Activating social stereotypes: A functional analysis. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 30, 370-389.

124-130, 194-6, 202, 228; Popowitz dep p 238).

Second, decision-makers most efficiently take in stereotypic information,[22] which confirms their stereotypes, especially when they are under time pressure. Because of its rapid rate of expansion and sales pressures, Home Depot pressures its managers to make rapid decisions (Lutostanski dep p 235; Singletary dep II p. 23).

Third, given the choice, people seek stereotype-confirming information.[23] Given discretion in questions to ask, people prefer information that confirms their stereotypic

---

[22] Belmore, S. M. (1987), Determinants of attention during impression formation. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 13, 480-489. Fiske, S. T., Neuberg, S. L., Beattie, A. E., & Milberg, S. J. (1987). Category-based and attribute-based reactions to others: Some informational conditions of stereotyping and individuating processes. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 23, 399-427. Macrae, C. N., Milne, A. B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (1994). Stereotypes as energy-saving devices: A peek inside the cognitive toolbox. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66, 37-47. von Hippel, W., Jonides, J., Hilton, J. L., & Narayan, S. (1993). Inhibitory effect of schematic processing on perceptual encoding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 921-935. von Hippel, W., Sekaquaptewa, D., & Vargas, P. (1995). On the role of encoding processes in stereotype maintenance. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, (Vol. 27, pp.177-253.) San Diego: Academic Press.

[23] Baseline conditions in: Erber, R., & Fiske, S. T. (1984). Outcome dependency and attention to inconsistent information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 709-726. Neuberg, S. L., & Fiske, S. T. (1987). Motivational influences on impression formation: Outcome dependency, accuracy-driven attention, and individuating processes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 431-444. Ruscher, J. B., & Fiske, S. T. (1990). Interpersonal competition can cause individuating impression formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 832-842. For other examples, see Diehl, M., & Jonas, K. (1991). Measures of national stereotypes as predictors of the latencies of inductive versus deductive stereotypic judgements. European Journal of Social Psychology, 21, 317-330. Fein, S., & Hilton, J. L. (1992). Attitudes toward groups and behavioral intentions toward individual group members: The impact of nondiagnostic information. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 28, 101-124. Ford, T. E., & Stangor, C. (1992). The role of diagnosticity in stereotype formation: Perceiving group means and variances. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63, 356-367. Johnston, L. C., & Macrae, C. N. (1994). Changing social stereotypes: The case of the information seeker. European Journal of Social Psychology, 24, 581-592. Krueger J. (1991). Accentuation effects and illusory change in exemplar-base category learning. European Journal of Social Psychology, 21, 37-48.

expectancies.[24] For example, a woman applying for a sales position might instead be asked about her interest in cashiering (Jones dep pp 92-97; Long dep pp 61-84; York dep pp 620-27) and a man interested in cashiering might be channeled toward sales (Jaber dep pp 24-48).

(f) Biased Attributions. When decision-makers do encounter information that is inconsistent with their stereotypes, they are biased to explain it away. That is, behavior is attributed to temporary, unstable causes if it disconfirms the stereotype.[25] For example, a woman who happens to be knowledgeable about lumber might be seen as having a freak bit of knowledge by luck or might be seen as having some knowledge by effort that overcompensates for a basic inability to have that expertise. The error consists first in specifically attributing women's success at traditionally male tasks as being due to luck, whereas men's comparable success is attributed to ability, a more flattering interpretation.[26]

---

[24] For a review, see Snyder, M. (1984). When belief creates reality. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 18, pp 248-306). New York: Academic Press. For other examples, see Kruglanski, A. W., & Mayseless, O. (1988). Contextual effects in hypothesis testing: The role of competing alternatives and epistemic motivations. Social Cognition, 6, 1-20. Zuckerman, M., Knee, C. R., Miyake, K., & Hodgins, H. S. (1995). Hypothesis confirmation: The joint effect of positive test strategy and acquiescence response set. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 52-60.

[25] Crocker, J., Hannah, D. B., & Weber, R. (1983). Person memory and causal attributions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 55-66. Kulik, J. A. (1983). Confirmatory attribution and the perpetuation of social beliefs. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 1171-1181. For reviews, see Hewstone, M. (1990). The 'ultimate attribution error'? A review of the literature on intergroup causal attribution. European Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 311-335. Hilton & von Hippel (1996, op. cit.). Mackie, Hamilton, Susskind, & Rosselli (1996, op. cit.) Rothbart, M., & Taylor, M. (1992). Category labels and social reality: Do we view social categories as natural kinds? In G. R. Semin, & K. Fiedler (Eds.), Language, interaction and social cognition (pp. 13-36). London: Sage. Yzerbyt, V., Rocher, S., & Schadron, G. (1996). Stereotypes as explanations: A subjective essentialistic view of group perception. In R. Spears, P. J. Oakes, N. Ellemers, & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), The social psychology of stereotyping and group life. Cambridge: Blackwell.

[26] Deaux, K. (1984). From individual differences to social categories: Analysis of a decade's research on gender. American Psychologist, 39, 105-116. Deaux, K. (1985). Sex and gender. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology (Vol. 36, pp. 49-81). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews. Deaux, K., & Emswiller, T. (1974). Explanations of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: What

Second, the bias gives an ingroup advantage: the ingroup has what it takes to succeed; outgroup has what it takes to fail. Thus, the decision-maker is prone to attributing positive outcomes to stable features of the ingroup and negative outcomes to stable features of the outgroup (people deserve what they get).[27] At Home Depot, all the comments by men about what men allegedly can do and women allegedly cannot illustrate this kind of thinking (see examples under "ingroup advantage" in Section II c). Third, it is the "marked" or nondefault group, in this case, women, whose behavior needs explaining,[28] so these biases are more likely to affect women than men.

Finally, there is a stereotype-matching advantage, such that stereotypic attributions make sense. Stereotype-confirming behavior is attributed to the stable (stereotypic) dispositions of the person, which blocks consideration of stereotype-irrelevant explanations.[29] All these types of interpretations and explanations serve to justify

---

is skill for the male is luck for the female. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 80-85. Deaux & LaFrance (in press, op. cit.). Swim, J. K., & Sanna, L. J. (1996). He's skilled, she's lucky: A meta-analysis of observers' attributions for women's and men's successes and failures. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22, 507-519.

[27] Hewstone, M. (1990). The 'ultimate attribution error'? A review of the literature on intergroup causal attribution. European Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 311-335. Pettigrew, T. F. (1979). The ultimate attribution error: Extending Allport's cognitive analysis of prejudice. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5, 461-476.

[28] Miller, D. T., Taylor, B., & Buck, M. L. (1991.) Gender gaps: who needs to be explained? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 5-12.

[29] Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (1995). Implicit gender stereotyping in judgments of fame. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 181-198. BenAri, R., Schwarzwald, J., & HorinerLevi, E. (1994). The effects of prevalent social stereotypes on intergroup attribution. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25, 489-500. Bodenhausen, G. V. (1988). Stereotypic biases in social decision making and memory: Testing process models for stereotype use. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 726-737. Bodenhausen, G. V., & Wyer, R. S., Jr. (1985). Effects of stereotypes on decision making and information-processing strategies: The impact of task complexity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 871-880. Gordon, R. A., & Anderson, K. S. (1995). Perceptions of race-stereotypic and race-nonstereotypic crimes: The impact of response-time instructions on attributions and judgments. Basic Applied Social Psychology, 16, 455-470. Macrae, C. N., & Shepherd, J. W. (1989). Stereotypes and social judgments. British Journal of Social Psychology, 28, 319-325. McGill, A. L. (1993). Selection of a causal background: Role of expectation versus feature mutability. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 701-707. Sanbonmatsu, D. M., Akimoto, S. A., & Gibson, B. D. (1994). Stereotype-based

stereotypes as valid explanations for the status quo.[30]

(g) Memory biases. The final relatively automatic bias, after categorization, outgroup homogeneity, biased information-seeking, and biased attributions, is memory bias. Decision-makers remember the ingroup better than the outgroup,[31] which means they are more likely to fall back on outgroup stereotypes to remember individual outgroup members. When the decision-makers are predominantly male, the women will be disadvantaged. Second, decision-makers preferentially recall stereotype matching information,[32] leading memory to confirm stereotypic perceptions. Finally, decision-

---

blocking in social explanation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 71-81.

[30] Allison, S. T., Mackie, D. M., & Messick, D. M. (1996). Outcome biases in social perception: Implications for dispositional inference, attitude change, stereotyping, and social behavior. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 28, 53-93. Eagly, A. H. (1987). Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of men and women into social roles. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 590-598. Hoffman, C., & Hurst, N. (1990). Gender stereotypes: Perception or rationalization? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 197-208. Huici, C. (1984). The individual and social functions of sex role stereotypes. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), The social dimension (Vol. 2, pp. 579-602). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system justification and the production of false consciousness. British Journal of Social Psychology, 33, 1-27. Martin, C. L., & Parker, S. (1995). Folk theories about sex and race differences. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 45-57. O'Leary, V. E. (1974). Some attitudinal barriers to occupational aspirations in women. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 809-826. Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1982). Measuring sex stereotypes: A thirty-nation study. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. Yzerbyt, Rocher, & Schadron (1996, op. cit.).

[31] Brigham, J. C., & Barkowitz, P. (1978). Do "they all look alike?" The effect of race, sex, experience, and attitudes on the ability to recognize faces Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 8, 306-318. Brigham, J. C., & Malpass, R. S. (1985). The role of experience and contact in the recognition of faces of own- and other-race faces. Journal of Social Issues, 41, 139-156. Park, B., & Rothbart, M. (1982). Perception of out-group homogeneity and levels of social categorization: Memory for the subordinate attributes of in-group and out-group members. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 1051-1068.

[32] For examples, see Hamilton, D. L., Driscoll, D. M., & Worth, L. T. (1989). Cognitive organization of impressions: Effects of incongruency in complex representations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 925-939. Macrae,

makers often confuse members of the same group with each other,[33] so that they can remember for example that a woman said something, but not which woman.

(h) Prejudice has automatic aspects. The net effect of automatic processes is to perpetuate stereotypes, all else being equal. The role of automatic processes in

---

C. N., Hewstone, M., & Griffiths, R. G. (1993). Processing load and memory for stereotype-based information. European Journal of Social Psychology, 23, 77-87. Stangor, C., & Duan, C. (1991). Effects of multiple task demands upon memory for information about social groups. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 27, 357-378. For reviews, see Fyock, J., & Stangor, C. (1994). The role of memory biases in stereotype maintenance. British Journal of Social Psychology, 33, 331-343. Rojahn, K., & Pettigrew, T. F. (1992). Memory for schema-relevant information: A meta-analytic resolution. British Journal of Social Psychology, 31, 81-109. Stangor, C., & McMillan, D. (1992). Memory for expectancy-congruent and expectancy-incongruent information: A review of the social and social developmental literatures. Psychological Bulletin, 1, 42-61.

[33] Arcuri, L. (1982). Three patterns of social categorization in attribution memory. European Journal of Social Psychology, 12, 271-282. Biernat, M., Vescio, T. K., & Manis, M. (In press). Judging and behaving toward members of stereotyped groups: A shifting standards perspective. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, & C. Insko (eds.), Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior. Mahweh NJ: Erlbaum. Frable, D. E. S., & Bem, S. L. (1985). If you're gender-schematic, all members of the opposite sex look alike. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 459-468. Hewstone, M., Hantzi, A., & Johnston, L. (1991). Social categorization and person memory: The pervasiveness of race as an organizing principle. European Journal of Social Psychology, 21, 517-528. Lorenzi-Cioldi, F. (1993). They all look alike, but so do we...sometimes: Perception of ingroup and outgroup homogeneity as a function of gender and context. British Journal of Social Psychology, 32, 111-124. Miller, C. T. (1986). Categorization and stereotypes about men and women. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 12, 502-512. Stangor, C., Lynch, L., Duan, C., & Glass, B. (1992). Categorization of individuals on the basis of multiple social features. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 207-218. Taylor, S. E., & Falcone, H. T. (1982). Cognitive bases of stereotyping: The relationship between categorization and prejudice. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8, 426-432. Taylor, S. E., Fiske, S. T., Etcoff, N. L., & Ruderman, A. J. (1978). Categorical and contextual bases of person memory and stereotyping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 778-793. van Knippenberg, A., & Van Twuyver, M. (1994). Factors affecting social categorization processes in memory. British Journal of Social Psychology, 33, 419-431. Walker, P., & Antaki, C. (1986). Sexual orientation as a basis for categorization in recall. British Journal of Social Psychology, 25, 337-339.

prejudice is parallel. Prejudice stems from perceived threats to one's ingroup,[34] as when a previously all-male job domain (such as home improvement) is integrated by women. Prejudice also stems from personal discomfort with people who are perceived not to belong in a particular context.[35] In addition, some individuals may display automatic prejudice toward groups perceived to interfere with traditional values.[36] As noted before, prejudice against women in particular takes the form of ambivalence: hostility toward nontraditional women and "benevolence" toward traditional women.[37]

(i) Discrimination has automatic aspects. The automatic aspects of stereotypes and prejudice result in automatic favoritism toward the ingroup,[38] whereby people benefit the ingroup more than the outgroup. Examples at Home Depot include (a) reports by

---

[34] Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (1995). Ambivalence and stereotypes cause sexual harassment: A theory with implications for organizational change. Journal of Social Issues, 51, 97-115. Fiske, S. T., & Ruscher, J. B. (1993). Negative interdependence and prejudice: Whence the affect? In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception (pp. 239-268). New York: Academic Press. Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in western Europe. European Journal of Social Psychology, 25, 57-75. Smith, E. R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions: Toward new conceptualizations of prejudice. In D. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception. Academic Press.

[35] Fiske & Glick (1995, op. cit.). Fiske & Ruscher (1993, op. cit.).

[36] Altemeyer, B. (1981). Right-wing authoritarianism. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press. Altemeyer, B. (1988). Enemies of freedom. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Bohner, G., Weisbord, C., Raymond, P., Barzvi, A., & Schwarz, N. (1993). Salience of rape affects self-esteem: The moderating role of gender and race myth acceptance. European Journal of Personality, 23, 561-579. Fiske & Glick, 1995, op. cit.). Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1994). Preferring "housewives" to "feminists". Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18, 25-52. Hunsberger, B. (1995). Religion and prejudice: The role of religious fundamentalism, quest, and right-wing authoritarianism. Journal of Social Issues, 51, 113-129. Nadler, E. B., & Morrow, W. R. (1959). Authoritarian attitudes toward women, and their correlates. The Journal of Social Psychology, 49, 113-123. Pryor, J. B., & Whalen, N. J.(in press). A typology of sexual harassment: Characteristics of harassers and the social circumstances under which sexual harassment occurs. In W. O'Donohue (ed.) Sexual harassment: Yheory, research, and treatment. Needham Heights MA: Allyn & Bacon.

[37] Fiske & Glick (1995, op. cit.). Glick & Fiske (1996, op. cit.).

[38] For a review, see Brewer & Brown (in press, op. cit.).

female associates that men are promoted faster than qualified women and women have to wait for men to get forklift licenses (Noll memo D83959); (b) female associates being given degrading tasks, such as cleaning (Ashby dep pp 42-43, 202).

Decision-makers may engage in stereotype-matching behavior that causes targets to behave in stereotype-confirming ways[39]; going along with the assumption that one is interested in being a cashier, going along with sexual harassment, or fetching lunch or coffee, rather than resisting and making trouble, are examples. Decision makers may prime stereotyped dimensions of behavior[40] or relegate women to women's jobs and men to men's.[41] Examples include categorizing some jobs as stereotypic for women and treating women as sexy but incompetent.

Finally, a variety of subtle hostility involves behavior that is not overtly discriminatory but has a chilling impact on the targeted individual: hostile nonverbal behavior, decreased discretionary contact, sheer avoidance, and sanctioned aggression in the context of legitimate hierarchies.[42]

---

[39] For an examples, see Skrypnek, B. J., & Snyder, M. (1982). On the self-perpetuating nature of stereotypes about women and men. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 18, 277-291. For reviews, see Claire, T., & Fiske, S. T. (in press). A systemic view of behavioral confirmation: Counterpoint to the individualist view. To appear in C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, & C. Insko (Eds.), Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Darley, J. M., & Fazio, R. H. (1980). Expectancy confirmation processes arising in the social interaction sequence. American Psychologist, 35, 867-881. Miller, D. T., & Turnbull, W. (1986). Expectancies and interpersonal processes. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual review of psychology (Vol. 37, pp. 233-256). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Review. Snyder, M. (1984). When belief creates reality. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 18, pp 248-306). New York: Academic Press. Snyder, M. (1992). Motivational foundations of behavioral confirmation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 25, pp. 67-114). San Diego: Academic Press.

[40] Bargh (in press, op. cit.).

[41] Glick, P., Zion, C., & Nelson, C. (1988). What mediates sex discrimination in hiring decisions? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 178-186. Heilman (1983, op. cit.).

[42] Batson, C. D. (in press). Prosocial behavior and altruism. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey (eds.) The handbook of social psychology (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp.). New York: McGraw-Hill. Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. (in press). Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey (eds.) The handbook of social psychology (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp.). New York: McGraw-Hill. Geen, R. G. (in press). Aggression and anti-

(j) Summary. Stereotyping has automatic aspects: Rapid and automatic categorization, outgroup homogeneity, biased information search, biased attributions, and biased memory. Prejudice and discrimination also are deeply rooted in human functioning, with automatic aspects. Evidence for these phenomena are well-established in the scientific literature, and in those instances where laboratory and field ("real world") settings have been compared, the effects are stronger in the real world than in the laboratory.[43] The net effect is to perpetuate stereotypes, as a default, when nothing intervenes to prevent these ingrained processes.

III. Bias can be socially convenient.

(a) Getting along with bias. Bias is not just cognitively convenient and therefore automatic. It persists in apparently decent people because it can be useful in dealing with other people on an everyday basis. For example, some gender stereotypes fit common social roles for men and women, such as homemaker and breadwinner.[44] (The problem comes when those assumptions are brought into the workplace.) And stereotypes can be useful if the target does not resist the categorization, either because of not noticing the bias[45] or to get along with the decision-maker.[46]

---

social behavior. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey (eds.) The handbook of social psychology (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp.). New York: McGraw-Hill. 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, 199-214. Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neo-sexism: Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 842-849.

[43] Outgroup homogeneity: Mullen & Hu (1989, op. cit.). Ostrom & Sedikides (1992, op. cit.). Memory biases: Fiske (in press, op. cit.). Ingroup favoritism: Brewer & Brown (in press, op. cit.).

[44] Eagly (1987, op, cit.), Eagly & Steffen (1984, op. cit.). Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1991). Explaining sex differences in social behavior: A meta-analytic perspective. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17, 306-315. Glick, P. (1991). Trait-based and sex-based discrimination in occupational prestige, occupational salary, and hiring. Sex Roles, 25, 351-378. Heilman (1983, op. cit.). Hoffman & Hurst (1990, op. cit.). Kiesler, S. B. (1975). Actuarial prejudice toward women and its implications. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 5, 201-216.

[45] Crosby, F. (1984). The denial of personal discrimination. American Behavioral Scientist, 27, 38-386. Crosby, F., Clayton, S., Alksnis, O., & Hemker, K. (1986). Cognitive biases in the perception of discrimination: The importance of format. Sex Roles, 14, 637-646. Crosby, F. J., Tabb, S., & Twiss, C. (1989). Affirmative action and aggregate data: The importance of patterns in the perception of discrimination. In

(b) Biased ingroup norms. Moreover, stereotypes fit common social motivations. Social convenience can act to maintain people's stereotypes, allowing them to use their automatic, default thinking processes: Biased ingroup norms[47] communicate that

---

F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 159-167). New York: Springer-Verlag. Ruggiero (1996). Rutte, C. G., Diekmann, K. A., Polzer, J. T., Crosby, F. J., & Messick, D. M. (1994). Organization of information and the detection of gender discrimination. Psychological Science, 5, 226-231. Taylor, D. M., Wright, S. C., Moghaddam, F. M., & Lalonde, R. N. (1990). The personal/group discrimination discrepancy: Perceiving my group, but not myself, to be a target for discrimination. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 16, 254-262. Taylor, D. M., Wright, S. C., & Porter, L. E. (1994). Dimensions of perceived discrimination: The personal/group discrimination discrepancy. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.), The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario Symposium (Vol. 7, pp. 233-255), Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum. Twiss, C., Tabb, S., & Crosby, F. J. (1989). Affirmative action and aggregate data: The importance of patterns in the perception of discrimination. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 159-167). NY: Springer-Verlag.

[46] Eberhardt, J. L., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). Motivating individuals to change: What is a target to do? In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), Stereotypes & stereotyping (pp.369-418). New York: Guilford. Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S., & Fischer, C. (1995). Why didn't she just report him? The psychological and legal implications of women's responses to sexual harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 51, 117-138. Snyder, M., & Haugen, J. A. (in press). Why does behavioral confirmation occur? A functional perspective on the role of the target. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.

[47] Barker, K. (1994). To be PC or not to be: A social psychological inquiry into political correctness. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 9, 271-281. Blanchard, F. A., Crandall, C. S., Brigham, J. C., & Vaughn, L. A. (1994). Condemning and condoning racism: A social context approach to interracial settings. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 79, 993-997. Blanchard, F. A., Lilly, T., & Vaughn, L. A. (1991). Reducing the expression of racial prejudice. Psychological Science, 2, 101-105. Chen, S., Schechter, D., & Chaiken, S. (1996). Getting the truth or getting along: Accuracy- vs. impression-motivated heuristic and systematic processing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 262-275. Fiske, S. T., & Von Hendy, H. M. (1992). Personality feedback and situational norms can control stereotyping processes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 577-596. Leippe, M. R., & Eisenstadt, D. (1994). Generalization of dissonance reduction: Decreasing prejudice through induced compliance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 395-413. Mackie, Hamilton, Susskind, & Rosselli (1996, op cit.). Pryor, J. B., Giedd, J. L., & Williams, K. B. (1995). A social psychological model for predicting sexual harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 51, 69-84. Ruscher, J. B., Hammer, E. Y., & Hammer, E. D.

stereotyping is acceptable. For example, at Home Depot, much of the company imagery and language conveyed male symbols, indicating that the ingroup was male, was intended to be all male, and should be all male. Examples include (a) District Manager John Werner's statements "You need to grow balls. This company is built on balls and if you don't have them don't let the door hit you on the ass on the way out," (Edwards dec., p. 1), "If you don't have balls, get the hell out of here" (Edwards dep. p. 294), "If you need to get a job done, you need to have balls to do a job like that" (Smith dep p 94), and Werner's other references to having balls (Edwards dep. pp. 295-302; Smith dep pp 95-101; Werner dep p 342-3); (b) an orientation class in which Kim Cordova was told "If you are a female, do not plan to get far. It's a male-oriented company" (Cordova dec pp 2-3); (c) Store Manager Mike Foster's statement that people needed to learn to "walk like a man" and that a male presence was wanted at the front of the store (D83228, Request for Admissions); (d) references to Bernie's Boys to describe a knowledgeable older person often retired from the building trades (Armstrong dep p 223; Lutostanski dep p 142; Popowitz dep pp 20-21; Stround dep pp. 100-105); (e) references to Arthur's Army to describe employees who work with contractors, as the Army is traditionally male-dominated (Armstrong dep p 224; Lutostanski dep p 141; Popowitz dep pp 22-23; Singletary dep II pp 10-11; Stround dep pp. 100-105); (f) Depot Don as the name for an information display (Armstrong dep p 224; Singletary dep II p 2; Stround dep pp. 100-105); (g) the culture as being a "men's club, network of good old boys" (Ashby dep p 56); (h) crude language, part of a macho male culture (Edwards dep p 298); (i) the "kick ass" cheer used in the San Diego area, meant to promote aggressive, competitive work to "take out the competition in a business sense" (Hicks dep p 5), but clearly reflecting a traditionally male sports team symbolism; (j) Store Manager Randy Womack's plaque with brass balls indicating what success at Home Depot requires.

(c) Biased power structure. Accountability to third-parties known to be biased[48/] merely reinforces stereotypes. (The apparent lack of top-level management insistence on balancing gender ratios in cashiers and sales speaks to this point.) Being in a

---

(1996). Forming shared impressions through conversation: An adaptation of the continuum model. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22, 705-720. Snyder (1992, op cit.). Snyder & Haugen (1995, op cit.)

[48/] For a review, see Tetlock, P. E. (1992). The impact of accountability on judgment and choice: Toward a social contingency model. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, (Vol. 23, pp. 331-376). San Diego: Academic Press. For a relevant example, see Tetlock, P. E., Skitka, L., & Boettger, R. (1989). Social and cognitive strategies for coping with accountability: Conformity, complexity, and bolstering. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 632-640.

position of power[49] encourages stereotypic thinking. And being under time pressure,[50] a frequent concomitant of power, also reliably increases stereotyping.

---

[49] For a review, see Fiske, S. T. (1993a). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. American Psychologist, 48, 621-628. Fiske, S. T., & Dépret, E. (1996). Control, interdependence, and power: Understanding social cognition in its social context. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), European Review of Social Psychology. (Vol. 7, pp. 31-61). New York: Wiley. For examples, see Copeland, J. T. (1994). Prophecies of power: Motivational implications of social power for behavioral confirmation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 264-277. Goodwin, S. A., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). Power and motivated impression formation: How powerholders stereotype by default and by design. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Goodwin, S. A., & Fiske, S. T. (in press). Judge not, unless... Standards for social judgment and ethical decision-making. In D. M. Messick & A. Tenbrunsel (Eds.), Codes of conduct: Behavioral research and business ethics. New York: Russell Sage. Goodwin, S. A., Fiske, S. T., & Yzerbyt, V. (1996). Power and motivated impression formation: How powerholders stereotype by default and by design. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

[50] For a review, see Kruglanski, A. W., & Webster, D. M. (1996). Motivated closing of the mind: "Seizing" and "freezing." Psychological Review, 103, 263-283. For examples, see Freund, T., Kruglanski, A. W., & Shpitizajzen, A. (1985). The freezing and unfreezing of impression primacy: Effects of the need for structure and the fear of invalidity. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 11, 479-487. Gollwitzer, P. M., & Kinney, R. F. (1989). Effects of deliberative and implemental mind-sets on illusion of control. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 531-542. Jamieson, D. W., & Zanna, M. P. (1989). Need for structure in attitude formation and expression. In A. R. Pratkanis, S. J. Breckler, & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), Attitude structure and function (pp. 383-406) Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Kruglanski, A. W. (1990). Motivations for judging and knowing: Implications for causal attribution. In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior (Vol. 2, pp. 13-37). New York: Guilford. Kruglanski, A. W., & Freund, T. (1983). The freezing and unfreezing of lay-inferences: Effects of impressional primacy, ethnic stereotyping, and numerical anchoring. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 19, 448-468. Neuberg, S. L., Judice, T. N., & West, S. G. (in press). What the need for closure scale measures and what it does not: Toward differentiating among related epistemic motives. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Neuberg, S. L., & Newsom, J. T. (1993). Personal need for structure: Individual differences in the desire for simpler structure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 113-131.

(d) Protecting against threat. Threats to one's self[51] or threats to one's values[52] or holding rigid values[53] encourage bias. There is no evidence for Vice President Donald Singletary's "common sense" idea that an organization that discriminates will decrease its applicant pool or be unsuccessful in business (Singletary dep II pp 57, 145, 194; IV pp 186-7).

IV. Organizations can control individuals' bias.
Despite the automatic aspects of bias, organizations can intervene to over-ride the individuals' default ways of thinking. Companies can control the bias of individual decision-makers.

(a) Providing valid, standard, unambiguous information. Left to themselves, people engage in biased information searches, starting from biased categories, as noted. And if they hold a strong stereotype, gathering ambiguous, mixed information simply reinforces the stereotype. Similarly, holding a strong stereotype and gathering irrelevant

---

[51] Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 60-67. Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1984). The role of ignorance in intergroup relations. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation (pp. 229-250). San Diego: Academic Press. Wilder, D. A., & Shapiro, P. (1989a). Effects of anxiety on impression formation in a group context: An anxiety-assimilation hypothesis. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 25, 481-499. Wilder, D. A., & Shapiro, P. (1989b). The role of competition-induced anxiety in limiting the beneficial impact of positive behavior by an out-group member. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 60-69. Wilder, D. A., & Simon, A. S. (1996). Incidental and Integral affect as triggers of stereotyping. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), Handbook of motivation and cognition: Vol. 3. The interpersonal context. New York: Guilford Press.

[52] Altemeyer (1981, 1988, op cit.). Duckitt, J. (1992b). The social psychology of prejudice. New York: Praeger. Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), Affect, cognition and stereotyping (Vol. 17). San Diego: Academic Press. Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 1105-1118. Kristiansen, C. M., & Zanna, M. P. (1994). The rhetorical use of values to justify social and intergroup attitudes. Journal of Social Issues, 50, 47-65.

[53] References already cited: Altemeyer (1981, 1988). Bohner, Weisbrod, Raymond, Barzvi, & Schwarz, 1993. Fiske & Glick (1995). Haddock & Zanna (1994). Hunsberger (1995).

information reinforces the stereotype.[54/] Thus, if decision-makers hold the common stereotypes about men and women, which the preceding sections indicate most people do, and if they are left to gather information in an unstructured, informal way, it is likely to yield some biased information confirming stereotypes (see previous sections), perhaps some disconfirmatory information, and some irrelevant information. Given that mix, the stereotype will win. The decision-making processes at Home Depot, in the individual stores where managers gather information according to no structured criteria, fit this case. At Home Depot, the decision-making criteria are decentralized, unspecified, vague, discretionary, not public, and not validated (Armstrong dep pp 60-63, 92, 105, 115, 124; Ashby dep pp 24, 36, 38; Hicks dep excerpt p 2; Lutostanski dep pp 159, 162, 164, 191, 229, 231, 235, 275 285-6; Popowitz dep pp 186-7, 190; Singletary dep I pp 140, 146, 147, 153, 156, 157, 161, 166, 193-4, 198, 201-5, 209, 229, 231, 234; II pp 20, 36-8, 42-4, 49-50, 101-3; III pp 14-15, 22, 24, 31-2, 42, 45, 97-9, 105, 125-6; IV pp 76, 92, 111, 115, 117, 118, 120, 125, 129; detailed procedures but not criteria I pp 175-83, 189).

But if decision-makers gather clear information to the contrary, guided by well-validated methods and explicit criteria, their stereotypes can be essentially eliminated as a basis for judgment. Even if they hold a strong stereotype, if it is combined with uniformly disconfirming information, decision-makers will form an individuated (as opposed to stereotypic) decision.[55/] Thus, if guided by explicit, well-validated criteria, which presumably would uncover nonstereotypic information about individuals, managers can form fair judgments. The key here is over-riding decision-makers' natural tendencies to gather information that confirms their stereotypes. Well-validated decision-making procedures perform that function. Arbitrary, unvalidated criteria specifically perpetuate stereotypes and disallow considering disconfirming information that would be gathered by more careful methods.

Several factors determine the strength of stereotypic expectations and additional, more individuating information that a decision-maker might gather: For example, the

---

[54/] For a review, see Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum model of impression formation: From category based to individuating processes as a function of information, motivation, and attention. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in experimental psychology (Vol. 23, pp. 1-108). San Diego: Academic Press.

[55/] For a review, see Fiske & Neuberg (1990, op. cit.). For recent examples, see Pratto, F., & Bargh, J. A. (1991). Stereotyping based on apparently individuating information: Trait and global components of sex stereotypes under attention overload. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 27, 26-47. Seta, J. J., & Seta, C. E. (1993). Stereotypes and the generation of compensatory and noncompensatory expectancies of group members. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19, 722-731.

credibility of the source of the information,[56] the ambiguity of the information,[57] and the ambiguity of the standards.[58] The most dangerous situation occurs when a decision-maker "feels" informed, without in fact having any valid information. Stereotypic judgments are made with confidence in that case.[59] (Singletary's description of decision-making as based on criteria as simple as feeling good, dep I p. 234)

The key process in using information about potentially stereotyped groups is not to attempt to be color-blind or gender-blind, not to suppress one's knowledge of the person's social category. (See earlier claims of gender-blind hiring.) Not only do the preceding sections indicate that this is impossible, but any attempt to suppress knowledge of the person's category typically backfires, causing the stereotype to rebound with doubled impact.[60] The key instead is a motivation to gather accurate additional information, while not attempting to forget the person's social category.

---

[56] Macrae, C. N., Shepherd, J. W., & Milne, A. B. (1992). The effects of source credibility on the dilution of stereotype-based judgments. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 765-775. Weisz, C. & Jones, E. (1993). Expectancy disconfirmation and dispositional inference: Latent strength of target based and category based expectancies. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19, 563-573.

[57] Hilton & von Hippel (1990, op. cit.). Nelson, T. E., Biernat, M. R., & Manis, M. (1990). Everyday base rates (sex stereotypes): Potent and resilient. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 664-675.

[58] Biernat, M., & Manis, M. (1994). Shifting standards and stereotype-based judgments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66, 5-20. Biernat, M., Manis, M., & Nelson, T. E. (1991). Stereotypes and standards of judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 485-499. McGill (1993, op. cit.)

[59] Yzerbyt, V. Y., Schadron, G., Leyens, J.-Ph., & Rocher, S. (1994). Social judgeability: The impact of meta-informational cues on the use of stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66, 48-55.

[60] Bodenhausen, G. V., & Macrae, C. N. (1996). The self-regulation of intergroup perception: Mechanisms and consequences of stereotype suppression. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), Stereotypes and stereotyping. (pp. 227-253). New York: Guilford. Macrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., Milne, A. B., & Ford, R. L. (in press). On the regulation of recollection: The intentional forgetting of stereotypical memories. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Macrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., Milne, A. B., & Jetten, J. (1994). Out of mind but back in sight: Stereotypes on the rebound. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 808-817. Wegner, D. M. (1994). Ironic processes of mental control. Psychological Review, 101, 34-52.

(b) Providing appropriate motivation to be accurate. Organizations can motivate individuals to be careful and to override their stereotypes. For example, organizations can encourage decision-makers to feel interdependent with members of under-represented groups. Interdependence discourages stereotyping.[61] That motivation was not provided at Home Depot, with regard to under-represented groups.

Organizations can foster egalitarian ingroup norms[62] and accountability to third-parties known to have egalitarian values[63]; both can undercut individual stereotypic thinking. An individual having egalitarian values[64] overrides bias. The research literature

---

[61] Fiske, S. T., & Dépret, E. (1996). Control, interdependence, and power: Understanding social cognition in its social context. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), European Review of Social Psychology. (Vol. 7, pp. 31-61). New York: Wiley. Erber & Fiske (1984, op cit.). Johnston, L. C., Hewstone, M., Pendry, L., & Frankish, C. (1994). Cognitive models of stereotype change: (4). Motivational and cognitive influences. European Journal of Social Psychology, 24, 237-265. Neuberg & Fiske (1987, op cit.). Pendry, L. F., & Macrae, C. N. (1994). Stereotypes and mental life: The case of the motivated but thwarted tactician. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 30, 303-325. Ruscher, J. B., Fiske, S. T., Miki, H., & Van Manen, S. (1991). Individuating processes in competition: Interpersonal versus intergroup. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17, 595-605. Snodgrass, S. E. (1992). Further effects of role versus gender on interpersonal sensitivity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 154-158. Snyder (1992, op cit.). Snyder & Haugen (1994, op cit.).

[62] References already cited: Barker, 1994; Blanchard et al., 1994; Blanchard et al. 1991. Chen, S., Schechter, D., & Chaiken, S. (1996). Fiske, S. T., & Von Hendy, H. M. (1992). Leippe, M. R., & Eisenstadt, D. (1994). Mackie, Hamilton, Susskind, & Rosselli (1996). Pryor, J. B., Giedd, J. L., & Williams, K. B. (1995). Ruscher, J. B., Hammer, E. Y., & Hammer, E. D. (1996). Snyder (1992). Snyder & Haugen (1995).

[63] Pendry, L. F., & Macrae, C. N. (1996). What the disinterested perceiver overlooks: Goal-directed social categorization. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22, 249-256. Tetlock, Skitka, & Boettger (1989, op cit.). For a review, see Tetlock (1992, op cit.).

[64] Regarding sexism: Glick & Fiske (1996, op cit.). Swim, Aiken, Hall, & Hunter (1995, op. cit.). Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly (1995, op. cit.). Regarding parallel values involving racism: 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: Academic Press. Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 893-905. McConahay, J.

demonstrates that these egalitarian motivations can be created and that they override stereotypes, but these motivations were not created at Home Depot. The fact that managers are vague, do not recall, or do not emphasize their (minimal) diversity training suggests that it is not perceived as central to their mission (Popowitz dep pp 177-8; Singletary dep II p 55). Moreover, the harassment case examples given in the diversity training all focus on men as targets of sexual harassment, with no female targets at all, a bizarre set of assumptions, given that the vast majority (on the order of 95%) of sexual harassment is perpetrated by men against women. These efforts at diversity training seem half-hearted and do not promote egalitarian values.

Having an explicit motivation to be accurate[65] reliably decreases stereotypic thinking. In the daily hiring practices of Home Depot, accuracy was not emphasized, demanded, and checked. Likewise being motivated to think in a scientific, well-validated way[66] undermines stereotypes. The lack of well-specified criteria for hiring, compensation, and promotion destroys any pretense of scientifically valid decision-making.

Which kinds of motivations are important is partly a matter of individual intent; some individual stereotyping is intentional. Some individuals are consciously, intentionally

---

B., & Hough, J. C., Jr. (1976). Symbolic racism. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 23-45. Nosworthy, G. J., Lea, J. A., & Lindsay, R. C. L. (1995). Opposition to affirmative action: Racial affect and traditional value predictors across 4 programs. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25, 314-337. Wood, J. (1994). Is "symbolic racism" racism?: A review informed by intergroup behavior. Political Psychology, 15, 673-686.

[65] Chen, Shechter, & Chaiken (1996, op cit.). Neuberg, S. L. (1989). The goal of forming accurate impressions during social interactions: Attenuating the impact of negative expectancies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 374-386. Neuberg & Fiske (1987, op cit.).

[66] Freund, T., Kruglanski, A. W., & Shpitizajzen, A. (1985). The freezing and unfreezing of impression primacy: Effects of the need for structure and the fear of invalidity. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 11, 479-487. Kruglanski, A. W. (1990). Motivations for judging and knowing: Implications for causal attribution. In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior (Vol. 2, pp. 13-37). New York: Guilford. Kruglanski, A. W., & Freund, T. (1983). The freezing and unfreezing of lay-inferences: Effects of impressional primacy, ethnic stereotyping, and numerical anchoring. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 19, 448-468. Petty & Wegener (in press). Zukier, H., & Pepitone, A. (1984). Social roles and strategies in prediction: Some determinants of the use of base rate information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 349-360.

biased. Other individual stereotyping is more automatic, but it can be overridden if the organization takes responsibility. Organizational structure shapes individual motivations.

V. Organizations can reduce bias by how they structure themselves. Organizations can create the incentives for decision-makers to avoid socially convenient stereotyping. Organizations can eliminate biased ingroup norms and avoid accountability to third-parties known to be biased. The corporate structure can decrease decision-making time pressure and create an awareness of ways the powerful depend on all their subordinates. The organization can minimize threats to the decision-maker's self, threats to the decision-maker's values, and emphasize value pluralism. All these factors have been empirically demonstrated to be helpful (see previous section), but none is in evidence at Home Depot, where rigidly defined values are demanded.

More proactively, the corporate structure can foster the feeling of interdependence between the target and the decision-maker, support egalitarian group norms, and build accountability to third-parties known to have egalitarian values. The organization can encourage egalitarian values, an explicit motivation to be accurate, and thinking in a scientific, well-validated way. These tried and true methods are documented in the research literature. But none is in evidence at Home Depot.

(a) Integrating previously segregated job categories. As a more specific strategy, the organization can create positive conditions for contact between men and women across segregated job boundaries. The standard conditions for successful contact promote positive incentives for friendship and mutual appreciation.[67] Men and women must have equal status, a condition not met when women predominantly occupy cashier jobs paying $2/hour less than comparable entry-level jobs predominantly filled by men. Men and women must have shared goals, whereby the women and men both want greater diversity in previously segregated job categories and both want the success of the company. Home Depot works to build a positive culture in the sense of "bleeding orange," but not all groups feel that they can share in the growth of the company by their own advancement. Hence, shared goals are incomplete. The male and female employees must view their goal as mutual cooperation, a goal not met when each person's promotion potentially excludes the other or when one group is viewed as excluding the other. Finally there must be aggressive expression of institutional support for these forms of integration. It is not enough that distant corporate headquarters make pronouncements, which may or may not be heeded out in the field offices. The message has to come from divisional offices, from district managers, from store managers, and from department heads, with one voice. If the message is dropped

---

[67] For a review of this well-established area, see Pettigrew, T. F. (in press). Intergroup contact theory. In J. T. Spence, J. M. Darley, & D. J. Foss (Eds.), Annual review of psychology. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

at any level, it gives aid and comfort to employees who resist the changes, providing them with an excuse for using their default modes of stereotyping. The purpose of all these contact conditions is to promote workplace friendship and mutual understanding that cuts across stereotypes and prejudices in the workplace.

(b) Numbers: Preventing tokenism and filling the pipeline. Women, as the under-represented group in the Home Depot sales force, must be hired in percentages sufficient to prevent the dynamics of tokenism. If women constitute less than 20% of the workforce in a given job category, it will be difficult for them to be evaluated fairly.[68/] To achieve this kind of group hiring and promotion, Home Depot may have to develop pipelines of women to feed into its hiring and promotion system. Contacts with vocational high-schools, for example, might help create pipelines for women with appropriate knowledge. Internal sources of women qualified for sales jobs must be recognized, including women employed as cashiers. Moreover, the women who apply for "any job" must be considered for the sales floor at the same rate as men who apply for "any job."

(c) Power must be used positively. Under-represented groups often encounter difficulty in being promoted when they would be managing members of the predominant

---

[68/] Crocker, J., & McGraw, K. M. (1982). What's good for the goose is not good for the gander: Solo status as an obstacle to occupational achievement for males and females. American Behavioral Scientist, 27, 357-369. Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic. Heilman, M. E. (1980). The impact of situational factors on personnel decisions concerning women: Varying the sex composition of the applicant pool. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 26, 386-395. McArthur, L., & Post, D. (1977). Figural emohasis and person perception. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 13, 520-535. Sackett, P. R., DuBois, C. L. Z., & Noe, A. W. (1991). Tokenism in performance evaluations: The effects of work group representation on male-female and Black-White differences in performance evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 263-267. Spangler, E., Gordon, M. A., & Pipkin, R. M. (1978). Token women: An empirical test of the Kanter hypothesis. American Journal of Sociology, 84, 160-170. Taylor, S. E. (1981). A categorization approach to stereotyping. In D. L. Hamilton (Ed.), Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior (pp. 83-114). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Wolman, C., & Frank, H. (1975). The solo woman in the professional peer group. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 45, 164-171. For a review, see Mullen, B. (1991). Group composition, salience, and cognitive representations: The phenomenology of being in a group. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 27, 297-323. In an unpublished meta-analysis of subsequent studies, Brian Mullen (May 20, 1992) finds that information about solos is more likely to be processed in gender-stereotypic terms, the fewer there are (in a job category).

group. This underlies the glass ceiling problem.[69] Recognizing this issue (the reluctance of the majority in the context to cede authority to many of the under-represented group) is a first step. The most clear-cut strategy is to make managers' own performance evaluations, raises, and bonuses contingent on their ability to mentor members of under-represented groups (in this case, women in sales and men in cashier positions).[70] At Home Depot, there are no explicit incentives in the evaluation of managers to include more women in sales and management (Popowitz dep p 258).

(d) Organizational priorities must identify equity as a clear goal. At the level of the organization, clear incentives[71] must emphasize that equity is a central part of the organization's mission, from the very top management on down. As noted earlier, accountability for one's decision fosters more careful thinking.[72] And criteria must identify the rationale, the priority, and the plan for achieving more balanced distributions of men and women across job categories.[73]

(e) Climate of mutual enthusiasm. The ideal case creates an atmosphere of mutual enthusiasm for the hiring and promotion of previously under-represented groups, not as a form of compliance with outside forces (for example, lawsuits), but as an intrinsic business necessity and responsible business practice. In such a climate, major constructive change can be fostered. This does not occur at Home Depot.

---

[69] e.g., Morrison, A. M., White, R. P. & Van Velsor, E. (1987). Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations? Reading MA: Addison-Wesley. U.S. Department of Labor (1991). A report on the glass ceiling initiative. Washington DC: Department of Labor.

[70] For a review, see Noe, R. A. (1988). Women and mentoring: A review and research agenda. Academy of Management Review, 31, 65-78. For examples, see Burke, R. J. (1984). Mentors in organizations. Group and Organization Studies, 9, 353-72. Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 539-46. Fagensen, E.A. (1988). The power of a mentor. Group and Organization Studies, 13, 182-94. Kram, K. E. (1985). Mentoring at work. Glenview IL: Scott Foresman. Whitely, W., Dougherty, T. W., & Dreher, G. F. (1991). Relationship of career mentoring and socioeconomic origin to managers' and professionals' early career success. Academy of Management Journal, 34, 331-51. Willbur, J. (1987). Does mentoring breed success? Training and Development Journal, 41, 38-41.

[71] See references in Section IVb.

[72] See references in Section IVb.

[73] See references in Section IVa.

Home Depot was clearly aware, at the level of the corporation, that gender diversity was an issue, as evidenced by their own statistics and training efforts (Johnson dep pp 164-166; Noll dep pp 256-260; Singletary dep IV 193-202; Stroud dep 196-210). For example, an agenda from an Employee Relations Managers Meeting (D96939ff) specifically addresses sexism in some detail. Yet this material is not reflected in the daily practices of managers making decisions about women in the stores. Home Depot knew about the problem, but did not take adequate steps to address it.

Signed,

Susan T. Fiske, Ph.D.

3/20/97

Date

Appendix 1. Information Considered

depositions of Tammy Adams, Kip Armstrong, Kerry Ashby, Christine Barnaby, Jeff Birren, Roger Castle, David Detillion, Shelley Edwards, Susan Ellis Vol II, Michael Foster, Greg Hacket, John Hajduk, Steve Harada, Bryan Harris, Arthur Hicks (excerpt), Alan Jang, Ann Marie Johnson, Jones, Darrel Kajoka, Long, Randy Lutostanki, Christopher Marino, Eric Noll, Callista Lee Olivares, Lilicia Perry, Jeffrey Pincus, Jeffrey Popowitz, Michael Rodr, Deborah Russell, Donald Singletary, Tracy Ann Smith, Charlesvetta Stroud, Daniel Vickery, Buddy Vosler, Wade Watkins, John Werner, York, Michael Zeiss
and Deposition exhibits 1-481.

D91949-55 Melissa Aguirre letter and HRM Pam Chudomelka reply
D83953-61 Eric Noll memo investigating management misconduct
D96939-ff Employee Relations Managers' Meeting February 1996

declarations of Kim Cordova, Shelley Edwards
EEOC charge by Susan Ellis

Home Depot's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Stage I Class Contention Interrogatories, Home Depot's Response to Plaintiffs' First Request for Admission under Rule 36, Home Depot's Supplemental Responses to Plaintiffs Third Set of Interrogatories

William Bielby Declaration in Support of Class Certification, Barbara Gutek Declaration in Opposition, Memorandum in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion, Order Certifying Class Action

Appendix 2. Overheads to Summarize Opinion

I. <u>Gender stereotyping plays a major role in Home Depot's hiring, placement, and promotion patterns.</u>

****

I. Bias: Stereotyping, Prejudice & Discrimination

Stereotyping = cognition, thoughts
Prejudice = affect, feelings
Discrimination = behavior

Discrimination results from
not just from heated prejudice,
but also from stereotyping.

****

I. Research on bias has a long history

- First mention of stereotyping:
  Lippmann (1922)
- Early measures of
  - → Prejudice: Bogardus (1927)
  - → Stereotyping: Katz & Braly (1933)
  - → Discrimination: LaPiere (1934)
- First edition of Lindzey <u>Handbook of Social Psychology</u> (1954)

****

I. Nature of gender categories

- Primacy of gender, relative to race & age

- Nature of gender subtypes, for women
  - →Ambivalence
  - →Hostility toward unattractive, independent nontraditional types (feminists, bossy women)
  - →Benevolence toward attractive, dependent, traditional types (caretakers, sexy women)

- Two kinds of stereotyped women
  - →like and disrespect (e.g., traditional)
  - →respect and dislike (e.g., nontraditional)

****

I. Bias: Stereotyping, Prejudice & Discrimination

Bias persists more than people think, because

- Bias has automatic aspects; and
- Bias can be socially convenient;

but

- Bias has individually controllable aspects; and
- Bias responds to social structural changes.

****

II. Stereotyping Has Automatic Aspects

What is meant by automatic?

- Automatic thoughts are
  - →unintentional
  - →involuntary
  - →effortless
  - →outside conscious awareness

****

- Practice makes automatic
  - →totally automatic
    e.g., first steps in forming impressions, activation of social categories
  - →less automatic
    e.g., goals affect impression formation, attention to further information

****

II. Stereotyping Has Automatic Aspects

- Rapid and automatic categorization
  - → Ingroup advantage:
    "we" are automatically good
  - → Stereotype-matching advantage:
    stereotypes fit automatically
  - → Marked (dis)advantage:
    women automatically judged as women more than men as men

Automaticity & categorization: Its cognitive utility

****

II. Stereotyping Has Automatic Aspects

- Outgroup homogeneity
  - → Outgroup disadvantage:
    "they" are all similar

("we" are more varied)
→ Abstraction plus exemplars:
general idea of women, plus examples

****

II. Stereotyping Has Automatic Aspects

■ Biased information search:
Stereotype-matching advantage

→ Perceptual assimilation of ambiguity:
Making it easy to fit data to stereotypes
→ Time-saving:
Efficient to (inhibit redundant encoding)
→ Prefer stereotype-confirming information:
Given the choice, what people seek

****

II. Stereotyping Has Automatic Aspects

■ Biased attributions

→ Disposition of person, if fits status quo
→ Gender advantage, attributing women's success at traditionally male tasks as being due to luck: Men have what it takes; Women were lucky or tried hard
→ Ingroup advantage:
Ingroup has what it takes to succeed; Outgroup has what it takes to fail
→ Marked (dis)advantage:
Default group needs no explanation
→ Stereotype matching advantage:
Stereotypic attributions make sense
→ Rationalizing the status quo

****

II. Stereotyping Has Automatic Aspects

■ Memory Biases

→ Ingroup advantage:
Better recall for "us" than "them"
→ Stereotype matching advantage:
Better recall for confirmatory information
→ Categorization (dis)advantage:
Mixing up members of the category

****

II. Stereotyping Has Automatic Aspects: Summary

- Rapid and automatic categorization
- Outgroup homogeneity
- Biased information search
- Attributions
- Biased memory

Net effect is to perpetuate stereotypes, as default

****

II. Prejudice has Automatic Aspects

- Origins of prejudice
  - → Threat to own group
  - → Personal discomfort with people who don't belong
  - → Individual intolerance:
    Interference with traditional values
  - → Ambivalence about women:
    Benevolence toward traditional women;
    Hostility toward nontraditional women

****

II. Discrimination has Automatic Aspects

- Ingroup favoritism

- Stereotype-matching behavior
  - →Self-fulfilling prophecy
  - →Priming stereotyped dimensions

- Subtle hostility, with excuses
  - →Nonverbal behavior
  - →Discretionary contact
  - →Avoidance
  - →Sanctioned aggression

****

III. Bias can be socially convenient

- If it fits common social roles:
  Traditional division of labor between genders
- If undisputed or undetected by targets:
  Targets go along to get along

****

IV. Bias is Controllable by Individuals

Using valid information

- Sheer Ignorance: Lack of Information, or the Right Kind of Information
- Well-validated information, clear criteria
  - → Ambiguous, mixed information or Irrelevant information reinforces stereotypes
  - → Uniformly disconfirming information overrides stereotypes

- Comment on controllability: Elaboration, not suppression

****

IV. Bias is Controllable by Individuals

Having appropriate motivation to be accurate

- Avoid reinforcing bias
  - → Biased ingroup norms
  - → Accountability to third-parties known to be biased
  - → Being under time pressure
  - → Being in a position of power
  - → Threats to one's self
  - → Threats to one's values
  - → Holding traditional values

- Over-ride bias
  - → Feeling that the target is part of one's own team
  - → Egalitarian ingroup norms
  - → Accountability to third-parties known to have egalitarian values
  - → Having egalitarian values
  - → Having an explicit motivation to be accurate
  - → Thinking in a scientific, well-validated way

****

V. Corporate culture has an impact

- Conditions for contact
  - →equal status
  - →common goals
  - →cooperation
  - →institutional support
  - →→→intergroup friendship

- Numbers game (pipeline, token issues)
- Power (mentoring incentives, glass ceiling)
- Organizational priorities (incentives)
- Culture of mutual enthusiasm

****

Appendix 3. Qualifications as an Expert Witness

SUSAN TUFTS FISKE

February 1997

Department of Psychology
Tobin Hall, Box 37710
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003-7710

voice phone: 413 545-0488
fax: 413 545-0996
e-mail: fiske@psych.umass.edu
Date of birth: 8/19/52

Degrees

Ph.D.	1995, Honoris Causa (honorary doctorate), Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
Ph.D.	1978, Social Psychology, Department of Psychology and Social Relations, Harvard University
A.B.	magna cum laude, 1973, Social Relations, Radcliffe College

Academic Honors

1995	Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Prize, Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues
1995	Katz-Newcomb Lecture, University of Michigan
1994-95	Distinguished Faculty Lecture Series, University of Massachusetts at Amherst
1994	invitee, Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford
1993	"A Conversation with Susan T. Fiske," by E. Krupat, Psychology is social: Readings and conversations in social psychology. New York: HarperCollins
1993	subject of "Behind the Scenes" vignette by D. Myers, Social psychology (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
1993-95	President-Elect, President, and Past-President, Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Division 8 of the American Psychological Association and affiliated with the American Psychological Society
1993	Charter Fellow, American Psychological Association, Division 48
1992	Burkenroad Symposium on Business and Society, Tulane University
1992	Distinguished University Professor
1992	University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Research Council Faculty Fellowship Award
1992	Phi Kappa Phi
1991	University of Nebraska Law and Psychology Program, Roberta Morris Lecture
1991	American Psychological Association Award for Distinguished Contributions to Psychology in the Public Interest, Early Career
1991	Faculty, European Association of Social Psychology, Erasmus Program, Graduate Summer School, San Sebastian, Spain
1989	Charter Fellow, American Psychological Society
1989	University of Kansas, Fisher Lecture on Women and Psychology
1988	Fellow, American Psychological Association, Divisions 8 and 9
1988	Michigan State University, GTE Lecture in Science, Technology, and Human Values
1985	University of Iowa, Ida Beam Lecture
1981-1982	Lilly Endowment Postdoctoral Teaching Fellowship
1978	Sloan Foundation Summer Workshop in Natural Language Processing, Departments of Psychology and Computer Science, Yale University
1974-1977	National Science Foundation Graduate Fellow
1971-1972	International Honors Program, International School of America; travel and study

in Asia and Africa

1969-1970 National Merit Scholar

Employment

1992- Distinguished University Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts at Amherst

1988-1992 Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts at Amherst

1986-1988 Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Fall, 1984 Visiting Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, and Visiting Research Scientist, Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

1983-1985 Associate Professor, Departments of Psychology and Social Science, Carnegie-Mellon University (Adjunct in Organizational Behavior and in Marketing, Graduate School of Industrial Administration)

1978-1983 Assistant Professor, Departments of Psychology and Social Science, Carnegie-Mellon University

1975-1978 User Consultant, Computation Facility of the Center for Behavioral Sciences, Harvard University

1976-1978 Teaching Fellow: Introductory Social Statistics and Methods, Advanced Social Research, Graduate Analysis of Variance, Harvard University

1974 Consultant and Project Coordinator, McBer and Company: validation of state civil service examination for entry-level Human Service Workers

1973-1974 Research Assistant to (separately) Shelley Taylor, Lee Hamilton, Jacqueline Fleming, and David McClelland, Department of Psychology and Social Relations, Harvard University

1969 Research Assistant to Eckhard Hess, Department of Psychology, University of Chicago

Professional Activities

Memberships:

American Psychological Association, Fellow, Divisions 8, 9, 48

- Task Force on Redefining Scholarly Work (to include teaching) (1992)
- Publications Board Search Committee for new editor of Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: Attitudes and Social Cognition (1992-1993)
- Committee to select winner of Early Career Award (1994)
- Fellows Committee, Div. 48 (1992-1994) (Chair, 1994-96)
- Publications Board Search Committee for new editor of Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: Personality Processes and Individual Differences. (1995-1996)

American Psychological Society, Charter Fellow
Eastern Psychological Association
European Association of Social Psychology, Associate Member
International Society of Political Psychology
- Lasswell Award Committee (1992)

Psychologists for Social Responsibility
Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics
Society of Experimental Social Psychology
- Hosted SESP: Pittsburgh, 1983, Massachusetts, 1996
- Executive Committee 1984-1987, 1991-1994
- Dissertation Award Committee, 1984-1987
- Distinguished Scientist Award Committee, 1991-1994, 1995-96

Society for Personality and Social Psychology
- President, 1994

Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues
- Lewin Award Committee, 1989-1990

Associate Editor:

Journal of Experimental Social Psychology (1987-1990)
Review of Personality and Social Psychology (1986-1987)
Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Psychology (1992-1994)
Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology (1994-)

Editorial Boards:

Journal of Experimental Social Psychology (1990-)
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (1985-)
Social Cognition (1984-1987)

Reviewing:

American Journal of Political Science, American Political Science Review, American Psychologist, American Psychological Association Division 8, American Psychologist, Australian Research Grants Scheme, Basic and Applied Social Psychology, British Journal of Social Psychology, Cognitive Psychology, Cognitive Therapy and Research, Communication Research, European Journal of Social Psychology, Experimental Study of Politics, International Journal of Psychology, Journal of Abnormal Psychology, Journal of Applied Social Psychology, Journl of Personality, Journal of Research in Personality, Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, National Institute of Mental Health (three times), National Science Foundation, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, Psychological Bulletin, Psychological Review, Social Psychology Quarterly, Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation, University of Leuven Research Council

Colloquia:

Ohio State University (four times), SUNY Binghamton, Adelphi University, New York University (four times), Stanford University, University of California at Santa Barbara, Midwestern Psychological Association, Vanderbilt University, Society of Experimental Social Psychology (seven times), Case Western Reserve University, Duke University, University of Delaware, Center for Group Dynamics University of Michigan (twice), Yale University (three times), Michigan State University (twice), State University of New York at Buffalo, University of Massachusetts at Amherst (twice), University of Iowa, University of Kansas (twice), University of Minnesota, New England Social Psychological

Association (twice), Five College Program in Peace and World Security Studies, Mount Holyoke College, Flaschner Judicial Center, Miami University of Ohio, Université Catholique de Louvain à Louvain-la-Neuve (five times), Princeton University (twice), District of Columbia Judicial Conference, University of Rhode Island, University of Pennsylvania, University of Padua, University of Connecticut, University of Pittsburgh, Society for Personality and Social Psychology, University of Notre Dame, University of Nebraska, Northwestern University, University of New Hampshire, Eastern Psychological Association, Brown University, Université du Québec à Montréal, Université Blaise Pascal (Clermont Ferrand II), European Association of Experimental Social Psychology (twice), University of Massachusetts (five-campus keynote), Harvard University, Columbia University, City University of New York Graduate Center (twice), European Association of Social Psychology (various small group meetings in person perception and social cognition), Boston College, University of Bologna, Purdue University, University of Groningen, University of Amsterdam

Boards:

Social Science Research Council, psychology representative (1995-)

The Common School, Amherst, Massachusetts, Board of Trustees (1995-1998)
Educational Advisory Committee, Member (1993-1995), Chair (1995-1996)
Diversity Committee, Member (1994-), Chair (1996-1997)
Secretary of the Board (1996-1997)

Grants

Kinder, D. R., Fiske, S. T., & Abelson, R. P. Mass response to political leadership: Models of understanding, modes of assessment. Grant funded as subcontract by Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan, September 1978-August 1979.

Fiske, S. T. Cognitive schemas and affective matches in the selection of intimates. Ford Motor Company Research Fund, Carnegie-Mellon University, July 1980-June 1981.

Fiske, S. T. Affective responses to social stereotypes. National Science Foundation, July 1984-December 1986. (Also approved by NIMH with a priority rating of 114)

Lau, R. R., & Smith, R. A., with the consultation of Fiske, S. T. Political cognition and political persuasion. National Science Foundation, July 1985-December 1986.

Fiske, S. T. Intent and category-based responses to mental patients. National Institute of Mental Health, July 1986-June 1988.

Fiske, S. T., & Janoff-Bulman, R. Cognitive and emotional responses to adversity: Training grant in personality and social psychology. National Institute of Mental Health, July 1987-June 1992, July 1993-June 1998.

Fiske, S. T. Interdependence and category-based responses. National Institute of Mental Health, July 1988-June 1995.

Fiske, S. T. Interdependence and category-based responses. National Science Foundation, March 1995-July 1997.

Appendix 4. Publications in Last Ten Years

(1986)

Fiske, S. T., & Pavelchak, M. A. (1986). Category-based versus piecemeal-based affective responses: Developments in schema-triggered affect. In R. M. Sorrentino and E. T. Higgins (Eds.), Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior (pp. 167-203). N. Y.: Guilford Press.

Reprinted in translation as Reakcje afektwne oparte na przetwarzaniu kategorialnym a reakcje afektywne oparte na przetwarzaniu analitycznym: Rozwiniecie w terminach koncepcji schematow wyzwalajacych afekt. In T. Maruszewskiego (Ed.), Pozanie afekt zachowanie (pp. 53-101). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Kinder, D. R., & Fiske, S. T. (1986). Presidents in the public mind. In M. G. Hermann (Ed.), Handbook of political psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 193-218). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fiske, S. T. (1986). Schema-based versus piecemeal politics: A patchwork quilt, but not a blanket of evidence. In R. R. Lau & D. O. Sears (Eds.), Political cognition: The 19th annual Carnegie symposium on cognition (pp. 41-53). Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum.

Fiske, S. T. (1986). Adult beliefs, feelings, and actions regarding nuclear war: Evidence from surveys and experiments. In National Academy of Sciences, Proceedings of the symposium on medical implications of nuclear war (pp. 444-466). Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, Institute of Medicine.

Fiske, S. T. (Section Ed.) (1986). Perception and misperception in international conflict. In R. K. White (Ed.), Psychology and the prevention of nuclear war: A book of readings. NY: New York University Press.

(1987)

Fiske, S. T., Neuberg, S. L., Beattie, A. E., & Milberg, S. J. (1987). Category-based and attribute-based reactions to others: Some informational conditions of stereotyping and individuating processes. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 23, 399-427.

Neuberg, S. L., & Fiske, S. T. (1987). Motivational influences on impression formation: Outcome dependency, accuracy-driven attention, and individuating processes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 431-444.

Fiske, S. T. (1987). On the road: Comment on Pettigrew and Martin's use of cognitive stereotyping literature. Journal of Social Issues, 43, 113-118.

Fiske, S. T. (1987). People's reactions to nuclear war: Implications for psychologists. American Psychologist, 42, 207-217.

Reprinted in S. Staub & P. Green (Eds.) (1992). Psychology and social responsibility: Facing global challenges. New York: New York University Press.

(1988)

Fiske, S. T. (1988). Compare and contrast: Brewer's dual-process model and Fiske et al.'s continuum model. In T. K. Srull, & R. S. Wyer (Eds.), Advances in social cognition, Vol. 1: A dual model of impression formation (pp. 65-76). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

(1989)

Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1989). Category-based and individuating processes as a function of information and motivation: Evidence from our laboratory. In D. Bar-Tal, C. F. Graumann, A. W. Kruglanski, & W. Stroebe (Eds.), Stereotypes and prejudices: Changing conceptions (pp. 83-104). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Fiske, S. T. (1989). Examining the role of intent: Toward understanding its role in stereotyping and prejudice. In J. Uleman & J. Bargh (Eds.), Unintended thought: The limits of awareness, intention, and control (pp. 253-283). New York: Guilford.

Fiske, S. T., & Ruscher, J. B. (1989). On-line processes in category-based and individuating impressions: Some basic principles and methodological reflections. In J. Bassili (Ed.) On-line cognition in person perception (pp. 141-174). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fiske, S. T. (1989, May 31). Opinion: Court's ruling against sex stereotyping in employment decisions will make it easier for professors to win discrimination suits. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. B1-B3.

(1990)

Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum model of impression formation, from category-based to individuating processes: Influence of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 23, pp. 1-74). New York: Academic Press.

Fiske, S. T., Lau, R. R., & Smith, R. A. (1990). On the variety and utility of political knowledge structures. Social Cognition, 8, 31-48.

Reprinted in J. A. Krosnick (Ed.), Thinking about politics: Comparisons of experts and novices. New York: Guilford Press.

Ruscher, J. B., & Fiske, S. T. (1990). Interpersonal competition can cause individuating processes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 832-843.

(1991)

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). Social cognition (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiske, S. T., & Ruscher, J. B. (1991). Affective responses. In R. Dulbeco (Ed.). Encyclopedia of human biology (Vol. 1, pp. 101-111). NY: Academic Press.

Reprinted in second edition, 1996.

Riley, T., & Fiske, S. T. (1991). Interdependence and the social context of impression formation. Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive (European Bulletin of Cognitive Psychology), 11, 173-192.

Fiske, A. P., Haslam, N., & Fiske, S. T. (1991). Confusing one person with another: What errors reveal about the elementary forms of social relations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 656-674.

Fiske, S. T., & Schatz, R. (1991). Un coinvolgimento attivo nell'iniziativa contro la guerra nucleare: Problematiche per le future ricerche in campo psicologico. [Active involvement in combatting nuclear threat: Questions for the next stage of psychological research.] Rassegna di Psicologia, 8, 179-196.

Lau, R. R., Smith, R. A., & Fiske, S. T. (1991). Political beliefs, policy interpretations, and political persuasion. The Journal of Politics, 53, 644-675.

Fiske, S. T., Bersoff, D. N., Borgida, E., Deaux, K., & Heilman, M. E. (1991). Social science research on trial: The use of sex stereotyping research in Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins. American Psychologist, 46, 1049-1060.

Ruscher, J. B., Fiske, S. T., Miki, H., & Van Manen, S. (1991). Individuating processes in competition: Interpersonal versus intergroup. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17, 595-605.

1991 Society for Personality and Social Psychology Student Publication Award

(1992)

Schatz, R., & Fiske, S. T. (1992). International reactions to the threat of nuclear war: The rise and fall of concern in the eighties. Political Psychology, 13, 1-30.

Fiske, S. T. (1992). Stereotypes work...But only sometimes: Comment on how to motivate the "Unfinished Mind." Psychological Inquiry, 3, 161-162.

Fiske, S. T., & Von Hendy, H. M. (1992). Personality feedback and situational norms can control stereotyping processes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 577-596.

Fiske, S. T. (1992). Thinking is for doing: Portraits of social cognition from daguerreotype to laserphoto. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63, 877-889.

Centennial Feature Article.

(1993)

Fiske, S. T., & Emery, E. J. (1993). Lost mental control and exaggerated social control: Social-cognitive and psychoanalytic speculations. In D. M. Wegner & J. W. Pennebaker (Eds.), Handbook of mental control (pp. 171-199). New York: Prentice-Hall.

Fiske, S. T., Bersoff, D. N., Borgida, E., Deaux, K., & Heilman, M. (1993). A brief rejoinder: Accuracy and objectivity on behalf of the APA. American Psychologist, 48, 55-56.

Fiske, S. T., Bersoff, D. N., Borgida, E., Deaux, K., & Heilman, M. (1993). What constitutes a scientific review? A majority retort to Barrett and Morris on gender stereotyping. Law and Human Behavior, 17, 217-233.

Reprinted in M. R. Walsh (Ed.) (1997), Women, men, and gender: Ongoing debates. (2nd ed.). New Haven: Yale University Press..

Fiske, S. T., & Stevens, L. E. (1993). What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), Gender issues in contemporary society: Applied social psychology annual (pp. 173-196). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fiske, S. T. (1993). Social cognition and social perception. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual review of psychology (Vol. 44, pp. 155-194). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews Inc.

Fiske, S. T., & Ruscher, J. B. (1993). Negative interdependence and prejudice: Whence the affect? In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception (pp. 239-268). New York: Academic Press.

Fiske, S. T. (1993). Cognitive theory and the presidency. In G. C. Edwards III, J. H. Kessel, and B. A. Rockman (Eds.) Researching the Presidency: Vital questions, new approaches (pp. 233-265). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Dépret, E. F., & Fiske, S. T. (1993). Social cognition and power: Some cognitive consequences of social structure as a source of control deprivation. In G. Weary, F. Gleicher, & K. Marsh (Eds.), Control motivation and social cognition (pp. 176-202). NY: Springer-Verlag.

Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. American Psychologist, 48, 621-628.

Reprinted in N. Goldberger & J. Veroff (Eds.), (1995). Essential papers in cultural psychology. New York: New York University Press.

Award address for Distinguished Contributions to Psychology in the Public Interest, Early Career, 1991.

(1994)

Fiske, S. T., & Goodwin, S. A. (1994). Social cognition research and small group research, a West Side Story or ...? Small Group Research, 25, 147-171.

Reprinted in J. L. Nye & A. M. Brower (Eds.) What's so social about social cognition? Social cognition research in small groups. Sage.

Eberhardt, J. L., & Fiske, S. T. (1994). Affirmative action in theory and implementation: Issues of power, ambiguity, and gender versus race. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 15, 201-220.

Leyens, J-Ph., & Fiske, S. T. (1994). Impression formation: From recitals to symphonie fantastique. In P. G. Devine, D. L. Hamilton, & T. M. Ostrom (Eds.) Social cognition: Impact on social psychology. (pp. 39-75). San Diego: Academic Press.

Fiske, S. T. (1994). Preface. In Leyens, J-Ph., Yzerbyt, V. Y., Schadron, G. Stereotypes and social cognition. London: Sage.

Goodwin, S. A., & Fiske, S. T. (1994). Impression formation. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior (Vol. 2, pp. 601-610). San Diego: Academic Press.

Stevens, L. E., & Fiske, S. T. (1994). Intention. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior (Vol. 2, pp. 675-681). San Diego: Academic Press.

Morling, B. A., & Fiske, S. T. (1994). Control. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior (Vol. 1, pp. 719-728). San Diego: Academic Press.

Van Manen, S., & Fiske, S. T. (1994). Fishing with the right associative net: Appreciation and apprehension regarding Associated Systems Theory. In R. S. Wyer & T. K. Srull (Eds.), Advances in social cognition (Vol. 7, pp. 87-98). Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum.

(1995)

Fiske, S. T. (1995). Social cognition. In A. Tesser (1995). Constructing social psychology (pp. 149-194). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiske, S. T. (1995). From the still small voice of discontent to the Supreme Court: How I learned to stop worrying and love social cognition. In G. G. Branigan & M. R. Merrens (Eds.), The social psychologists: Research adventures (pp. 19-34). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Shrout, P. E., & Fiske, S. T. (Eds.) (1995). Personality research, methods, and theory: A Festschrift honoring Donald W. Fiske. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fiske, S. T. (1995). Words! Words! Words! Confronting the problem of observer and self reports. In P. E. Shrout & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), Personality research, methods, and theory: A Festschrift honoring Donald W. Fiske (pp. 221-240). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rouhana, N., & Fiske, S. T. (1995). Perception of power, threat, and conflict intensity in asymmetric intergroup conflict: Arab and Jewish citizens of Israel. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 39, 49-81.

Fiske, S. T., & Morling, B. A. (1995). Accessibility; Associative networks; Attention; Automaticity; Categorization; Encoding; Memory; Person memory; Priming; Prototypes; Salience; Schemas; Scripts; Self-schemas; Top-of-the-head phenomena; Unconscious processing; Vividness. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), Blackwell encyclopedia of social psychology. Oxford: Blackwell.

Borgida, E., & Fiske, S. T. (Eds.) (1995). Gender stereotyping, sexual harassment, and the law. Journal of Social Issues, 51.

Borgida, E., & Fiske, S. T. (1995). By way of introduction. In E. Borgida & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), Gender stereotyping, sexual harassment, and the law. Journal of Social Issues, 51, 1-10.

Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (1995). Ambivalence and stereotypes cause sexual harassment: A theory with implications for organizational change. In E. Borgida & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), Gender stereotyping, sexual harassment, and the law. Journal of Social Issues, 51, 97-115.

Reprinted in E. Coats & R. Feldman (eds.)(in press). Classic and contemporary

readings in social psychology, 2nd ed. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Stevens, L. E., & Fiske, S. T. (1995). Motivation and cognition in social life: A social survival perspective, Social Cognition, 13, 189-214.

(1996)

Fiske, S. T., Morling, B. A., & Stevens, L. E. (1996). Controlling self and others: A theory of anxiety, mental control, and social control. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22, 115-123.

American Psychological Association, Division 8, and Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Presidential Address, 1994.

Eberhardt, J., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). Motivating individuals to change: What is a target to do? In N. Macrae, M. Hewstone, & C. Stangor (Eds.), Foundations of stereotypes and stereotyping (pp. 369-415). New York: Guilford.

Fiske, S. T., & Morling, B. A. (1996). Stereotyping as a function of personal control motives and capacity constraints: The odd couple of power and anxiety. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior (Vol. 3, pp. 322-356). New York: Guilford Press.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 491-512.

Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Award, Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, 1995

Fiske, S. T., & Dépret, E. (1996). Control, interdependence, and power: Understanding social cognition in its social context. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), European Review of Social Psychology. (Vol. 7, pp. 31-61). New York: Wiley.

Goodwin, S. A., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). Judge not, unless... Standards for social judgment and ethical decisionmaking. In D. M. Messick & A. Tenbrunsel (Eds.), Codes of conduct: Behavioral research and business ethics (pp. 117-142). New York: Russell Sage.

Fiske, S. T., & Leyens, J.-Ph. (1996). Let social psychology be faddish, or at least heterogenous. In C. McGarty & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), Message of social psychology: Perspectives on mind in society (pp. 92-112). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

(in press)

Claire, T., & Fiske, S. T. (in press). A systemic view of behavioral confirmation: Counterpoint to the individualist view. In C. Sedikides, C. Insko, & J. Schopler (Eds.) Intergroup cognition and behavior. Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (in press). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. Special Issue: Measuring attitudes toward appropriate roles for women and men. Psychology of Women Quarterly.

Leyens, J.-Ph., & Fiske, S. T. (in press). Modèles de formation d'impression. In J.-L. Beauvois

& J.-Ph. Leyens (Eds.) Traité de psychologie sociale, Vol. 3, Cognition sociale.

Croizet, J.-C., & Fiske, S. T. (in press). Pragmatisme et cognition sociale. In J.-L. Beauvois, R.-V. Joule, & J.-M. Monteil (Eds.) Perspectives cognitives et conduites sociales (Vol. 6). Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé.

Fiske, S. T. (in press). Goal taxonomies, then and now. J. Darley & J. Cooper (Eds.), Attribution processes, person perception, and social interaction: The legacy of Ned Jones. Washington: APA.

Operario, D., & Fiske, S. T. (in press). Power plus prejudice: Socio-structural and psychological foundations of racial oppression. In J. L. Eberhardt & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), Racism: The problem and the response. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gilbert, D. T., Fiske, S. T., & Lindzey, G. (Eds.) (in press) The handbook of social psychology (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiske, S. T. (in press). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey, (Eds.) The handbook of social psychology (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Leyens, J-Ph., Dardenne, B., & Fiske, S. T. (in press) Is there a useful bias in hypothesis confirmation? British Journal of Social Psychology.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (in press). Gender, power dynamics, and social interaction. In J. Lorber, M. M. Ferree, & B. Hess (Eds.), Revisioning gender (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendix 5. Compensation

Class Counsel have agreed to pay me $250.00 per hour for consulting services in this case. For deposition and trial testimony my rate is $500.00 per hour. Class Counsel will also reimburse me for reasonable out of pocket costs incurred in connection with my consultation or testimony in this case.

Appendix 6. Other Cases Qualified as an Expert in Last 4 Years

Gantchar v United Air Lines. United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division. Report and deposition only; case settled. Contact: Christopher Mackaronis, Bell, Boyd, & Lloyd, 1615 L Street, Suite 1200, Washington DC 20036-5610. 202 466-6300.

Cases turned down: at least 70.