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ABSTRACT

IS EMPATHY THE LINK? AN EXPLORATION OF IMPLICIT RACIAL BIAS IN THE WORKPLACE

Carla Thomas
Caroline Watts

Implicit racial bias is a prominent concern in today’s academic and popular discussions. The negative effects of implicit racial bias have been seen in both private and public forums. Society and, in particular, the workplace, is approaching a significant racial demographic transformation; however, as yet there are no effective approaches to mitigating the negative effects of implicit racial bias. This study examined how ethnocultural empathic response, as a psychological process capable of development, relates to the negative effects of implicit racial bias in the workplace. By means of a mixed-methods, phenomenological approach, this study’s 146 participants completed 2 online surveys and, of those 8 qualitative interviews were used to triangulate results. These online surveys are 1) The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy—SEE, which measures ethnocultural empathic response, and 2) the Implicit Association Test (IAT), which measures implicit racial bias. Four key findings emerged from this study: 1) Ethnocultural empathy is a psychological phenomenon that contributes to an individual’s level of implicit racial bias; 2) Implicit racial bias in the workplace is perceived to be happening predominantly to other people, the result of other people’s actions, and having
no lasting impact on those who observe it; 3) Ethnocultural empathy in the workplace is perceived to be demonstrated predominantly through appreciating cultural difference. 4) In measuring ethnocultural empathy, it must be taken into account that there are five distinct factors. This study offers an increased awareness of the aspects of ethnocultural empathy and contributes to an understanding of psychosocial factors, capable of development, that can mitigate the negative effects of implicit racial bias.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history and within present-day communities, humans grapple with social norms. This is an age of many types of socio-cultural conflict amidst interactions mired in complexity, complexity that is only exacerbated by the scope and pervasiveness of biases. Researchers posit that the nature of bias is rooted in how humans create cognitive associations with their lived experiences (Devine, 1989; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2002; Greenwald & Banaldi, 1995). Cognitive associations form rapidly and are the trace result of social interactions from birth until present. Cognitive associations can demonstrate themselves as explicit biases, which are conscious and/or intentionally prejudiced judgment, stereotyping, or social behavior. Cognitive associations can also demonstrate themselves as implicit biases, or “introspectively unidentified (or inaccurately identified) traces of experience that mediate favorable or unfavorable feeling, thought, or action toward social objects” (Greenwald & Banaldi, 1995, p. 8). Based on these constructs of bias, human beings cannot escape associations because they are the basis for their understanding of the world. Furthermore, this means people should not ignore that bias plays a part in how they engage with one another, both in their private and public lives. However, by exploring the factors that influence bias, one can attempt to mitigate the negative effects of implicit and explicit cognitive associations.
This study sought to discern, among other key considerations, what relationship exists between implicit racial bias and ethnocultural empathy in the workplace. This introductory chapter begins to articulate the current trends and context in which bias exists at the macro-societal, organizational, and individual levels. The subsequent review of literature in Chapter 2 will outline a conceptual framework of bias, empathy, and workplace dynamics as it is understood today as well as the limitations in literature and practice that this study sought to address. Chapter 3 defines specific research questions, hypotheses, and a research design. Chapter 4 presents the quantitative and qualitative data findings. Chapter 5 “synthesizes and discusses the results in light of this study’s research questions, literature review and conceptual framework” (Volpe & Linda, 2016, p. 10). Based on study findings, Chapter 5 will also present initial suggestions for future research and practice. The following sections of this chapter will provide this study’s problem statement, research questions, definition of terms, and relevant contextual themes that provide a rationale for conducting this study at this time.

**Problem Statement**

Racial bias in the workplace is symptomatic of broader interpersonal transformations. Interpersonal transformations are a reflection of current socio-cultural interactions which are complex due, in part, to constantly shifting global population demographics. In recent years, diversity has become a prevalent topic of interest, particularly within the United States. In fact, due to emerging social phenomena, the latest projections from the U.S. Census Bureau state that the population of the United
States will be ‘majority-minority’ by 2043 (Economic Policy Institute, 2016). “Majority-minority” is a descriptive term indicating that most of the population, across all racial and ethnic demographics, will be people of color\textsuperscript{1}. Given the transformation of racial and ethnic demographics alongside subsequent socio-cultural impacts, understanding the perceived effects of implicit racial bias in the workplace, which will be discussed throughout Chapters one and two, is a trend worth examining more closely. Additionally, research is needed to learn more about psychological factors, such as ethnocultural empathy, that can mitigate the negative effects of implicit racial bias.

**Research Questions**

The far-reaching consequences of implicit cognitive associations concerning racial identity are well documented areas of study (Amodio & Sunstein, 2006; Green et al, 2007; Greenwald & Krieger, 2006; Jolls & Sunstein, 2006); however, empathy as a mechanism for challenging limitations in the face of biases, specifically racial predisposition, remains largely unclear. The objective of this study was to gain a deeper understanding of how individuals experience implicit racial bias in the workplace and to discover what impact ethnocultural empathy has on the phenomenon. The primary questions for this study are as follows:

**Questions One:** What is the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias?

\textsuperscript{1} People of color- a term used to describe an individual who is not white or of European parentage. See Houghton Mifflin Company (Harcourt, 2005) for additional information.
Question Two: How is implicit racial bias perceived to be experienced in the workplace at the organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal levels?

Question Three: How is ethnocultural empathy perceived to be experienced in the workplace?

In consideration of these research questions, the following sections will clearly define a mechanism for studying ethnocultural empathic response in individuals who demonstrate implicit racial via quantitative methods. Subsequent qualitative interviews explored how implicit racial bias and ethnocultural empathy are experienced in the workplace. The overall study took an emergent mixed-methods approach.

Definition of Terms

Embedded in these research questions are important concepts relevant to the study. The following definition of terms will allow the reader to more clearly recognize the relationship between theoretical frameworks, rationale, and research questions.

Implicit racial bias (IRB): IRB is the “introspectively unidentified (or inaccurately identified) trace of past experience that mediates [racially] prejudiced judgment, stereotyping, and social behavior” (Greenwald & Banaldi, 1995, p. 5). This operational definition suggests that implicit bias incorporates both cognitive and behavioral aspects. For the purposes of this proposed study, implicit racial bias, implicit social cognitions, and implicit associations are used interchangeably.
Avoidant Racism (AR): According to Carter et al.’s research, there are three distinct categories of racially-biased behavior as they are understood in the context of victim stress and trauma. Avoidant Racism underscores the “distance between dominant and non-dominant groups (e.g., being ignored by a sales person in a store or denied housing because of your race).” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64).

Hostile Racism (HR): This is a category of racially-biased trauma that describes “actions meant to communicate the target’s inferior status because of his or her membership in a non-dominant racial-group (e.g., being stopped by the police because of your race)” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64)

Aversive-Hostile Racism (AHR): This is a category of racially-biased trauma that denotes experiences “intended to create distance with strong hostile elements after a person of Color has gained entry into an organization or institution in which they were previously excluded (e.g. having your abilities and professional skills questioned)” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64)

Empathy: Empathy is defined as “feeling in oneself the feelings of others” (Strayer & Eisenberg, 1987)

Ethnocultural Empathy (EE): References to ethnocultural empathy are based on a concept introduced by researchers in the field of counseling psychology. Ethnocultural Empathy is “empathy directed towards person(s) from racial and ethnocultural groups different from one's own ethnocultural group” (Wang et al., 2003, p. 222). Ethnocultural empathy can take the form of cognitive and/or
behavioral responses.

**Automaticity**: *Automaticity* is a concept defined by humanist William Hazlett in 1830, whereby he argued that it is a process of cognition that can form without concrete attention having been paid to it, in an unlimited variety of circumstances, and while also being difficult to control (Payne & Gawronski, 2010; Bargh, 1994)

**Human Agency**: This study defines human agency based on Emirybar and Mische’s (1998) work, which states that,

“[human agency is] the temporally constructed engagement by actors of different structural environments—the temporal relational context of action—which, through the interplay of habit, imagination, and judgment, both reproduces and transforms those structure in interactive response to the problems posed by changing historical situations” (p. 970).

Given this definition, this study uses the terms *human agency* and *agency* interchangeably throughout this study.

**Trauma**: For the purposes of this study’s approach to thematically analyzing perceived experience, trauma is defined as a potentially significant negative psychological or emotional effect as a result of bias (Rollock, 2000; Carter et al., 2005; Carter, 2007; Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Broman, Mavaddat, & Hsu, 2000). Given this definition, I use the terms *trauma* and *stress* interchangeably throughout this dissertation.
Organizational level: This study uses the term organizational level to refer to systemic behaviors and processes within a workplace setting. Organizational level behaviors include such processes as talent acquisition, promotion, or hierarchical structures. Given the emergent nature of the study, the list of organizational behaviors was expanded upon further review.

Interpersonal level: This study uses the term interpersonal level to refer to interactions that occur between and/or amongst people. This includes interactions that occur between distinct teams, cross-functional project teams, workplace departments, divisions, or hierarchical groups (e.g., individual contributor, external customer, internal customer, supervisor). Interactions between or among people can also include 1:1 contact such as in the case of peer-to-peer, leader-to-follower, or employee-to-customer (external or internal).

Intrapersonal level: I use the term intrapersonal level to refer to the concept of internal actions that may occur. Action can refer to cases of cognitive processes, intrinsic motivational drivers, emotional and psychological responses, stress, or trauma.

Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion (DEI): DEI is a term popularized in corporate industry that is considered a philosophical approach to impartiality within procedures, processes, and distribution of resources. It is a term meant to demonstrate the full participation of a demographic mix of varying human differences that encompass, but are not limited to, race and ethnic group, sexual affiliation, gender, physical ability, or any variety of lived experience.
The following sections outline the importance of gaining a deeper understanding of the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias in today’s society. Additionally, the following sections will outline existing and future states of diversity, polarization, and conflict as well as workplace practices (e.g., compensation, talent acquisition, succession-planning, employee engagement, and training) in the context of race. These ongoing and emerging themes warrant a focus on factors that can impact implicit racial bias in the workplace.

Diversity—Who Is in The Room?

Changing population demographics are particularly noteworthy because the number of non-Caucasians entering the United States is rising. Immigrants are coming from primarily Latin America and Asia (Pew Research Center, 2015). According to the Pew Research Center (2015), “the U.S. population that is foreign born [has grown] from 5% in 1965 to 14% today [2015] and will push it to a projected record 18% in 2065” (p. 39). The rapid changes in the racial and ethnic makeup of immigrant populations has had a trickle-down effect on the nation’s broader ethnic and racial composition.

The same demographic shifts that are seen at a societal level are pervasive within organizations; however, there is a growing disparity in minority representation in the workplace, which reflects increasing gaps in workplace practices (Altonji & Blank, 1999; Chapman et al., 2014; Cain, 1986; Donohue & Heckman, 1991; Ihlanfeldt & Sjoquist, 1990; Steinecke & Terrell, 2010; Welch, 1990). The working-age population (those
between the ages of 18 and 64) will experience a significant inflection point to majority-minority in 2039 (Economic Policy Institute, 2016). This is a critical juncture when considering DEI practices because, this rise in working-age eligible individuals should be reflected within the workplace where there will be a majority-minority shift several years before the general population. Noting this inflection point is consequential because today’s organizations struggle to address the growing disparity in minority representation in the workplace. The far-reaching effects of diversity on organizational recruitment and retention strategies has already flooded best practice discussions in trade journals as well as academic research (Beckwith et al., 2016; Turner, 2013; Starks, 2009). According to report findings of the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), “Based on long-term labor force projections from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and continuation of trends in college completion among different demographic groups, the working class is projected to become majority people of color in 2032” (Wilson, Pew Research Center, 2016, p. 3). This is 11 years sooner than the Census Bureau projection for the entire population and 7 years sooner than the transition for all working-age adults (18 to 64 years old). There is a more rapid pace of change in workforce trends, particularly in bachelor’s and/or advanced degree-holding candidates who are potential leadership applicants given their credentials (Wilson, Pew Research Center, 2016, p. 3). Due to this pace, the urgency to evaluate the impact of demographic shifts on talent management strategy will continue to inform DEI policies and practices. In fact, it becomes an even more pressing subject of discussion.
An approaching majority-minority shift of workforce potential employees is especially relevant to current and future approaches to the increasing “War for Talent” (Michaels et. al., 2001). The “War for Talent” is a trade term used to depict a surge in demand to create competitive advantages for skilled workers even as companies define their employer brand (i.e., employee value proposition). Beyond employer brand, diversity has been shown to directly influence revenue across industries (Herring, 2009). In a study that collected data from a national sample of for-profit business organizations, researchers were interested in the value-in-diversity thesis. Their results supported seven value-in-diversity hypotheses, most notably: “racial diversity is associated with increased sales revenue, more customers, greater market share, and greater relative profits” (Herring, 2009, p. 209).

**Polarization & Conflict**

Seated amidst the transformation of the racial and ethnic makeup of the United States, reports suggest that there are surges in socio-political movements and intergroup conflicts at macro-sociopolitical levels (Hate Crimes Statistics’ Report, 2016). Essentially, the United States has become a more polarized society in demonstrable ways such as in reported hate crimes, grassroots social media campaigns, and a revitalized political activism movement. The manifestation of intergroup conflict is visible in statistical confirmation of discriminatory behavior as well as in a renaissance of inequity discourse. The *Hate Crimes Statistics Act* of 1990, for example, was enacted as a law to begin collecting data on the nature and frequency of self-reported hate crimes throughout the United States. Since the implementation of the Hate Crimes Statistics Act, federal and
local agencies have attempted to identify trends in hate-crime specific behaviors. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s 2016 Hate Crimes Statistics’ Report, Of the 7,227 single-bias hate crime offenses reported, forty-eight-point five (48.5) percent stemmed from a race/ethnicity/ancestry bias (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017). As of 2016, reports suggest that roughly seven-in-ten black Americans (71%) say they have personally experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly because of their race or ethnicity, including 11% who say this is something they experience regularly (Pew Research Center, 2016, Q27). It should be noted that these statistics reflect only self-reported incidents. Researchers and human rights advocates alike posit that many incidents of discrimination go unreported, thus these figures are likely grossly under-representative of the phenomenon (Nolan et al., 2002).

Despite the increasing prevalence of self-reported discriminant behavior, Pew Research Center findings indicate that not only is there

No consensus among American adults about the state of race relations in the U.S.: 48% say race relations are generally bad, and 44% say they are generally good. Opinions on fundamental questions about race relations—where we are, how they can be improved, and how much attention the issue warrants—are sharply divided along racial lines (2016, p. 31, 35, 36)

It appears that there are considerable numbers of individuals who inherently believe biased behavior happens somewhere else, to someone else, with someone else at fault. In turn, these individuals do not believe themselves to be directly connected to these discriminatory behaviors. This dissonance highlights the need to examine implicit racial bias specifically because people are unaware of their own biased behavior.
Social Media

As a society, there are attempts to make meaning of current socio-cultural upheaval in the United States. The #BlackLivesMatter movement, for example, launched as a social commentary of discriminant police treatment toward people of color. Despite this call to action, a recent survey found that blacks are twenty-five (25) percentage points more likely than whites to say the deaths of blacks during encounters with police in recent years are signs of a broader societal problem and not merely isolated incidents (Pew Research Center, 2016). In fact, the #BlueLivesMatter Campaign emerged in counter-protest to the #BlackLivesMatter Campaign and is just one example of the divergent responses to politically volatile events within the United States.

In recent academic discussions, the social media response to ongoing intergroup tensions is seen as an effort to accommodate a multitude of demographic shifts. In one study that explored social media activity and the socio-cultural ramifications of the historic 2008 presidential election and Barack Obama’s unprecedented win, researchers found “a dynamic change in bias [for the worse], tracking the realignment of real world conflict lines and public efforts to reconstitute group identity” (Rand, et al., 2009). Social media activity reflects current societal debates surrounding judicial practice (e.g., #BlackLivesMatter movement2,

---
2 Founded by Alicia Garza, Patrisse Cullors, and Opal Tometi, the #BlackLivesMatter movement has been credited with revitalizing a new era in the modern civil rights movement.
#ICantBreathe campaign, #BlueLivesMatter campaign, gender inequality (e.g., #closethepaygap movement), and even socially. The discord observed as a society is visible not only in media (Tukachinsky, Mastro, & Yarchi, 2015; Dukes & Gaither, 2017; Bonilla, Rosa, 2015; Entman, 2007) and partisan politics (Lybarger & Monteith, 2011; Rand et al., 2009) but also in the financial pressures placed on companies that must now choose how best to represent their brands in the face of these crises. Corporate Social Responsibility—“social responsibility of business [that] encompasses the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time” (Carroll, 1979, p. 500, emphasis added)—has emerged as a major indicator of consumer loyalty and employer brand backlash (Du et al., 2007; Grohmann & Bodur, 2015; Maignan, & Ferrell, 2003). For example, the ensuing backlash that Starbucks faced after a series of bias-related incidents that went viral on social media (Logan, 2016) has caused many organizations to confront issues of discrimination and racism. As a society, there is a struggle to coexist across broader communities. Private and public organizations must place greater importance on pre-emptive adaptation to changing cultural norms rather than face the repercussions in hindsight. Social media activity and divergent perceptions of racial inequity are visible not only in the macro-social trends

---

3 A protest slogan and ongoing campaign born out of the police killing of an unarmed African American male, Eric Garner.

4 A countermovement that formed in response to the #BlackLivesMatter Campaign. This campaign has led to #BlueLivesMatter bills being put forward that constitute the killing of police officers as a hate crime.

5 A gender pay inequity movement that has created marketing campaigns for several organizations seeking to create socially responsible brands, including The Gap Inc.

6 #MeToo is a viral social media campaign to address sexual harassment and assault in the workplace.
noted earlier but also in a marked discrepancy within the workplace. For example, these divergent perceptions are apparent when observing racial harassment. A governing body that tracks employment practices, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), has seen a 4% annual increase in the number of race-based charges filed in the last ten years (EEOC, 2017). A study conducted in 2013 found that a significant racial divide exists in awareness of racial harassment at work. White employees were less likely than Black employees to report that people of color had experienced racial harassment in the workplace (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2013). While it may appear that those who experience racial harassment are more likely to report it, this particular study demonstrates a lack of perception of racial harassment by those who are doing the harassing or even just observing racial harassment that’s occurring. This same study suggested a call to action for an “understand[ing of] the psychological and identity related processes underlying race differences in perceptions of harassment at work, as well as the outcomes associated with this perceptual disconnect” (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2013, p. 18).

The current study begins to address such gaps in existing research. The purpose of one of the research questions posed in the study (i.e., How is implicit racial bias perceived to be experienced in the workplace?) is meant to expand understanding of the phenomenon of perceiving implicit racial bias by those directly and/or indirectly involved. Participants were asked to describe not only their own observations of implicit racial bias, but the behaviors that they noted of others surrounding specific events. The rationale and framework of this research question, and others, will be explored in the subsequent literature review. There is an opportunity suggested by this study to create a deeper comprehension of how implicit racial bias is perceived and how it subsequently
impacts employees in the workplace, particularly as the demographic makeup of talent continues to evolve.

**Workplace Practice**

In the last six decades, there have been overarching societal conflicts that impact approaches to workforce talent policy and practice (Hope et al., 1999; Ely & Thomas, 2001). It has been shown that there are issues of under representation among women and people of color at senior leadership levels in Fortune 500 companies (EEOC, 2016) for example. The following sections will outline how talent policies, such as recruitment and corporate advancement reflect the negative effects of bias in the workplace.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Today’s workplace environments typically approach stemming the negative effects of bias by establishing institutional structures (e.g., policy and procedure) (Cox, 1991). One of the core positions that this study holds is that, alongside structural intervention, there is a need to further consider the emotional, cognitive, and behavioral aspects of bias to affect true change. Having addressed the importance of the topic of this study in Chapter 1, the following review of literature and conceptual definitions will outline a theoretical framework for this study. The review of literature further identifies historical trends, themes, and gaps in both academic literature and practice on the topics of implicit racial bias, ethnocultural empathy, and workplace dynamics.

Conceptual Framework

Conceptually, this study was designed to explore the nature of the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias in the workplace. Additionally, this study examined the perceived effects of ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias in organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal processes within the workplace. Figure 1 depicts the conceptual framework for this study.
The approach used for this review of literature focuses on critically evaluating existing theoretical and empirical research to define a clear conceptual framework (Ravitch & Riggan, 2012). This is done via an examination of each of the major independent and dependent variables of the proposed study, including bias, empathy, and workplace dynamics concerning racial interactions.

**Bias**

The concept of bias has its modern-day roots in the field of social psychology. Prior to the inception of social psychology and before the term bias came into the popular lexicon, there were a series of academic discussions surrounding prejudice. Prejudice
sparked academic debate in the individual fields of both psychology and sociology. William Hazlett, for example, an England-born humanist and literary critic, first explored prejudice in his essay, aptly named *On Prejudice*, in 1830. His working definition of Prejudice was that, “in its ordinary and literal sense, [prejudice] is prejudging any question without having sufficiently examined it, and adhering to our opinion upon it through ignorance, malice, or perversity, in spite of every evidence to the contrary” (Hazlett, 1830, p. 235). Hazlett goes on to reference implicit associations and the power of individual agency by stating that “the largest part of our judgments is prompted by habit and passion,” but we acquiesce— “whether conscious or unconscious—to our passions because humans are creatures of habit” (p. 240). William Hazlett’s early work introduced a body of literature that sought to understand *automaticity*— or automatic processing—a concept that derived from the idea that cognition can form without concrete attention having been paid to it, in an unlimited variety of circumstances, and while also being difficult to control (Payne & Gawronski, 2010; Bargh, 1994). Like the arguments that Hazlett made in 1830, when exploring the arc of the academic conversation surrounding bias, questions of moral response, the nature of cognition, as well as individual accountability continue to emerge.

**The History of Prejudice and Bias**

Early psychological and sociological studies on prejudice toward women and blacks were particularly abundant throughout the late 20th and early 21st centuries (Duckitt, 1992; Glăveanu, 2009; Guthrie, 1976/2004; Jones, 1997; Richards, 1997; Samuelson, 1978). These discussions took the form of *race psychology*—"examining
individual differences between blacks and whites as well as between men and women” (Webster, Saucier, & Harris, 2010). Before a time when we used the term bias, prejudice was the widely accepted terminology for the concept. G.T.W. Patrick, a founding member of what is today known as the American Psychological Association (APA, founded in 1892), is the first known, self-identified psychologist to examine the issue of prejudice. His work on prejudice, however short-lived and riddled with unfounded stereotypes of women, Jews, and blacks⁶, would “pave the way for future approaches to ethnic perspective-taking or the awareness of ethnic discrimination and prejudice” (Quintana et al., 1999, p. 220). Patrick (1890) argued that prejudice was rooted in “incongruities in apperception,” which he referred to as “people being able to ‘perceive’ the same object (e.g. a tract of country), but ‘apperceive’ the object differently” (p. 634). He posited that the methods by which one apperceived information was informed by their “previously acquired groups of ideas” (p. 634). Many critiqued his definition of prejudice as being unsatisfactory, most notably, a fellow psychologist and moralist by the name of Josiah Morse. Morse (1907), in a subsequent piece that was critical of Patrick’s findings, noted that, “Prejudice is not apperception, but rather an arrest of it; a refusal or inability to perceive” (p. 494). These seminal works demonstrate a consistent theme in the literature that suggests that bias must include a cognitive process alongside an action-oriented response. The mechanisms of any cognitive process surrounding bias continue to shape the academic

⁶ It should be noted that Patrick (1890) made several references to the intellectual inferiority of women (p. 215). He, along with his PhD mentor at John Hopkins University, G. Stanley Hall, would regularly explore diversity in ways that endorsed stereotypes of the time.
research in an emerging field known as *implicit social cognition*—a term coined by scholars Greenwald and Banaji (1995)—which seeks to understand individual attitudes and the nature of how people come to construct meaning.

**Motivation—Why Does Implicit Bias Form?**

Throughout much of the 21st century, “across the country and in most [U.S.] states, the proportions of people other than White increased” (Hobbs, 2002, p. 88). During these demographic shifts, like what is occurring today, researchers sought to understand how bias forms. Most of the early work that examined Hazlett’s theory of automaticity is based on the premise that bias is unavoidable and difficult to mediate (1830). Festinger, a prominent social psychologist of the mid-20th century, argued that cognitive dissonance is the clash or discrepancy evoked because of cognitions about the world and individuals being called into question. The state of tension that emerges is known as a cognitive dissonant effect (See Figure 2). Because the consequence of experiencing dissonance is an unpleasant sensation, we are motivated to eliminate or reduce this tension and achieve consonance (Festinger, 1957). This is particularly relevant to this study’s exploration of how individuals experience implicit racial bias in the workplace. If it is understood that individuals are aware of the widespread prevalence of racial bias broadly, it becomes necessary to evaluate the commonly held belief that racism occurs somewhere else, with someone else, through someone else. Cognitive dissonance could account for the lack in personal awareness or accountability for widely apparent racial bias in the workplace. Research to date has not demonstrated that the reduction of implicit racial bias can be done via factors capable of development. Whereas
Hazlett considered bias, and by extension the concept of automaticity, to be difficult to control, this study posits that implicit bias is within the realm of individual agency and can therefore be mitigated by psychological factors such as ethnocultural empathy.

Figure 2. Festinger's Cognitive Dissonance Theory

In subsequent studies of implicit bias, cognitive dissonance has been explored in the context of ethical as well as practical considerations. Levy’s work (2012) discusses the issue of moral responsibility and individual agency in addressing agent awareness of implicit bias. He argues that although practical laws such as involuntary manslaughter embrace the notion that despite intention, consequence is most critical, this may not be an accurate assessment of moral responsibility. For example, once individuals become conscious of their implicit biases and conflicting self-perceptions, they now have grounds to become responsible for introducing behavioral changes. However, Levy states that this “awareness of the content of our implicit attitudes fails to integrate [attitudes] into our person level concerns in the manner required for direct moral responsibility” (Levy, 2012, forthcoming). His findings are especially relevant when considering workplace
interventions such as anti-bias training, which has only been explored in academic discussions in context of early education approaches. There is a distinct lack of anti-bias training pedagogy for adults (The SAGE Encyclopedia, 2016). Most of today’s DEI approaches have used a limited anti-bias training, ranging from 1-hour virtual learning modules to multi-day, group facilitated presentations, to explore only those aspects of bias that refer to legal consequences (e.g. not discriminating when selecting candidates or avoiding divisive language). These concepts are relevant only in superficially addressing bias in the workplace. Deeper, person-level concern for these concepts shifts anti-bias training from an exercise in employment law repercussions to individual moral accountability for addressing these issues.

A key aspect of cognitive dissonance is the questioning of one’s firmly held beliefs or tenets that are rooted in one’s lived experiences. In the instance of police interaction, the response to riots in Los Angeles⁷ and the trial of Rodney King are relevant illustrations. An individual’s lived experience may infer that police are always safe, secure, honest, and that they are there to “protect and serve.” In turn, this same individual may view African Americans as criminals. A firmly held belief that police are good could be in direct conflict to someone who has experienced the police as being violent, systemic tools of racism. The same individual who has a negative belief surrounding police encounters may also view African Americans as being no more prone to criminality than anyone else⁸; furthermore, no one deserves a brutal beating.

---

⁷ Los Angeles Riots or Rodney King Riots- A series of civil disturbances, looting, and arson that occurred after the acquittal of 4 Los Angeles police officers for the prolonged beating of Rodney King. The officers were charged with use of excessive force in the arrest of Rodney King after footage of the incident was widely dispersed in the news media.
⁸ See Kim & Kiesel (2018) for additional information about police racial treatment
Another example, using the same preconceived tenets and beliefs, would be when watching a video of an unarmed African American being gunned down by a police officer. One reaction is to recognize the affront and loss of human life as a situation in which non-lethal intervention is mandated by law. The other reaction, to the same visual stimulus, is an immediate denial of racial motivation and an assumption made that the victim was somehow responsible for their death. Extensive work has been done to define the justification for or denial of racist behavior (Goldberg, 1996; Santa Ana, 1999) that has been attributed to a fear of criticism as an assumption of extreme overreaction to common response (e.g., extreme political correctness or “thought policing”) (Augoustinos & Every, 2010). To study this phenomenon is to consider the roots of racial cognitive dissonance in our day-to-day discourse of cross-cultural interaction.

As it stands today, research has found that “efforts to moderate managerial bias through diversity training and diversity evaluations are least effective at increasing the share of white women, black women, and black men in management” (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). Although minority underrepresentation is one quantifiable metric to measure bias in the workplace, it does not establish clear criteria for what cognitive interventions can mitigate implicit bias within organizations. When considering intention and motivations that drive cognitive and behavioral responses, bias has been proven to exist despite individuals indicating agreement or disagreement with explicit statements of aforementioned stereotypes (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Greenwald, McGhee, &

---

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-]
Schwartz, 1998). This topic is worth noting due to one output of this study, which is determining the veracity of ethnocultural empathy (EE)—a construct capable of agent development and influence—and identifying whether EE has significant relational impact on biased thoughts and/or behavior.

As Delgado and Stefancic (2012) noted, racism is ordinary, not aberrational—“[it is] normal science, [it is] the usual way society does business, the common, everyday experience of most people in this country” (p. 7). Despite poll findings that validate the belief of the prevalence of racially biased behavior, there is a marked contradiction in the acknowledgement of personal accountability or even peripheral interaction with racially biased practices (Brewer, 1988; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Schlenker, 1980; Tedeschi, 1981; Van Dijik, 1992). This disconnect in self-reported accounting of perceived racism-driven behaviors is usually attributed to a fear of negatively perceived social responses (Carter et al., 2005). Although several researchers note social backlash as a potential motivation for the failure to disclose biased thoughts or behaviors (Janus, 2010; Krysan & Couper, 2003; Weeks & Moore, 1981), this does not address other potential drivers such as cognitive dissonance when confronted with personal accountability for exhibiting racially biased thoughts or behaviors. This is one reason why this study defines a methodological approach that assessed “people’s attitudes without having to ask them directly” (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995, p. 10). Establishing “indirect measures [that] do not require…participants [to] be aware of what is being measured” (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995, p. 10) is a necessary consideration when defining methodological approaches for studying these concepts. The rationale for the methodology of this study, which takes into
consideration social backlash, will be outlined further in Chapter 3.

**How Does Implicit Bias Form?**

From Hazlett’s work until the present day, the field of bias research continues to scrutinize the concept of unconscious and conscious awareness. This notion is also referred to as implicit social cognition. Although implicit racial bias is a cognitive phenomenon that cannot always be observed behaviorally or expressly identified by the individuals themselves, several researchers have sought to determine how implicit bias forms (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998).

Greenwald and Banaji’s (1995) influential work *Implicit Social Cognition: Attitude, Self-esteem, and Stereotypes* suggests that implicit bias incorporates both cognitive and behavioral aspects. The argument has also emerged that, despite policies meant to encourage diversity and inclusion, there exists a widespread presence of implicit biases and their negative effects, such as disproportionate, racially diverse leadership representation. This is related to this study because there is no consensus on what and how to effectively address DEI while incorporating the knowledge that bias is both cognitive and behavioral. This study identifies aspects of empathy as having a relationship to implicit racial bias, which until now, has never been clearly explored. The emergence of stereotypical inferences that present when people evaluate others continues to be a trend observed in psychological research (e.g. men are better suited to math than women or whites are better suited to leadership than blacks) (Naomi et al., 2013; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). The phenomenon has been seen even amongst those who purport to hold egalitarian views. There are many recent examples that demonstrate this
dichotomous response (Delk, 1995; Kim & Keisel, 2018). The following paragraphs outlines relevant examples in workplace context.

**Effects of bias.** Studies have evaluated the presence of implicit bias in subgroups according to professional occupation (Clark, 2009; Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, 2007; Green et al., 2007; Sabin & Greenwald, 2012; Chapman et al., 2013). It is worth noting for the purposes of this study that extensive research has been done specifically in occupational fields that were chosen based on the presumption that members who engage in these professions require an inherent disposition toward the empathic care of others, such as in healthcare, judiciary practice, or education (Marcelo & Yates, 2014; Todd et al., 2016; Trawalter et al., 2008; Zaw et al., 2016). The overwhelming consensus has shown that the prevalence of bias is reflective of a larger cultural occurrence that is present across occupational, geographic, gendered, and age distinctions.

General motives or potential origins for denying biased behavior in self-reporting are appropriate considerations when approaching research design; however, few distinctions are made that identify factors of emotional response that impact biased thoughts and behaviors. The racially disproportionately higher prevalence of stop and frisk police interventions for African American and Latino individuals is one ongoing study (New York Civil Liberties Union, 2017). Although one argument can be made for these disproportionate experiences to be attributed to hypersensitivity, research trends indicate that racially biased behavior is a psychosocial phenomenon that is quantifiable by the unequal arrest numbers according to race or ethnicity (Quintana, 1994).
The epistemology of biased behavior in police practices was a key rationale of a study done by Payne et al. (2001) that has been replicated several times since (Payne et al., 2002; Conrey et al., 2005). Payne’s research (2001) utilized a sequential priming technique—one of the earliest methods of investigating implicit social cognition—by recording “response times” after having been prompted by exposure to an emotive artifact (i.e., wording or pictures) (Cameron et al., 2012, p. 331). The methodological design of Payne’s work allowed for the demonstration of the impact that attitudes and beliefs can have on visual perception. Payne compared participants who were shown a white face to those who were shown a black face. After priming, participants where then asked to identify pictures of guns. Payne’s findings overwhelmingly indicated that those participants shown a black face were more likely to misidentify pictures of tools as guns. When considering the phenomenon of police-involved shootings of black individuals who were found to not be carrying any weapons (e.g. Stephon Clark10, Philando Castile11, Sandra Bland12, Walter Scott13), the practical applications of his study are both necessary and troubling. What is also worth noting is that in most of these instances, there was no subsequent conviction of the officers involved (Lee & Park, 2017). In noting these examples, one can observe the effects of bias in workplace practice as well as in
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personal interactions. The interconnectedness of biased thoughts and behaviors is a key rationale for this study’s sample population, participant criteria sequencing, and overall research design. The phenomenon of implicit racial bias exists in a variety of workplace environments, amongst varying degrees of interaction with people of a different race or ethnicity, as well as even after a self-expression of differing life values from that of racial prejudice.

**Self-perceived effects of racial bias.** The phenomenon of implicit bias has been shown to have far-reaching effects. Numerous studies have shown the traumatic psychological and emotional effects of racially biased behavior on individuals (Rollock, 2000; Carter et al., 2005; Carter, 2007; Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Broman, Mavaddat, & Hsu, 2000; Brown, 2001). In fact, microaggressions, or “daily slights and insults directed at someone because of her or his race,” (Pierce, 1974, p. 515) and the long-term effects of these daily hassles have been generally found to be sources of stress related to depression, anxiety, and decline in physical health (DeLongis et al., 1982; Kanner et al., 1981; Levy et al., 1997; Solorzano et al., 2000; Feagin & Sikes, 1994).

Symptoms that reflect trauma are one of many reasons why counseling psychologists have influenced much of current academic understanding of bias and its effects.

**Behaviors of Racial Bias**

Racial bias can take several forms of behavioral display. There is a broad spectrum ranging from microaggressions to the overt violence that manifests in deadly violence and hate crimes such as in the case of the recent Charleston, South Carolina church shootings\(^{14}\). Many have struggled to fully describe what it is like to live with

\(^{14}\) See "Dylann Roof confesses to killing 9 people in Charleston church, wanting to start ‘race war’".
constant verbal, emotional, and physical attacks against their person because of their race. This study incorporates qualitative feedback from respondents who may or may not have experienced racial bias in the workplace. To authentically represent the lived experience of interviewees, it becomes vital to create a consistent means of categorizing the perceived effects of racial bias.

Since there is such variance in racial discourse about the effects of bias, it can be difficult to typify racism or racial bias when encountered. This study uses the research of Carter and Helms (2002) and Carter et al. (2007), who have extrapolated a model for the interpretation of racially biased behavioral encounters. Their model categorizes racially biased behaviors through the lens of the victim according to three classes of distinct experience: avoidant, hostile, and aversive hostile (see definition of terms). Carter’s approach allows the researcher to analyze qualitative themes that show fidelity to the lived experience of participants while also capturing the intersectionality of these experiences with organizational dynamics in such a way that existing quantitative instruments, currently, are unable to demonstrate. Each class of distinct experience is meant to denote racially biased behavior at distinct levels of system: individual, institutional, and cultural. These levels of systems are also tied to “emotional and psychological responses such as race-based traumatic stress symptoms (e.g. depression, anxiety, intrusion, etc.)” (Carter & Helms, 2002). For the purposes of defining each class of the Carter et al.’s model, please refer to Figure 3.

Avoidant Racism underscores the “distance between dominant and non-dominant groups (e.g., being ignored by a sales person in a store or denied housing because of your race).” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64)

Hostile Racism examines “actions meant to communicate the target’s inferior status because of his or her membership in a non-dominant racial-group (e.g., being stopped by the police because of your race)” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64)

Aversive-Hostile Racism denotes experiences “intended to create distance with strong hostile elements after a person of Color has gained entry into an organization or institution in which they were previously excluded (e.g., having your abilities and professional skills questioned)” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64)

These three categories for defining racially biased behavior provides an initial means of thematic analysis for the personal stories of individuals who experienced racism within the workplace. Inherent in Carter’s definitions is a deliberate consideration of the psychological trauma inflicted by each experience, which Carter further articulates in his
subsequent studies (Carter et al., 2007, 2016). Additional thematic analysis approaches and rationales are further discussed in Chapter 3.

As organizations continue to strive for competitive advantages in a drive to be destination employers for in-demand talent, mitigating employee stress and, by extension, propelling corporate wellness is a principal factor for recruitment and retention, particularly within the millennial population (Cahill & Sedrak, 2012). That said, there are additional work-context repercussions to biased behavior that have been found in several research disciplines (e.g. EEOC claims or employee disengagement), such as in the study of managerial sciences, organizational dynamics, and leadership development. Having a formalized theory that incorporates perception and impact of encounters with racial bias at all 3 levels of system is necessary when coding themes of qualitative interviewee responses. In Chapter 3 there will be additional discussion regarding the approach to identifying, measuring, and subsequently assessing findings once data was collected.

**Bias and Organizational Workplace Dynamics**

Gordon Allport’s 1954 text, *The Nature of Prejudice*, is considered by many to be the preeminent text of the academic discussion surrounding prejudice and its effects on intergroup relations (deCarvahlo, 1993; Dovidio, Glick, & Rudman, 2005). His scholarly contributions draw from a unique and deliberately multidimensional view of the phenomenon of prejudice. In fact, his rationale was that,

> It would be a serious error to ascribe prejudice and discrimination to any single taproot, reaching into economic exploitation, social structure, the mores, fear, aggression, sex conflict, or any other favored soil. Prejudice and discrimination...may draw nourishment from all of these conditions and many others (Allport, 1954, p. xviii)
Allport’s argument recognizes the complexity of a phenomenon which was, at the time, rarely acknowledged as worthy of consideration; it shaped the study of bias over the next six decades. In fact, Allport is credited with placing importance on implicit and explicit associations nearly forty years before Greenwald and Banaji’s (1995) seminal work, *Implicit Social Cognition: Attitude, Self-esteem, and Stereotypes*.

Since Allport’s studies, establishing causal relationships for observed prejudicial behavior has continued to prove difficult. Because prejudicial behavior is multifaceted and insidious in both cause and effect, in many ways, this has hampered the ability to establish targeted interventions to address the issue at hand (Anand & Winters, 2008). Another key aspect of Allport’s early work would later become what is known as critical race theory (CRT). CRT emerged as a prominent field of thought in the 1970s and 1980s.

Critical race theory investigates a paradox: How does racism persist despite its nearly universal condemnation by state policy and by the norms of polite society? Rejecting the conventional liberal position that racism survives only as a relic from a less-enlightened time or as a characteristic of poorly educated or troubled individuals, critical race theorists take the position that racism is ordinary and normal in contemporary society, indeed perhaps integral to social practices and institutions. Critical race theory can thus be understood as a study of hegemony: how domination can persist without coercion. It can also be understood as a study of collective denial. (Harris, 2015)

Similar to today, CRT’s emergence was alongside an increase in demographic workforce changes during the same time period. This demographic shift contributed to a surge in disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations (Langdon, McMenamic, & Krolik, 2002; Kuczynski, 1999). CRT-grounded approaches to multiculturalism and diversity in the workplace informed much of the arguments made in anti-bias training and academic research. For example, *Diversity and Organizational
Communication by BJ Allen (1995) is a published work that would shape diversity research throughout much of the late 1990s and early 2000s. In his work, Allen (1995) stated that "critical approaches seem particularly fitting because they would compel researchers to analyze issues of power and control that inhere racism in our society" (p. 149). What Allen discussed is a reference to the same power dynamics, both inherent and assumed, that exist within the workplace. As a phenomenon placed in context, it is important to note that implicit racial bias can be informed by the constraints of hierarchy, power, team dynamics and employee engagement that exist within a workplace environment. For the purposes of this study, several examples are outlined in the following section that demonstrate racial bias, either explicit or implicit, reflected in workplace policy, practice, and interaction. These examples expose the ways in which bias impacts productivity, leadership efficacy, team dynamics, and employee engagement.

Bias at Intrapersonal & Interpersonal Levels—Team Dynamics and Employee Engagement in the Workplace

When considering the nature of identity and its impact on leadership as well as peer-to-peer interaction, this study sought to explore how implicit racial bias is experienced as interconnected. Given that research has indicated that bias can have a significant traumatic effect on individuals, one argument could be made that the natural conflict within teams could be enmeshed in implicit biased behavior (Rollock, 2000; Carter et al., 2005; Carter, 2007; Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Broman,
Mavaddat, & Hsu, 2000; Brown, 2001). The intersectionality of role and ethnic or cultural identity are relevant areas to consider when defining implicit racial bias in workplace context. In fact, one published study noted that “race and tenure diversity are positively associated with emotional conflict” (Pelled, Eisenhardt, & Xin, 1999, p. 1). Pelled et al.’s work presents a finding that demonstrates the tangible relationship between role in the workplace and intrapersonal as well as interpersonal affects. In addition to seeking to understand the nature of the relationship between empathy and implicit racial bias, this study sought to understand the impact of workplace interactions on the individuals who experienced trauma within workplace context made up of interacting groups (e.g., leader-follower, peer-to-peer, customer-employee, etc.). The complexity of these interactions is rooted in current understanding of racial group membership and subsequent social identity.

Racial group membership refers to one’s social demographic and presumed cultural group. When a person indicates that his or her race has meaning to him or her, this is thought to be a reflection of one’s ‘race (or racial) identity.’ As it is typically used, race has social implications and people infer psychological meaning from sociodemographic group membership. (Carter, 2007, p. 18) In the instance of undue stress placed on marginalized individuals in the workplace, there is, as a result of a person’s racial identity, a need to accommodate the social norms of that organization’s culture. A qualitative interview from an African American woman who represents the issue of undue stress was well articulated in William’s 1996 study, *The Alchemy of Race and Rights*. The respondent described a typical workplace encounter wherein she was acutely aware of her racial identity as well

---

15 Identity in this case refers to Tajfel’s Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 2010) wherein he suggests that individuals derive their sense of self—racial, class, sex, religion, etc.—from social categories (otherwise known as social groups) which influence normative expectations of appropriate group behavior.
as the ways in which her marginalized identity became a challenge. This particular example also highlights the unintended dangers and limitations of inclusion practices that fail to acknowledge and appreciate cultural or racial difference. The respondent stated:

A man with whom I used to work once told me that I made too much of my race. After all,” he said, “I don’t even think of you as black.” Yet sometime later, when another black woman became engaged in an ultimately unsuccessful tenure battle, he confided to me that he wished the school could find more blacks like me. I felt myself slip in and out of shadow, as I became nonblack for purposes of inclusion and black for purposes of exclusion; I felt the boundaries of my very body manipulated, casually inscribed by definitional demarcations that did not refer to me. (Williams, 1991, p. 661)

The colleague’s demand, if seemingly innocuous and therefore potentially unintended or implicit, is fraught with bias. This is a demonstration of just one workplace interaction that can and does occur in cross-cultural discussions, specifically when arguing that an individual’s preference is to be ‘colorblind’. The colleague “is not asking Williams [the interviewee] to convert to being white, or to pass as white. He is, rather, asking her to perform her racial identity in ways that make it easy for him to ignore her race. Williams is entitled to her race, but not to make ‘too much’ of it — there is some excess of race that she can and should control” (Gotanda, 1991, p. 4). No matter how real or perceived this individual’s power as ascribed to her role or tenure within the organization, the intersectionality of racial identity and intrapersonal interaction requires a hypervigilance in accommodating another’s preconceived cognitive associations.

Institutional discrimination and interpersonal prejudice were more important predictors of job quality among [the respondents] than were other occupational stressors such as low task variety and decision authority, heavy workloads, and

17 *Colorblind* - A sociological phenomenon born out of the 1950s and 60s. It was meant to describe an ideal state of race neutrality in a society wherein race classifications do not inhibit one’s access to opportunities. See Ansell (2008) for additional information.
poor supervision. Racial bias in the workplace was most likely to be reported by workers in predominantly white work settings. (Hughes & Dodge, 1997, p. 581)

Essentially, the consequence of bias in the workplace has been shown to have a more debilitating effect than other occupational stressors. Not only is this debilitating effect noted as an important predictor of job quality and employee engagement, research has shown that “Harassment and Discrimination in the Workplace (HDW) is a common workplace experience affecting over one half of the U.S. workforce and is associated with negative mental health and problem drinking consequences” (Rospenda, Richman, & Shannon, 2008, p. 821). Each of these findings demonstrate the intrapersonal effect of interpersonal interactions at varying levels of system. Given this context, in the interview portion of this study’s mixed methods research design, it was vital to consider questions that sought a first-person outlook of the effects of perceived implicit racial bias in the workplace.

**Mitigating Bias Interventions—Training and Organizational Development**

In recognizing the preponderance of racially discriminant behavior, some alarming trends demonstrate the pervasiveness of this phenomenon in the workplace. In a study conducted in 2016,

> When asked about specific kinds of discrimination that people may face, about two-in-ten blacks say that they were treated unfairly in hiring, pay or promotion over the past year (21%)…In each of these cases, blacks are more likely than both whites and Hispanics to say they have experienced [discrimination] over the same timeframe (Pew Research Center, 2016, p. 60)

When examining the individual roles most likely to interact with these organizational practices (e.g., hiring, pay, or promotion), racially discriminant behavior exists both
across power hierarchies and within individual roles themselves (March & Simon, 1993). The intersectionality of the phenomenon of racial bias in the workplace is important to consider because an “organization’s managers are individually or collectively the primary decision-makers in investments of human and financial capital; distributions of costs, profits, risks, responsibilities, and opportunities; and fundamental assessments of human potential and character” (Chugh, 2004, p. 204).

Although there are certainly policies meant to mitigate the negative effects of bias, the practice is dictated by individuals empowered and inclined to demonstrate their biases. The subjective nature of mentorship is one such example. In a study conducted in the field of social work, findings indicated that “the significant association between the race of protégés and their mentors suggests that a strong bias prevails toward ‘like mentoring like,’ or same-race relationships” (Collins, Tamya, & Tourse, 1997, p. 145). One of the gaps in research is to understand the lived experience of those whose behaviors are driven by or impacted by bias in mentorship interactions. Although the researchers noted previously have demonstrated the effects of bias in the workplace, there is little known about the ways in which implicit racial bias manifests and consequently impacts those involved.

**Bias, Workplace Power Dynamics and Productivity**

There are several ways to address the perceived effects of bias on workplace dynamics. Researchers posit that “racial microaggressions [for example] are potentially present whenever human interactions involve participants who differ in race and culture (e.g. teaching, supervising, training, administering, evaluating, etc.)” (Sue et al., 2008, p.
14). When considering the nature of power, there is a phenomenon known as upward-directed bias—

A form of bias [which] reflects how minority supervisors face a disconcerting, paradoxical tension between the power and status they have earned while climbing the organizational hierarchy and the lack of power and status they have inherited by virtue of their membership in historically stigmatized ethnic groups” (Zapata, Carton, & Liu, 2016, p. 36)

This is an observed phenomenon that could serve as an explanation for the failure of diversity initiatives to successfully attract and retain talent at key leadership levels (McKary & Avery, 2005). Research has shown that upward-directed bias can directly impact leader efficacy, particularly for those leaders who represent marginalized ethnic or cultural identities. Upward-directed bias is,

A stereotype application [that] perpetuates two different ways [by which] subordinates exhibit bias against minority supervisors relative to Caucasian supervisors: providing less help and engaging in more undermining. Given that a supervisor’s success largely depends on his or her legitimate hold on power, upward-directed bias is likely to be debilitating for minorities” (Blair, 2002, p. 260-61)

One of the outcomes of the study conducted herein is a further understanding of perceived bias in the workplace. In relation to each of the research questions of this study, the participant criteria are broad enough to include both leaders (those with direct reports) and individual contributors (those without direct reports). This presents an opportunity to explore how implicit racial bias, in particular, is perceived by those who experience it as well as those who demonstrate it from different roles within the workplace.

In summary, Chapter 2 has thus far explored the history of prejudice and bias, the self-perceived effects of bias as well as bias in organizational workplace dynamics.
Outlining the importance of automaticity highlighted the possibility for implicit racial bias to be capable of human agency, which provides a means of exploring psychological factors for mitigating the negative effects of implicit racial bias. Cognitive dissonance was also identified as a potential motivational driver for demonstrating human agency when mitigating implicit racial bias. In empathy, the final independent variable of this study, research defining the psychological mechanisms involved in empathic response, situational factors, as well as historical means of measuring these processes will be discussed in greater detail.

**Empathy**

Modern socio-psychology research has sought to define general empathy along three main approaches to personality: affective, cognitive, or a blending of the two. Empathy as an affective psychological phenomenon can look at both the outer appearance and the inner (essential) nature whereby one experiences the emotions of another (Allport, 1961; MacKinnon, 1944). In 1992, as a result of an experimental study, Kozeki and Berghammer stated that affective empathy is the lowest valued form of empathy. Essentially, they defined affective empathy as appropriately recognizing another person’s experience of an emotion and, in response, developing similar emotions (Kozeki & Berghammer, 1992). Several studies have made significant strides in measuring Racial Interpersonal Empathy through non-invasive, neurological indicators such as fMRI results of event-related potential (ERP) studies (Wiesz & Zaki, 2018; Cao et al., 2015; Sheng & Han, 2012; Decety & Cowell, 2014; Riecansky et al., 2014). The ERP technique “provides a powerful method for exploring the human mind and brain”
(Luck, 2005, p. 1) via the measurement of responses that are the direct result of specific sensory, cognitive, or motor events. By introducing specific racially distinct stimuli meant to represent pain (e.g., a Caucasian hand being pricked by a needle vs. a cotton q-tip or a brown-skinned hand about to be cut by a knife and the opposite visual prompt as a control), the aforementioned studies have been able to demonstrate a disparate reaction to another race’s pain. “However, these ERP studies did not differentiate between persons with low and high implicit racial bias. Certainly, there is a need to further examine the boundary conditions under which the stimulus categorization stage” (Fabi & Luethold, 2018, p. 155).

In academic discourse, there is a concurrent counter-argument to the affective approach. A cognitive approach emerged as a defining methodology for assessing empathy in individuals. The crux of the divergent approaches lies in the autonomy of the individual. A person's ability to recognize another's emotions and decide to "imaginatively take the role of another, understand and accurately predict that person's thoughts, feelings, and actions" (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972, p. 525) demonstrates a cognitive choice and subsequent action. Empathy is no longer assumed as a neutral response. One recent ERP study noted the potential opportunities of defining motivation and ethical response in the respondent’s empathic reactions to painful stimuli. They found that

The [aforementioned] study should be viewed as an important first step in demonstrating the practicality of approaching the mechanisms underlying the RBE [racially biased empathy] by presenting static hand stimuli 17 rather than the commonly employed, more complex racial face stimuli18. As highlighted by

17 Static Hand Stimuli- a non-moving image of a hand
18 Racial Face Stimuli- a non-moving image of an individual’s face demonstrating a particular emotion
Decety and Cowell (2014), such knowledge would seem important to promote
moral progress by overcoming RBE effects and expanding empathy from close
persons to humanity in general” (Fabil & Luethold, 2018, p. 148)

This key distinction of moral progress noted by Fabil and Leuthold opens the doorway to
exploring the motivation (i.e., intrinsic, extrinsic, or altruistic) behind empathetic
behavior. The assumptions made in current research to name motivation so exclusively
provides an opportunity for determining whether empathic response, despite the presence
of implicit bias, is capable of influence by an individual, and therefore by extension, is
within the realm of their developmental control. This study considers the hypothesis that
ethnocultural empathy, as a cognitive-behavioral response, is within an individuals’
control and therefore can be developed.

**Empathy and Human Agency**

Because empathy, as it is understood in the social sciences, is capable of influence
by human agency—“the temporally constructed engagement by actors of different
structural environments—the temporal relational context of action—which, through the
interplay of habit, imagination, and judgment, both reproduces and transforms those
structure in interactive response to the problems posed by changing historical situations”
(Mische, 1998, p. 970), there is an opportunity to further understand empathic response
under conditions of bias, particularly implicit racial bias. Although much of the research
noted earlier has been done to understand moral responsibility, it is only within the last
few years that there has been an effort to gain a deeper understanding of the ways in
which individuals can impact empathy through concerted development, growth or

(e.g. anger, sadness, fear, etc.)
evolution. One of the critiques surrounding anti-bias training to date has been that any positive effects noted in cognitive or behavioral change are short-lived, rarely lasting beyond 24–48 hours (Paluck & Greene, 2009). However, scholars have been exploring neuroplasticity and the social brain with some startling results (Valk & Bernhardt, 2017). Wiesz and Zaki (2018) have found that training in cognitive perspective taking [a major component of empathy] increased cortical thickness in mentalizing-related systems, including the ventrolateral prefrontal cortex and the right middle temporal gyrus. These findings suggest that shaping empathic experiences through daily mental exercises creates both functional and structural changes in the brain, lending support to the idea that tuning vicarious emotions creates real and long-lasting impact on empathic motives and experiences. (p. 26)

One of the goals of this study was to address a gap in the literature whereby it is possible to understand the relationships between empathic response and implicit racial bias in workplace contexts. While the current study does not incorporate neuroplasticity assessment as there is no defined intervention to assess, a subsequent study could potentially build on findings by determining to what extent ethnocultural empathic response can be developed despite a participant’s existing implicit racial bias in workplace environments.

Another aspect of workplace power dynamics that was relevant to this study was the ability to understand from respondents themselves the situational and structural factors that influence a psychological mechanism such as empathic response. One of the secondary questions posed in this study sought to understand the effects of perceived ethnocultural empathy on respondents in the workplace. This is in response to a gap in literature whereby other researchers sought to understand the malleability of automatic
stereotypes and prejudice. Researchers, such as Blair, made significant findings yet failed to take into account implicit racial bias or empathic response. Blair found in his 2002 study that

[Measuring] unit size [the number of individuals who make up a team] mitigates the influence of interpersonal justice on racial bias [which] can help surface potential solutions because it suggests that structural and situational factors can influence the psychological mechanism (inattention to supervisors’ individual characteristics) that triggers stereotype application… This evidence has significant implications for conceptions of automaticity, models of stereotyping and prejudice, and attitude representation” (Blair, 2002, p. 242-43).

Blair’s study identified in its findings several potential models, such as automaticity, for understanding subordinate-driven biased behavior. Although he suggested a continued area of study that examines structural and situational factors, the research did not outline intrinsic motivators. More specifically, Blair’s work did not discuss the psychological drivers (e.g. ethnocultural empathy) of biased behavior in subordinate-leader dynamics.

**Empathy in Organizational Research**

Organizational research studies have shifted in the latter half of the 20th and early 21st centuries to understanding the nature of how work is done in preparation for what Klaus Schwab (2016) calls the Fourth Industrial Revolution (or 4IR). The 4IR outlines the disruption of industry as a result of artificial intelligence alongside rapid innovation. Schwab argues that the convergence of these events will affect the nature of business and collaboration within an even more technologically interconnected society. According to Pavlovich and Krahne’s 2012 study titled *Empathy, Connectedness and Organization*, Connectedness may be one of the defining attributes of the twenty-first century, with organizational research shifting from an emphasis on competition and reductionism to partnerships (e.g. Seitanidi and Crane 2009), networks (e.g.
Gulati 1998), high quality relationships (e.g. Dutton and Heaphy 2003; Quinn 2007), community (e.g. Waddock 2009) and stakeholder negotiation (e.g. Greenwood and Van Buren 2010). This movement indicates a paradigm shift from the individual to the collective…This shift to the collective has profound implications regarding how we relate to each other, how we respond to ethical challenges, and how our organizations need to function within this connectedness mandate. (p. 131)

Pavolovich and Kranke argue that they “consider connectedness as ‘a shared collective property’ [as defined by Kozlowski and Klein (2000)], and while it has its origins at the individual level, it is expressed collectively through mutual interdependence” (p. 135). This has significant implications in how workplace environments organize; empathy can act as an organizing mechanism to enhance connectedness through patterns that emerge from social relationships (Hosking & Fineman, 1990). Although empathy is noted as one of the key social skills necessary to enable 21st century organizations to thrive, the literature does not speak to how a lack of empathic response can impact organizations. Furthermore, the literature fails to acknowledge how, why, and when those who demonstrate implicit racial bias do not exhibit an empathic response.

Alongside the 4IR are the same workforce demographic shifts that will place racially diverse talents with the requisite academic and professional credentialing in a position to support future work being done; however, racial bias has already shown itself to limit the breadth of opportunity for these racially diverse individuals. This is indicated by the underrepresentation of people of color within leadership roles of organizations as well as in specific job categories. This lack of diversity is seen in a variety of job categories across corporate America (e.g. Information Technology, Science, Mathematics, etc.) (Reed, 2011). A major contribution of this study is in the
identification of cognitive-behavioral factors that are within the scope of individual agency and control, factors such as empathy, which may demonstrate having a relationship to implicit racial bias. A goal of this study is to provide further insight into the ways in which ethnocultural empathy drives organizational connectedness and, by extension, organizational success.

Although there are several studies that examine empathy amidst undefined intergroup relations (Batson et al., 1997; Stephan & Finlay, 1999, 2000; Dovidio et al., 2003), few studies define the interaction between empathy, race, and workplace settings (Lee & Allen, 2002). Those that do explore prosocial, ethical, and moral responsiveness but do little to define empathy as a specific driver of prosocial behavior across racial differences, except to note its absence when examining other race pain and the merits of psychotherapeutic interventions, otherwise known as clinical therapy (Avenanti, Sirigu, & Aglioti, 2010; Xu et al., 2009; Drwecki et al., 2011). Focusing predominantly in the healthcare sectors and patient care specifically, research has shown the neurological indicators (e.g. MRI results) of failed empathic response and other race pain (Avenanti, Sirigu, & Aglioti, 2010; Xu et al., 2009; Drwecki et al., 2011). This is relevant to this study because it demonstrates workplace interactions such as mentorship or team dynamics, that are impacted by empathic response. There is much more that can be explored in workplace dynamics across industries when specifically tied to empathic response and implicit racial bias. As noted earlier, there are the cultural ramifications of inclusive practice in leader capability, team dynamics, mentorship, employee engagement, and talent acquisition practices, to name just a few. As Castaneda & Batech
noted in 2013, “To meet current challenges, organizations must have effective communication and collaboration among the various segments to ensure that everyone has an adequate understanding and acceptance of the cultural beliefs of their coworkers” (p. 42). An effective means of measuring the components of ethnocultural empathy and its relationship to implicit racial bias can provide practitioners with evidence-based criterion for creating more impactful organizational practices.

**Conclusion**

The goal of this literature review was to articulate a theoretical underpinning to historical methodological approaches when trying to understand the independent and dependent variables of this study. These include bias, empathy, and workplace dynamics in race relations. First, an examination of bias literature grounded the study by giving insight into the nature of bias. By referencing specifically Greenwald and Banji’s definition of *implicit social cognition*, it is possible to clearly identify how cognitive associations form and, as such, are a universal human trait that can demonstrate in ways that are both positive and negative. Next, an introduction of Festinger’s Theory of Cognitive Dissonance articulated the motivational drivers of implicit racial bias. This was done to explain why the preponderance of a phenomena such as implicit racial bias in the workplace is claimed, when self-reported, to occur to other individuals as a result of other individuals and rarely directly by those who self-report the behavior. Festinger’s theory also takes into consideration the noted exception in several studies of bias; these studies describe a lack of self-reporting in those cases in which the uninjured party is non-white. Festinger argued that a clash or discrepancy is evoked because of cognitions about the
world and individuals being called into question. Demonstrating bias is considered by many to be a cognition that occurs outside of one’s self.

Next, an understanding of the effects of bias is an integral construct central to this study. Research has shown a rich history of identifying trauma associated with microaggressions as well as more overt demonstrations of racially biased behavior. Some findings have also articulated the ways in which bias affects leader-follower efficacy, employee engagement, productivity, and coping strategies such as covering\(^\text{19}\). When noting the variance of racially biased behavior, Carter et al.’s (2016) model for racism established key definitions for the experience of racial bias in relation to each of the three levels of system: organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal. These key definitions are: hostile racism-- “actions meant to communicate the target’s inferior status because of his or her membership in a nondominant racial-group (e.g., being stopped by the police because of your race)” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64), Aversive-Hostile Racism-- experiences “intended to create distance with strong hostile elements after a person of Color has gained entry into an organization or institution in which they were previously excluded having your abilities and professional skills questioned)” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64), and avoidant racism-- “distance between dominant and nondominant groups (e.g., being ignored by a sales person in a store or denied housing because of your race).” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64). Finally, with regard to empathy, the literature review outlined specific historical attempts at organizational interventions, such as anti-bias training, meant to

\(^{19}\) Kenji Yoshino in his 2006 book titled, *Covering: The Hidden Assault on Our Civil Rights*, introduced the concept as something everyone does to various degrees in the workplace to hide elements of their authentic selves in an effort to fit in with the dominant culture. Refer to Yoshino (2006) for additional information.
mitigate the negative effects of bias in the workplace. In many instances noted, psychosocial factors were *not* explored as a means of addressing the preponderance of failed attempts at intervention through training, mentorship, or structural changes. As such, the review of literature argued why empathy is worth consideration as a means of mitigating the negative effects of implicit racial bias in the workplace.

By taking a socio-psychological approach, the literature review highlighted empathy as a cognitive behavioral ability capable of human agency. This approach underpins a philosophy that in order to counter cognitive dissonance in implicit bias, it is possible to remain intrinsically motivated to demonstrate an empathic response. Neurological findings in ERP studies demonstrated the sustained ability to strengthen empathic response to other race pain via development. Although this was shown in a laboratory setting, the review of literature noted that this has not yet been explored in workplace environments pre-, post-, or during said racially biased events.

Having described the main bodies of literature that support a conceptual framework for this study, the following chapter will outline how the researcher used these theoretical underpinnings to create a rigorous methodological approach that explores the nature of the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias in the workplace. Furthermore, the methodology outlined in Chapter 3 will consider the perceived effects of ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias, independently, in the workplace.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Chapter 3 discusses this study’s research methodology. This study used a mixed methods approach that incorporated qualitative interviews and two quantitative instruments. The following chapter outlines the rationale for this study’s research approach, the research tradition, research methodology, and suitability of this study’s approach to addressing the research questions of the study. This chapter will then describe and provide justification for the research settings and participant selection criteria. I then outline ethical considerations pertaining to participant solicitation and maintaining confidentiality. Next, the data collection methods used in this study are described and justified. This is followed by a description of the quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods used. Finally, issues of trustworthiness, limitations, and mitigation of validity concerns are discussed. Potential weaknesses of the study as well as the conditions that constrain this study in relation to potential study outcomes.

Rationale for Research Approach

The previous chapters identified the nature of the relationship between empathy and implicit racial bias, two agency-driven psychological factors, as the driving purpose of this study. I was also interested in understanding the effects of ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias on individuals at organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal
levels. This study is designed to collect data to answer the following research questions:

**Research Question One:** What is the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias?

**Research Question Two:** How is implicit racial bias perceived to be experienced in the workplace at the organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal levels?

**Research Question Three:** How is ethnocultural empathy perceived to be experienced in the workplace?

Based on the conceptual framework outlined in the literature review, the hypothesis for the primary research questions of this study states:

**Hypothesis:** There is a negative correlation between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias for employees in the workplace according to responses in the Implicit Association Test and Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy. Ethnocultural empathy increases as implicit racial bias decreases.

Utilizing a methodological approach that collects data in several forms is a common collection approach for triangulating data (Maxwell, 2013). This was done for several key reasons. First, a technique that established anonymity enabled the researcher to compare quantitative instrument and qualitative results for consistent trends. The quantitative instruments were the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE) and the Implicit Association Test (IAT). These instruments were designed to reveal psychosocial processes that have proven difficult to examine behaviorally. As psychological constructs, both empathy and implicit social cognition in self-reported instruments are capable of rater bias. Fear of social backlash and several types of rater bias are typically demonstrated in these
phenomena. These rater biases include: leniency, severity, halo, horns, stereotyping, recency, similarity, negative event, and comparison (Types of Rater Bias, 2018). Each type of rater bias is defined in Table 1.

Table 1

Types of Rater Biases & Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Rater Bias</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leniency Rater Bias</strong></td>
<td>The evaluator tends to evaluate everyone positively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Severity Rater Bias</strong></td>
<td>The evaluator tends to avoid giving highly positive ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Halo Rater Bias</strong></td>
<td>The person being rated has one very positive attribute that causes the evaluator to rate other attributes more positively than deserved; the rating of that one attribute “spills over” to influence the other attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horns Rater Bias</td>
<td>The person being rated has one very negative attribute that causes the evaluator to rate other attributes more negatively than warranted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotyping Rater Bias</td>
<td>Because the person being rated is perceived to belong to a particular group (for example, female, Hispanic, accountant, a casual dresser, a smoker, a vegetarian, etc.), the evaluator assumes that the individual possesses all the stereotypic traits associated with that group and allows these assumptions to color the rating of the person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recency Rater Bias</td>
<td>The evaluator remembers best what has happened most recently and allows these recent recollections to unduly influence the ratings, rather than taking into account performance over the entire performance period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity Rater Bias</td>
<td>Because the person being rated shares some attribute with the evaluator (for example, both are UK fans, wear similar fashions, enjoy the same music, etc.), the evaluator rates the person more favorably.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Event Rater Bias</td>
<td>The evaluator allows a single negative event to influence the perception of the person’s performance, even long after the event has passed into history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Rater Bias</td>
<td>The evaluator rates the person based on comparisons with other employees, past or present, rather than basing the evaluation on how the person performed compared to the expectations set in the work plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First establishing a means of anonymous data collection in the quantitative portion of this mixed methods approach reduced confirmation bias for the researcher when identifying a heterogeneous sampling of participants for the qualitative data collection process.

A second purpose for using a mixed methods approach that includes qualitative
interviews was to obtain a broader range of understanding of the aspects that affect implicit racial bias and ethnocultural empathy in the workplace. The rationale for such an approach was noted by Greene (2007) as a means of expanding upon a phenomenon rather than simply reiterating established conclusions. Given the complexity of the motivational drivers involved in this study, the limitations in self-recognition of perception barriers, and the possibility of several forms of rater bias, it became necessary to take an emergent approach to qualitative interviews that was completed after both survey instruments were done. The interviews themselves utilized triangulation techniques that enabled the research to establish whether each quantitative instrument demonstrated face validity. In addition, I engaged several content experts to evaluate the efficacy of these instruments in demonstrating construct validity. They noted that, particularly with regard to the construct validity of the Implicit Association Test, the instruments are an excellent and effective means of assessing bias in those individuals who may not be aware of their implicit social cognitions. This, alongside additional findings noted later in this chapter, validated the use of the SEE and IAT instruments for the purposes of this study.

Qualitative interviews align with my interest in exploring the participants’ deep meaning, highly personalized, and detailed examples of both empathy and implicit racial bias in the workplace (Maxwell, 2013) as well as addressing a need for expanded understanding of the phenomena. This is important due to the limitations of any quantitative assessment, which, by design, are unable to expand upon a respondents’ implicit perceptions. Qualitative data elicited via an emergent interview protocol allowed
for the opportunity to delve further into a more expansive understanding of ethnocultural empathy in workplace settings.

The sequence of delivery of the quantitative instruments was an intentional consideration. Given that questions posed in the SEE incorporate terms and behavioral event incidents that may influence response times in the Implicit Association Test (IAT), it was necessary to consider Markov’s “first-order model,” which argues that “every event is only influenced by the immediately preceding event. This means that at a given point in time the next event would be influenced by the present event, but it does not matter what determined the present event.” (Ivanouw, 2007, p. 254). In order to avoid survey influence from one instrument to the next, it was determined that the IAT should be administered prior to the SEE. The sequencing of instruments was deliberate in light of studies that have found that

IAT measures are not influenced by wide variations in subjects’ familiarity with IAT stimuli (Dasgupta, McGhee, Greenwald, & Banaji, 2000; Ottaway, Hayden, & Oakes, 2001; Rudman et al., 1999), and IAT measures are relatively insensitive to procedural variations such as the number of trials, the number of exemplars per concept, and the time interval between trials (Greenwald et al., 1998; Nosek, Greenwald, & Banaji, 2005). (Greenwald et al., 2009, p. 18)

The decision was also made not to explain the full nature and extent of this study’s purpose when soliciting participants. This was done to avoid rater bias in both quantitative and qualitative responses.

**Measurement of Bias**

This study sought to address the role that implicit racial bias performs in daily interactions, particularly within the workplace where organizations face the task of fostering collaborative and engaging work environments in a highly competitive global
economy. Shifts in policies and practices remain limited in their ability to address how best to mitigate the negative effects of bias (McKay & Avery, 2005; Elvira & Town, 2002; Anand & Winters, 2008). Training programs and structural interventions in the workplace are struggling to assess their impact in ways other than quantitative data such as through recruitment metrics, employee engagement, and cultural surveys. There are concerns regarding the ability to measure the veracity of authentic relationships across differences when taking into consideration implicit associations (Conrey et al., 2005; GNAT, Nosek, & Banaji, 2001; Nosek et al., 2007). Researchers and practitioners alike have discussed the barriers to articulate shifting human interaction. One key concern that has been raised is how best to assess enhanced understanding if it is not reflected in observable behavioral change over time.

The Implicit Association Test (IAT)

The Implicit Association Test uses a sequential priming technique which is based on the paradigm that when an individual is presented with a variant, then presented with a task for interpreting the variant, there is a latent response. A variant (e.g. an image of a Caucasian face) is presented and the time to press a word (or non-word) (e.g. Good) key is recorded as the dependent variable (lexical decision task).

In the second variant, targets (now words only) have to be read as quickly as possible (naming or pronunciation task), and the latency of naming is the dependent variable. The essential experimental manipulation in both tasks is whether the prime is semantically related or unrelated to the target. The typical difference between mean reaction latencies for related and unrelated pairs is explained by the activation of prime meaning, which facilitates encoding of related targets compared with unrelated Guide to Sequential Priming 4 targets (Wentura & Degner, 2010).
The IAT is one of several instruments designed to assess implicit bias. Regarding the IAT, the researchers define the IAT as measuring “attitudinal processes for which their possessor[s] may have limited awareness and which, therefore, may not be well captured by self-report measures” (Greenwald et al., 2009, p. 18). This instrument is highlighted, in part, because of its noted sensitivity to measuring automatically associative processes, which in turn has led some to deem the IAT immune (or at least highly resistant) to respondent gaming or manipulation (Devine, Plant, Amodio, Harmon-Jones, & Vance, 2002; Greenwald et al., 2002; Conrey et al., 2005; Banse, Seise, & Zerbes, 2001).

However, researchers have found that “subjects who are explicitly instructed to slow their responding in one of the IAT’s two combined tasks, can use that instruction to produce faked scores. At the same time, most naive subjects do not spontaneously discover this strategy” (Cvencek, Greenwald, Brown, Gray, & Snowden, 2008; Kim, 2003; Steffens, 2004; but cf. Fiedler & Bluemke, 2005).

**Reliability and Validity of IAT**

For the purposes of this study, the IAT was critically assessed against the findings of Harvard’s Project Implicit team as well as an independent recent meta-analysis of 122 research reports (184 independent samples, 14,900 subjects). The meta-analysis demonstrated an “average $r = .274$ for prediction of behavioral, judgement and physiological measures” (Greenwald et al., 2009, p. 17). The same report indicated that “in the domains of Black-White interracial behavior and other intergroup behavior (and only in these two domains) … measures had greater predictive validity than did self-report measures” (Greenwald et al., 2009, p. 29). Scholars have attempted to determine
the validity of measuring attitude-behavior relations throughout the 1970s and 1980s.

There is significant interest in the use of IAT measures for applied behavioral studies in law, policy, and business (Ayres, 2001; Banaji & Bhaskar, 2000; Banaji & Dasgupta, 1998; Chugh, 2004). To date, the IAT has shown itself to be the predominant instrument of choice for scholars seeking to determine attitude-behavior correlations. Despite the IAT’s relatively high reliability, critiques have questioned,

That in addition to attitudes, [the IAT] may reflect other constructs such as cultural knowledge (See Karpinski & Hilton, 2001; Olson & Fazio, 2004), similarity between concepts (See De Houwer, Geldof, & De Bruycker, 2005), or salient differences between the two sets of items that are paired (See Rothermund & Wentura, 2004) (Cameron et al., 2012, p. 331)

There are additional critiques of the IAT and language distinctions that denote researcher bias. A recent meta-analysis done by Paluck and Green (2009) found that,

across 32 studies the IAT’s ability to predict discriminatory behavior varies widely and sometimes inexplicably (Greenwald et. al., 2009). Other measures of implicit prejudice, such as word fragment completion (e.g., “short” versus “smart” in the case of Asians; Son Hing et al. 2002), are not empirically linked to behavior. Most importantly, few studies have connected the reduction of implicit prejudice with a reduction in prejudiced behavior. (p. 350)

A wave of second-generation instruments was born in the early 2000s, nearly 20 years after the emergence and dominance of the IAT as a diagnostic tool. These new instruments either attempted to make targeted changes to the original IAT (e.g., Affect Misattribution Procedure, See Payne et al., 2005) or they sought to improve psychometric validity by establishing new category-based measures (e.g., the Go/No-Go Association Task, See GNAT; Nosek & Banaji, 2001). Several second-generation instruments are referred to as multinomial models (e.g., Quadruple Process Model, See Conrey et al.,
measure[s] the independent influences of four qualitatively different processes on implicit task performance by estimating a parameter value for each: automatic activation of an association with the stimulus (AC), the ability to detect an appropriate response (D), the success at overcoming automatically activated biased associations (OB), and the influence of any response bias that may guide overt responses when other guides to response are absent (G). The Activation parameter (AC) refers to the degree to which biased associations are automatically activated when responding to a stimulus. All else being equal, the stronger the associations, the more likely they are to be activated and to influence behavior. The Detection parameter (D) reflects a relatively controlled process that detects appropriate and inappropriate responses. Sometimes, the activated associations conflict with the detected correct response (Beer, Stallen, & Lombardo, 2008).

Instruments such as the Quadruple Process Model have not been widely tested in non-laboratory settings and have not demonstrated the validity and reliability of the original IAT, which is why they were not chosen for this study. In addition, given the lack of access to neurological assessment tools (e.g. MRI), the IAT was able to note and assess the phenomenon of implicit racial bias in the workplace contexts critically without the constraints of access to MRI equipment and having participants who would be willing to take part in such a physically involved study approach.

Despite critiques of the IAT, an instrument based on sequential priming, a recent meta-analysis of 167 published studies with a methodological approach of sequential priming was completed to evaluate the veracity of measuring associations with explicit behavior and attitude. The study found that,

Many controversies over the meaning and usefulness of implicit measures hinge on the question of whether implicit measures are valid predictors of behavior and preferences. A comprehensive examination of all available data suggests that priming tasks, as a class, are indeed valid measures” (Cameron et al. 2012, p. 343)
In addition, I reached out to 3 DEI practitioners and asked them to assess the face validity of the IAT and SEE. Each expressed that these instruments presented a sound data source for assessing implicit associations. Given the parameters of the study (i.e., participants in geographically dispersed locations, limited funding, non-laboratory settings, lack of testing of proposed algorithmic changes in U.S.-based studies), and having considered these most recent findings, I have identified the IAT as the most relevant instrument to assess implicit racial bias at this time. In this study, the IAT served as a diagnostic tool meant to establish a baseline state of implicit racial bias predisposition for participants.

**Measurement of Empathy**

ERP studies seeking to understand affective empathy signified a certain behavior. This effort was done either through self-reporting or physically observable response (e.g., vasoconstriction or pupil dilation, neurological responses, etc.); however, these efforts did not examine the intrinsic motivations, workplace situations, or structural factors of the respondent (Wiesz & Zaki, 2018; Cao et al., 2015; Sheng & Han, 2012; Decety & Cowell, 2014; Riecansky et al., 2014; Fabi & Luethold, 2018). Intrinsic motivations will be demonstrated in the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy’s weighted factor results. Workplace situations and structural factors were noted in the qualitative interview portion of the study. Based on the overarching research design, the study addressed these important aspects of empathic response to identify ways to mitigate the negative effects of bias in the workplace.

Throughout the early 20th century, a variety of self-reporting assessments tools surrounding empathy began to emerge. Several psychometric instruments struggled to
define clear pathways to valid measurement of empathetic response. These instruments were largely criticized due to inconsistencies in self-reporting (Kerr & Sperroff, 1953; Aderman & Berkowitz, 1970). "Because of present limitations in the realm of objective personality measurement, a place still remains for observer-evaluations as the initial standard against which ‘observer-less’ measures may be compared" (Block, 1961/1978). The only instrument in academic literature that has been found to examine cross-cultural empathic response in a self-reporting assessment is the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy, or SEE (Wang et al., 2003).

**Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE)**

The prospect of examining an empathetic reaction with measured cultural biases would later emerge with the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy, or SEE (Wang et al., 2003). In leading up to the SEE’s development, there were several blended (cognitive and affective) seminal studies that explored the relationships between empathy and context in an attempt to define valid and reliable psychometric tools of assessment (Block, 1961; Choplan et al., 1985; Hogan, 1969; Grief & Hogan, 1973; Johnson, Cheek, & Smither, 1983). Each researcher derived an instrument to study empathy with varying degrees of accuracy, yet there was no consensus built on the general definition of the term empathy, and no study directly focused on the presence of empathy in racial bias, be it implicit or explicit. A unique contextual attribute of the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (Wang, 2003) is its intentional examination of self-reported empathetic response across racial or ethnic differences.

The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy considers ethnocultural empathic response
along four distinct factors:

**Empathic Feeling and Expression (EFE):** EFE addresses concern via thoughts, feelings, words, or actions about expressed discriminatory or prejudiced attitudes or beliefs. In addition, this factor considers the emotional or physical response to the emotions or lived experiences of people from differing racial or ethnic groups from that of the participant.

**Empathic Perspective Taking (EPT):** EPT ascribes quantitative value to a participant’s effort to understand and relate to the experiences and emotions of people from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Key to this factor is the attempt to embody the perspective of others in viewing their environment and interactions.

**Acceptance of Cultural Differences (ACD):** ACD provides a quantitative value to acceptance of cultural difference as a distinct factor of empathy. ACD stipulates an understanding, acceptance, and ascribing value to the individual customs and cultural traditions of various racial and ethnic groups.

**Empathic Awareness (EA):** EA considers the knowledge that one’s lived experience may differ from those of people from differing racial or ethnic groups. There is a hyper focus on discriminatory or unequal treatment by or of diverse groups.

**Reliability & validity of SEE.** The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy has emerged as one of the few tools of any significant reliability and validity to measure empathy specifically within ethnic and cultural contexts. Its use has been explored in counseling
interventions (Ridley & Lingle, 1996; Chung & Bemak, 2002), yet inconsistencies remain in clearly defining what ethnocultural empathy is (Fuerte et al., 2000). This study presented an opportunity to revisit the effectiveness of existing tools, such as the SEE, in workplace contexts and among specific intrapersonal dynamics. In the case of those instruments used in this study, it is important to note that one study that examined the use of the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy suggested that,

Because the four components that emerged in the SEE do not map directly back to the theory of ethnocultural empathy from which it was developed, it is suggested that researchers return to the substantive stage of instrument development and revisit how ethnocultural empathy is defined” (Gerstner & Pastor, 2011)

In addition, limitations to the SEE as a quantitative instrument includes a static self-reporting structure that does not account for reflexive design to participant gaming. In addition, an emergent qualitative interview broadened the existing definition of ethnocultural empathy as it stands today. The expansion of current understanding of ethnocultural empathy will be explored in Chapters 4 and 5.

**Participants**

This section outlines the participant selection strategy, sample size, criteria for selecting participants, and participant recruitment approach.

**Participant Selection Strategy**

The participant selection strategy for this study was based on Patton’s concept of purposeful selection (2002). The intention was to identify those participants who would establish a loose structure of shared perspective. Participants represented a convenience
sampling population across multiple functional skillsets in an effort to understand the phenomena of implicit racial bias and ethnocultural empathy at all three levels of system. To limit participants to a specific role, title, or skillset would inhibit a deeper understanding of responses within an organization.

A diverse sample population allowed for an opportunity to gain insight into issues central to this study (Patton, 2002). The study’s unit of analysis identified participants based on two distinct criteria. These include:

- Participants must currently have or have had professional workplace experience.
- Participants must have had or are currently experiencing professional relationships (vertical or horizontal) that contain representatives of one or more ethnic or racial differences from the participant.

When selecting participants, it was initially desired not to preclude participation based on a participants’ professional performance; however, one limitation in the participant criteria was that workplace experience assumes a particular age demographic within the United States. This, in turn, would exclude potential participants who may provide interesting data on the phenomenon; however, for the purposes of this study, those individuals who were 18 years or older were deemed appropriate.

**Personal Characteristics**

The demographic characteristics of the individuals who participated in the study are listed in Table 2. Demographic characteristics were assessed according to gender, age, Hispanic descent, race, job tenure, job level and job function. A majority of the respondents were male (59.6%). In addition, a majority of the respondents were older than 34 years of age (50.9%). Of those surveyed, only 59% were white, 30% were black
and the remaining 15.2% identified either American Indian/Alaskan, Pacific Islander, or Asian. There were 15 persons who identified as being Hispanic. This represented 10% of respondents. The population’s job level was primarily individual contributor (53.8%), followed by manager with less than five years of management experience (25.2%), Sr. Mgr. with less than 5 years of senior management experience (15.4%), and Sr. Mgr. with 5 or more years of senior management experience (5.6%). Participants worked in a variety of industries. Lastly, respondents represented a wide variety of job functions.

The top three job functions were IT, Sales and Customer Support at 19.9%, 15.1% and 12.3% respectively. Finance (11.6%) and Marketing (10.3%) positions were held by a fair number of participants. HR and Admin Support employed equal number of respondents with 8 each or 5.5%. Legal only had one representative and Other was selected by 25 or 17%.

Table 2

Demographic Data of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Respondents n = 146</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00 – 24.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00 – 34.00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.00 – 44.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.00 – 54.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.00 – 64.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>10.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Indian/Alaskan Nat.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Contributor</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager less than 5 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Mgr. less than 5 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Mgr. more than 5 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Function</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Support</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Marketing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative interviewees represented a range of ages from 18 years old to 54 years
old. Figure 3 demonstrates the range of age of the interviewees.

Figure 4. Range of Age Distribution of Interviewees

Figure 3 shows that the majority (50%) of the 8 interviews were between 35 and 44 years old, 25% of interviewees were 45-54 years old, and 25% of interviewees were 18-34 years old. As such, these findings cannot infer any results regarding those 55 and older.

Interviewees represented 2 race categories: White and Other. 62% of interviewees considered themselves white. The other 38% interviewees would categorize themselves as Other. Since no interviews were completed by those who would self-identify as black, the researcher was unable to determine how those who would self-identify as Black perceive implicit racial bias or ethnocultural empathy in the workplace. Figure 4 shows the number of interviewees in each racial category.
Interviewees also represented a mix of genders. Of the 8 interviews completed, 39% of individuals self-identified as female. Of the 8 interview subjects, 61% of individuals self-identified as male. Figure 5 represents the gender breakdown of interviewees.
The range in job level of interviewees is another aspect of demographic breakdown that was done. Figure 6 shows that interviewees represented 3 distinct hierarchical levels within their organizations. These hierarchical job levels are: Individual Contributor (5), Manager- 5 years or less (1), and Senior Manager- 5 years or more. No executives were represented in this sample of interviewees.

![Job Level Distribution of Interviewees]

The range in job functions of interviewees was the final aspect of demographic breakdown that was done. Figure 7 shows that interviewees represented 5 different job functions within their organizations. The job functions represented are: Sales (3), Finance (1), Administrative Support (1), Customer Support (2), and other (1).
Data Collection Methods

The ability to access interviewees for a visually recorded sixty-minute follow-up interview required sourcing participants who were open to providing direct contact information. As such, during the quantitative data collection process, participants were invited to provide an email address to schedule a 1-hour qualitative interview. This did affect the number of participants willing to schedule and hold the interview. As a result, this study included 8 qualitative interviews. The recorded qualitative interviews took place approximately one month after participants had completed the quantitative portion of the study. Interviews were conducted over a series of six weeks. Given that technological access is required in both the quantitative and qualitative portions of this mixed-methods approach, these requirements did limit potential participants to those individuals who have computer access with keyboards. Technological constraints also required any identified workplace organizations whose employees took part in the
proposed study to provide direct contact information. Participants from the global construction organization who were solicited via their supervisor, were given the option to share any email address (work or private) that they felt comfortable sharing with a third party. It was also explicitly reiterated prior to both the qualitative interview and survey participation, with written and verbal consent, that at no time would individual responses be shared with the respondent’s workplace or additional third party.

Participants who were solicited via Amazon’s MTurk platform were asked to proceed with the survey in order to receive their financial payment. These participants were also asked to provide a valid email address. After both quantitative surveys were completed, participants were then sent an invitation via a Doodle poll to provide their availability for a 1-hour interview. A reminder email was sent out 3 days before the survey was due to close. Those who ultimately responded, were then sent a calendar invite via Outlook with Zoom login information for a virtual video conference with an option to dial in. Of the 13 participants who confirmed an interview, 8 ultimately attended the scheduled interview. Of those 8, 1 participant opted to conduct the interview via dial-in. In the following sections, I describe specific steps related to the measurement of each independent variable as well as a description of the interview process that was followed.

**Interview Format Rationale**

Bearing in mind the design of the interview format as well as various aspects of motivational drivers of biased thoughts, this study integrated the work of Batson and

---

20Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) is a crowdsourcing marketplace that makes it easier for individuals and businesses to outsource their processes and jobs to a distributed workforce who can perform these tasks virtually. See [www.mturk.com](http://www.mturk.com) for additional information.
Shaw (1991) and Batson et al. (1997) in the empathy-altruism hypothesis. Interview questions attempted to understand the “degree of attachment in terms of the closeness of the relationship between two individuals” (Cialdini, Brown, Lewis, Luce, & Neuberg, 1997, p. 483). According to the Batson model, “feelings of attachment stem from such factors as kinship, friendship, and familiarity. Consequently, participants in [our] study focused on an individual who was a near stranger, an acquaintance, a good friend, or a family member.” (Cialdini, Brown, Lewis, Luce, & Neuberg, 1997, p. 483). As the interview protocol follows a semi-structured qualitative approach, questions evaluating Batson and Shaw’s “feelings of attachment” (e.g., perceived relationship strength and weakness) in self-selected (personal) and forced (workplace setting) interracial interactions were incorporated. Given the intersectionality of role vs. identity, I posit that a mechanism for examining how the variables of empathy and bias uniquely interact in the workplace required consideration of how they interact in private interactions as well. Creswell (2014) argues that this approach is a key strength of an exploratory sequential mixed methods design (p. 224). As such, questions were posed regarding personal as well as workplace interactions.

Demographics questions identified key structured hierarchical components of workplace intrapersonal dynamics, which allowed for emergent themes surrounding ethnocultural empathy and bias in workplace environments. Questions concerning structural hierarchical factors included interactions at the interpersonal level of system: peer-to-peer, leader-follower, or employee-customer. The study assessed demographics according to age range, race, gender, job level, and job function. Specific findings based
on these demographic breakdowns will be explored further in Chapter 4.

Because research has shown that past behavior is a solid predictor of future behavior, the study utilized critical incident interview questions that introduced targeted language. This was done to avoid speculating on what the interviewee might be feeling should a set of events occur, but rather rating what they were or are currently feeling after having spent time focused on the need situation (Oullette & Wood, 1998). Qualitative interview questions and their rationales can be found in Appendix A.

**Interview Format**

The semi-structured interviews among a heterogeneous participant pool allowed for findings that could be replicated outside of the initially sampled population. The interview protocol also incorporated questions evaluating the comprehensive nature of the SEE by asking for participants’ definition of empathy toward other races in a workplace context. Additional observations made by participants allowed for an expanded understanding about what should or should not be included when thinking through empathy as a behavioral and psychological construct in workplace settings. This also presented an opportunity to evaluate divergence in both self-reported findings while also identifying key themes for further analysis.

Qualitative interviews lasted approximately 60 minutes and were conducted via Zoom virtual platform, except for one interview which was done solely via phone. A visual recording of the interview allowed for demonstration of observed behavioral responses that provided another data point in assessing participant response. For the purposes of interview format, visual recordings allowed for comparison against
transcribed verbal interview data. A visual dataset established a medium for identifying interviewee comfort levels with the topic, veracity or truth-telling to critical incidents interview questions posed. A visual recording also provided an approach to assessing participant reactions to engaging in uncomfortable dialogue across differences with a researcher who may or may not share their racial/ethnic or gendered backgrounds. As no proxy interviewer was utilized for this study, those visual recordings that were collected provided a necessary reflexive interview protocol by viewing the data through the researcher as instrument lens—a lens that recognizes unique researcher characteristics that are believed to have the potential to influence the collection and analysis of empirical data (Pezalla, Pettigrew, and Miller-Day, 2012).

With respect to a reflexive protocol that demonstrates researcher as instrument, race-of-interviewer has been explored in several survey interviews conducted from 1942 until present day (Hatchett & Schuman, 1975; Hymen et al., 1954; Schuman & Converse, 1971). In one particular study conducted across a randomized sample of 160 participants, evidence showed that “both interviewer’s race and mode of interview are statistically significant (p < .05): African Americans were more likely to deny discrimination when talking to white interviewers—in both live and virtual conditions—than to African American interviewers.” (Krysan & Couper, 2003, p. 372). In considering the rationale for the qualitative interview design, particularly with a socially sensitive topic such as bias, Anderson et al. (1988) suggested that researchers “need to be more alert to how the racial composition of the interviewer staff can affect response variation, both on race-related items and on other items.” (p. 320). Any of the data interpretations and analyses of this
study took into consideration the undercurrent of these dynamics, particularly in light of my being an African-American female. As such, the lack of a proxy interviewer may be deemed a limitation of the data collection method.

Ideally, the study would have utilized proxy interviewers so that the interviewer’s race and ethnicity would match that of the interviewee. The proxy’s presence when conducting other race interviews may have influenced the interviewee, and considerations of psychological safety for participants during the interview process was an ethical concern. As the primary researcher, I would have become an observer of the qualitative interview either in the room or through observation of a visual recording. There were concerns in finding enough qualified appropriate proxies along with defining the relevant visual identifiers: race and/or gender for proxy selection. Given the limited time allotment, proxy interviewers were not used. In future studies, visual recording within an exploratory approach may raise themes of intersectionality and positioning social identity; however, no clear assumptions can be made about the influence of the interviewer impacting responses. Therefore, comparison of qualitative data and quantitative data will serve as a triangulation technique at this time. Additional information regarding data analysis will be explored in the following section.

Data Analysis

The primary goal of data analysis was to address this study’s research questions. This section outlines the approaches used to analyze quantitative and qualitative data
elements. I begin by describing the strategies utilized to assess the quantitative data. I then describe how qualitative data expanded upon quantitative results. This is followed by a review of how a triangulation of data will support findings and conclusions. As a visual reference, please refer to the figure below.

Figure 4. Data Analysis Framework

Quantitative Data Analysis

All statistical analysis was done in SPSS analysis software. Chapter four will outline the results of the factor analysis conducted. A series of statistical analyses of each instrument’s results (e.g. IAT and SEE) was done, both individually as well as in relation to one another. Statistical analyses included correlation regression tests in order to answer research question one, kurtosis and skewness analyses were also run. To begin, the reliability of the SEE is presented by reviewing the Cronbach Alphas of each identified variable of the SEE.
A factor analysis was done of each of the original 4 factors indicated by the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy. These original factors are Empathic Feeling and Expression, Appreciating Cultural Difference, Empathic Awareness, and Empathic Perspective-taking. The researcher ran a factor analysis with a varimax roundtable which identified that the seven questions for empathetic perspective taking had two distinct and separate themes. As a result, 2 new factors were identified with each having Eigenvalues over 1.0. The SEE-items included under each of the 2 new factors, Negative Social Racial Empathy and Racial Interpersonal Empathy are listed below in Table 3.

Table 3

SEE-items related to Negative Social Racial Empathy and Racial Interpersonal Empathy

**Negative Social Racial Empathy**

31. It is difficult for me to relate to stories in which people talk about racial or ethnic discrimination they experience in their day-to-day lives.

24. It is difficult for me to put myself in the shoes of someone who is racially and/or ethnically different from me.

29. I feel uncomfortable when I am around a significant number of people who are racially/ethnically different than me.
2. I don’t know a lot of information about important social and political events of racial and ethnic groups other than my own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Interpersonal Empathy</th>
<th>4. I know what it feels like to be the only person of a certain race or ethnicity in a group of people.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. I can relate to the frustration that some people feel about having fewer opportunities due to their racial or ethnic backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. It is easy for me to understand what it would feel like to be a person of another racial or ethnic background other than my own.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data analysis, the SEE-items established 2 new factors. After completing a series of dialogic engagements with various thought partners throughout the course of data analysis, I have defined these new factors as Negative Social Racial Empathy and Racial Interpersonal Empathy. The thought partners with whom I engaged included dissertation advisors and peers. These individuals were able to provide, “collaborative, dialogue-based processes that pushed me “to think about various aspects of the research process (and products)” (Ravitch & Carl, 2016, p. 534) by engaging in a “collaborative,
dialogue-based process” (Ravitch & Carl, p. 534). Ultimately, Negative Social Racial Empathy (NSRE) is defined as a difficulty in demonstrating an affective and cognitive response that includes sharing the emotional experience, thinking about, and understanding the mental state of another who’s racial or ethnic identity differs from one’s own. Racial Interpersonal Empathy (RIE) is defined as the ability to sense and respond to social pain or experience of another who’s race or ethnicity differs from one’s own. Given their relevance to ethnocultural empathy, NSRE and RIE were considered as distinct factors throughout the rest of the data analyses. The subsequent quantitative results were then utilized to refine an approach for thematic analysis in the qualitative interview follow-up.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

Each of the 8 interviews was first transcribed, then coded for specific themes (See Appendix C for a qualitative code chart with definitions). Identified thematic codes were compared against the IAT scores of the respondents. These scores ranged from .03 to 1.23, which indicates a slight to a strong implicit preference for Caucasians over blacks based on the speed of response to Black People + Good/ White People + Bad versus Black People + Bad/ White People + Good.

As such, based on the analytic results from the quantitative dataset, qualitative questions did evolve to expand upon the definitions of Negative Social Racial Empathy and Racial Interpersonal Empathy. This was done by exploring those instances where respondents observed and/or experienced race negatively in the workplace. As
quantitative analysis was completed prior to qualitative interviews, data collection was spaced out over approximately 2 months, which, given time constraints as a full-time employee and full-time doctoral candidate, was a necessary consideration. Data interpretation did require the merging of both quantitative and qualitative datasets by considering key themes across distinct demographics and their respective quantitative results in both the SEE and IAT. For example, a respondent’s IAT (e.g. a score indicating a moderate preference for white faces over black faces) was compared to that same respondent’s SEE scores according to the new identified factors that demonstrated a relationship with biased response (e.g. Negative Social Racial Empathy and Racial Interpersonal Empathy). The qualitative results helped to expand upon the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and organizational aspects of the quantitative results.

Given that one of the goals of this study was to remain reflexive in my subjectivities and finds, I completed several steps when approaching thematic analysis. In the following section, I identify the steps of data analysis and interpretation that provided a means of establishing validity. These steps are summarized below.

**Step One:** As interviews were ongoing, I analyzed results and created reflexive memos. Direct quotes from these reflexive memos are referred to in Chapter 4 as field notes and utilization of researcher as instrument.

**Step Two:** Despite a preponderance of data that may prove relevant to future studies, I focused on those aspects of the data relevant to this study. This was done through a process known as “winnowing” (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey,
An example of winnowing would be the use of Carter et al.’s (2012) racism behavior framework. Although Carter’s framework does consider the traumatic effects of bias in the context of system at all three levels, it cannot be assumed that Carter’s model will encompass all of the themes that emerged in my thematic coding. As such, while additional themes may be noted, winnowing will include an deductive analysis of findings through Carter’s model while noting the expansive list of themes that emerged. This was done in order to aggregate data into a manageable number of themes given time and resource constraints.

**Step Three:** In iterative steps, each transcription was first hand-coded for efficiency and to ensure timely completion of the study in consideration of my proposed timelines. Next, Windows Excel was used independently to allow me to compare coding results. Next, I created a coding chart (See Appendix C) and was able to assess qualitative results according to these emergent themes: *Avoidant Racism, Hostile Racism, Aversive-Hostile Racism, Privilege, cognitive dissonance, trauma, covering, each of the 5 identified ethnocultural empathic factors, and finally, those instances of bias in the workplace were assessed according to their levels of system (e.g. interpersonal, intrapersonal, and organizational).*

**Step Four:** Once a coding chart was created by the researcher, this chart along with 3 transcribed interviews were shared with two other scholars in the PennCLO program. These individuals coded their respective transcriptions and their results were compared again my own. Over 80% of their codes aligned with
each other and with my own thematic coding results, which was deemed valid
even enough to use in this study’s qualitative analysis approach.

**Step Five:** The resulting coding chart was then distributed among members of my
dissertation committee. Their input and reflexive discussions were recorded in
this study’s journal via reflexive memos. As a result of this process, theme
definitions were further refined.

Qualitative analysis steps also included process-oriented approaches. These process-
oriented approaches are outlined in the following steps.

**Step One:** I collected and transcribed all data via a third party transcriber. These
transcriptions were sorted and arranged according to the date of the interview and
a random ID generated during the quantitative data collection by the Qualtrics
software platform. In consideration of final reports to be shared with the initially
identified participating organization (e.g., a multi-national manufacturing
company), no transcribed responses were shared directly and all data was referred
to only via coded identifiers.

**Step Two:** I reviewed all data to gain “a general sense of the information and
[provide] an opportunity to reflect on [the] overall meaning” (Creswell, 2014, p.
197). During this time, I began to note general ideas, tones of ideas, impressions
of overall depth, credibility, and use of the information. Notes taken in a study
journal captured both observational field notes and transcription notes. The study
journal included sketches and visual representations of ideas. I also noted
observations of visual vs. verbal discrepancies (e.g. long pauses or filler language
such as ‘umm’) that might indicate implicit associations or discomfort.

**Step Three:** I began by choosing one interview and identified consistent criteria for interpreting coding themes. Alongside the coding chart, this included an inductive analysis of my fieldnotes and the transcriptions. This analysis included self-reflective questions such as: What is the overall statement being made? What structural components of organization are referred to here? I then considered answers to major questions that are relevant to my research interests and began finding connections across interviews.

**Step Four:** After completion of my first and final coded interviews, I discussed and reviewed my coded interviews with several committee members. These individuals noted their agreement and disagreements with my quantitative and qualitative findings. I then returned to my statistics coach to review their analysis of my quantitative results and whether my qualitative results were divergent or explanatory of my overall findings. After each discussion, I continued to complete reflexive memos and add them to my study journal.

**Issues of Trustworthiness**

Due to the exploratory nature of this study, additional steps were required to mitigate the risk of validity concerns. Three types of threats are relevant to my study: construct validity, response bias, and researcher bias. My awareness of these threats allowed me to incorporate methods to limit their risks.

Regarding construct validity, the concept of implicit social cognition is built on the idea that it can be inaccurately perceived or incorrectly identified by those self-
reporting their behaviors or cognitions. As such, the use of an instrument such as the IAT should mitigate what Greenwald describes as the “investigations of attitudes that involve indirect attitude measures [which] should continue to result in strong effects of attitudes…they [investigations of attitudes] offer the promise of overcoming the construct validity problems” (1990, p. 259). In addition, there was a need to identify the self-reported perception of cognitive associations (known and unknown), prejudiced judgements, and social behaviors in the workplace. This was done by sequencing an indirect attitude measure, such as the IAT, before a behavioral event interview questions in the form of an emergent qualitative interview.

Given the validity concern surrounding response bias, it was important to recognize that “studies showing that the social context of the interview—for example, whether the respondent has privacy (Krysan, 1998), or whether the interviewer is of the same race as the respondent or a different race (e.g., Anderson et al. 1988b; Davis 1997a) can have an effect on rater response” (Krysan & Couper, 2003, p. 365). It was vital to maintain anonymity of participants. Participants were organized by coded identifiers as soon as they indicated their participation in the study after clicking on the link inviting them to take part in the study. However, in order to complete the qualitative interview, respondents were still asked to provide a valid email address for post-survey communication and scheduling of the interview. Email addresses were housed in the raw data report of the SEE findings. The only other information on the report was the coded identifier. Interviews were scheduled via the online scheduling platform, Doodle. All respondents were anonymous. A solicitation email for interview scheduling was sent out
after quantitative data was collected. An example of the solicitation email can be found in Appendix D. Once interviews had been conducted, the participant’s email information was removed from all research documentation. The one organization that invited their employees and volunteers to take part in the study shared an initial invitation email only. The participating organization was never made aware of who ultimately took part in the study. No additional identifying information was shared with the employer throughout the duration of the study. Any findings generated at the end of the study and shared with the participating organization will not disclose unique identifiers.

When considering response bias to a socially sensitive topic, it was necessary to evaluate word associations to bias and diversity. The quantitative test forms and all referring communications with potential participants were labeled as an empathy research study, including the title of the zoom meeting once scheduling had been confirmed. This approach was intended to ensure that the participants were unaware that the entire study, specifically the IAT and SEE, was used as a means of measuring bias and to minimize any sensitivity to the general issues of diversity or bias.

Finally, with regard to researcher bias, I engaged in peer debriefings. During peer debriefings, I connected with three impartial PennCLO colleagues throughout my reflexive journaling process. I also scheduled standing appointments with members of my dissertation committee to regularly consider aspects of the data. This was done via virtual and in-person sessions held every three weeks with the PennCLO peers and on a weekly to monthly basis with dissertation committee members. Additional debriefing occurred on an as-needed basis throughout the duration of the research.
Conclusion

In summary, the purpose of Chapter 3 was to relay the methods used to examine this study’s topic of interest and subsequent research questions. This chapter defines how the main goal of this study — obtaining a broader range of understanding of the relationship between implicit racial bias and ethnocultural empathy in the workplace— was addressed by evaluation of both quantitative and qualitative data. The rational for such as a mixed methods study which incorporates the SEE and IAT is a necessary component of expanding current understanding of an implicit cognitive process. The broad participant criteria allowed for an examination of the relationship between implicit racial bias in context from various perspectives of the phenomenon. The social repercussions of exploring these topics required a consistent effort to maintain confidentiality. The same fear of social backlash was a consideration in using a video recording of qualitative interviews, reflexive memos, field notes, and iterative evaluation of thematic analysis. Issues of trustworthiness were addresses through the inductive approach to qualitative interviews as well as regular reflexive discussions with scholars and practitioners throughout the design of this study’s methodology. In critically assessing the methods used for this study, the potential weaknesses, and parameters that the researcher intentionally imposed to structure the study were examined. In Chapter 4, the main findings of this study are organized and reported on in detail. The next chapter will present relevant statistical and narrative data in depth. Finally, in Chapter 5, I discuss my interpretations as a researcher as well as potential implications for future research and practice.
Chapter 4

FINDINGS

In Chapter 3, I described the research methodology that guided my completion of the study. Chapter 4 discusses this study’s quantitative and qualitative results. Specifically, this chapter includes a reporting of the following results as broken down according to each of the study’s research questions: 1) quantitative data analysis of the SEE and IAT, and 2) inductive thematic analysis of qualitative data.

Chapter 4 does not refer to detailed interpretation of the data. The data is only aggregated and reported upon in consideration of the quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. Chapter 5 will include further analysis of these data in order to draw findings from this study. These findings include my personal interpretations of patterns, themes, ambiguities, and inconsistencies. Chapter 5 will also include my views regarding the findings’ implication for future research and practice.

Quantitative Analysis Approach

As described in Chapter 3, the results of the IAT and SEE were analyzed using the following steps:

Step 1: The reliability of the SEE was assessed by calculating the Cronbach Alphas of each of the 5 identified variables of the SEE (i.e. Appreciating Cultural Differences, Empathic Awareness, Empathic Feeling & Expression, Negative Social
Racial Empathy, and Racial Interpersonal Empathy).

**Step 2:** The statistical analysis of data then included a factor analysis.

**Step 3:** Next, this study’s statistical analysis included testing for skewness and kurtosis values.

**Step 4:** To conclude the quantitative analysis portion of this study, there were a series of correlation analyses run for each quantitative instrument’s results (e.g., SEE and IAT) in relation to one another. This was done to provide an answer to this study’s first research question: What is the nature of the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias?

**Qualitative Analysis Approach**

The qualitative analysis was done by inductive content analysis of key themes from the transcripts of 8, 60-minute virtual interviews. Themes emerged from the raw data and were refined in 3 phases: identification, definition, and refinement of definition. I utilized 4 interpretive lenses for identifying key themes in transcripts. These were *language, researcher as instrument, Carter et. al’s definitions of racism at various levels of system* (2016, p. 64), and *Wang et. al’s factors of Ethnocultural Empathy* (2003).

*Language* refers to distinctive articulation and/or added meaning from participants themselves. *Researcher as instrument* refers to a lens that recognizes unique researcher characteristics that are believed to have the potential to influence the collection and analysis of empirical data (Pezalla, Pettigrew, and Miller-Day, 2012). Once key themes were identified and defined by the researcher, a coding chart was created and distributed.
to other parties in order to refine definitions. These parties included 2 scholars in the PennCLO program as well as 2 individuals from the dissertation committee members.

The 2 PennCLO peer scholars proceeded to independently code 3 transcribed interviews a piece. Their results matched my own coding findings at a rate exceeding 80 percent. The coding chart, sample transcriptions and field notes were also presented to dissertation committee members for reflexive discussion of the veracity of the codes. After each interaction with my dissertation committee, reflexive memos were written into a Study Journal in order to capture the evolution of thought while completing qualitative analysis.

Next, the results of both qualitative interviews and quantitative data are presented via thick description, verbatim quotes, tables and figures. Findings are presented according to each of the major research questions of this study. Last, a summary of this study’s findings and results will offer some insight into the study’s data analysis and synthesis to be covered in more detail in Chapter 5.

Questions One: What is the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias?

Hypothesis One: There is a negative correlation between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias for employees in the workplace according to responses in the Implicit Association Test and Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy. Ethnocultural Empathy increases as implicit racial bias decreases.

The relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias was assessed by evaluating the reliability of the compound variables that were identified in the SEE (Table 6). This was done by calculating the Cronbach Alphas of each identified
element of the SEE. All of the variables met or exceeded the .70 threshold and are deemed reliable, with the exception of empathetic perspective taking which has an alpha of .63. After breaking out Empathic Perspective-taking into the newly identified factors, Negative Social Racial Empathy and Racial Interpersonal Empathy, each of the Ethnocultural Empathy factors were deemed reliable. See Table 4 for each Ethnocultural Empathy Factors’ Cronbach Alpha Score.

Table 4

*Table 4

Cronbach Alpha Scores of Each Ethnocultural Empathy Factor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnocultural Empathy Factors</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Feeling and Expression</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciating cultural differences</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Awareness</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social Racial Empathy</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Interpersonal Empathy</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These high Cronbach’s alpha scores provide evidence that each of the items that make up each variable of ethnocultural empathy are, in fact, closely related as a group. Considered as a measure of reliability (or consistency), these scores meet the threshold to indicate there are 5 distinct empathy factors that the SEE is measuring.

A linear regression was run to see if the IAT score could be predicted using Factor 1 - Negative Social Racial Empathy and Factor 2 - Racial Interpersonal Empathy. The regression was significant. After the 2 new factors were identified as having Eigenvalues over 1.0, the ranking of each factor’s SEE-item are listed below in Table 7.
The first four variables were combined into Factor 1 - Racial Interpersonal Empathy. The remaining three were combined into Factor 2 - Negative Social Racial Empathy.

Table 5

*Factor Analysis of Factor 1-Negative Social Racial Empathy and Factor 2- Racial Interpersonal Empathy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It is difficult for me to put myself in the shoes of someone who is racially and/or ethnically different from me.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is difficult for me to relate to stories in which people talk about racial or ethnic discrimination they experience in their day-to-day lives.</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel uncomfortable when I am around a significant number of people who are racially/ethnically different than me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I don’t know a lot of information about important social and political events of racial and ethnic groups other than my own.

I know what it feels like to be the only person of a certain race or ethnicity in a group of people.

I can relate to the frustration that some people feel about having fewer opportunities due to their racial or ethnic backgrounds.

It is easy for me to understand what it would feel like to be a person of another racial or ethnic background other than my own.
These results demonstrate the relationship between one dependent variable (i.e. an Implicit Association Test score) and two independent variables (i.e. Negative Social Racial Empathy Racial Interpersonal Empathy). These findings indicate that there is a positive relationship between Negative Social Racial Empathy and Implicit Racial Bias. Essentially, as Negative Social Racial Empathy increases, so too does the strength of the association that European Americans are better than African Americans. In the instance of Racial Interpersonal Empathy’s relationship to Implicit Racial Bias, as Racial Interpersonal Empathy increases, Implicit Racial Bias decreases. This means that as Racial Interpersonal Empathy increases, the strength of the association that European Americans are better than African Americans goes down.

Table 6 is a summary of the mean scores for both the IAT assessment and each ethnocultural empathy variable. The mean IAT score across all variables is a 0.43 which indicates that, on average, respondents have a moderate preference for European Americans over African Americans. Overall respondents’ mean scores regarding empathic awareness, empathic feeling and expression, Negative Social Racial Empathy, Racial Interpersonal Empathy, and appreciating cultural differences are below. As Table 6 shows, the mean scores fell between strongly agree/agree (4.62) and disagree/neutral (2.71). This indicates that, on average, respondents demonstrated a moderate preference for European Americans over African Americans despite their score on each of the ethnocultural empathic variables. Respondents reported a higher level of empathic
awareness (4.62) and empathic feeling and expression (4.04) but were neutral when it came to Negative Social Racial Empathy (3.50) and Racial Interpersonal Empathy (3.42).

The data indicates that despite relatively higher levels of empathic awareness and empathic feeling and expression, this did not affect a respondent’s implicit racial bias. The neutral Negative Social Racial Empathy and affective response mean scores indicate that respondents did continue to demonstrate a moderate preference for European Americans over African Americans. Participants reported lower levels of cultural differences at 2.71, which shows that despite a low score in this particular ethnocultural empathy factor, moderate implicit racial bias still exists. The standard deviation (SD) were close to or under 1.0 for four of the variables indicating a smaller amount of spread in responses. The standard deviation for cultural differences was 1.32 showing there was a bit more variability in scores.

Table 6

*Overall IAT Score and Means and Standard Deviations for Key Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAT</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Feeling and Expression</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social Racial Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data indicated that each of the ethnocultural empathy factors were represented in respondents. This was despite a moderate level of implicit racial bias. As such, it was necessary to determine the strength of the relationship between each ethnocultural empathy factor and implicit racial bias. A Pearson Correlation analysis was conducted between the IAT score and the five variables that make up empathy. Table 7 shows that a significant relationship exists between 2 factors of ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias. It was demonstrated that there is a relationship at a \( p < .01 \) level of significance between IAT and appreciating cultural differences (.212). A significant positive relationship between appreciating cultural difference and implicit racial bias indicates that as Appreciating Cultural Difference increases, implicit racial bias increases. The correlation analysis also demonstrated a significant relationship (.138) at a \( p < .05 \) for IAT (i.e. implicit racial bias) and Racial Interpersonal Empathy. This significant positive relationship indicates that as Racial Interpersonal Empathy increases, so does implicit racial bias. These results show that the higher an individual scored on the IAT survey (i.e. the strength of implicit racial bias), the higher the levels of Racial Interpersonal Empathy and Appreciating Cultural Differences. There was no relationship identified for the other ethnocultural factors: Empathic Feeling and Expression, Negative
Table 7

*Pearson Correlation of the Relationship Between the IAT Score and Empathy Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empathy Variable</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciating cultural differences</td>
<td>.212**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Interpersonal Empathy</td>
<td>.138*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social Racial Empathy</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Feeling and Expression</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Awareness</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 146

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

A linear regression was run to see if the IAT score could be predicted using the Racial Interpersonal Empathy and appreciating cultural differences. The regression was significant with an R-squared of .03 which indicates there is predictive value associated
with these two variables. Racial Interpersonal Empathy and Appreciating Cultural Difference scores can be used to predict Implicit Racial Bias.

Table 8 provides the pearson correlation between each of the Ethnocultural Empathic variables. These intercorrelation results indicate that there is no significant relationship between any of the five ethnocultural empathic variables. This demonstrates that each factor uniquely measures an aspect of ethnocultural empathy.

Table 8

*Pearson Correlation between Ethnocultural Empathic Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emphatic Feeling ad Expression</th>
<th>Racial Interpersonal Empathy</th>
<th>Negative Social Racial Empathy</th>
<th>Appreciating Cultural Difference</th>
<th>Empathic Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial Interpersonal Emaphy</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social Racial Empathy</td>
<td>.353**</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciating Cultural Empathy</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.548**</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Awareness</td>
<td>.609**</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.195**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the original Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy included four factors; however, this study’s five factor solution makes the best argument for this sample. There is more clarity in identifying relationships by evaluating ethnocultural empathy according to five distinct factors.
**Demographic Analysis: Race**

Each IAT score was also broken down according to demographic categories of respondents. Table 11 has mean IAT scores broken out by race. The IAT scores indicated that both black and white respondents have a moderate preference for European Americans over African Americans while other only has a slight preference. Other and white scored higher than blacks in terms of empathic feeling and expression with 4.23, 4.07, and 3.93 respectively. Scores for Negative Social Racial Empathy showed means scores in the neutral range with white (3.45) and other (3.42) showing almost identical ratings and black respondents having a mean score of 3.61. Black respondents had a mean score of 3.73 with white respondents having a lower score of 3.23. appreciating cultural differences had white (2.56) and other (2.65) in the disagree range with black reporting a mean of 3.04. All races scored high for empathic awareness ranging from black at 4.48, to white at 4.67, and other being the highest at 4.98. All standard deviation scores were a 1.0 or under for white and black with the exception of Appreciating Cultural Differences which ranged from 1.28 to 1.31. The Other standard deviation scores ranged from .95 for empathic feeling and expression to a 1.48 for appreciating cultural differences which indicates a bit of variability in responses. Overall whites demonstrated a higher level of implicit racial bias even as white respondents demonstrated moderate Empathic Awareness and Negative Social Racial Empathy scores than their black or other counterparts. This data also shows that there exists a moderate implicit racial bias among blacks, compared to their white and other counterparts, despite blacks having higher empathic awareness scores (4.48), affective empathic awareness
response scores (3.73), Negative Social Racial Empathy (3.61), and appreciating cultural difference (3.04).

Table 9

*Total IAT and Mean Empathy Scores by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAT Score</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Awareness</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Feeling and Expression</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Interpersonal Empathy</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social Racial Empathy</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciating cultural differences</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means scores for empathy and IAT scores broken out by race suggest that there may be significant differences amongst specific groups. Therefore, a one-way
analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test for mean differences across the groups. Table 9 shows that Racial Interpersonal Empathy was the only empathy variable that had a significant difference between groups.

Table 10

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Racial Interpersonal Empathy and IAT Scores Compared by Race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.471</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.735</td>
<td>3.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>155.572</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 163.043 142

These results show that the higher an individual scored on the IAT survey, the higher the levels of Racial Interpersonal Empathy. Because RIE was shown earlier to have a significant positive relationship with implicit racial bias (i.e. as RIE increases, so does implicit racial bias) it is important to note that RIE is the only ethnocultural empathic factor that varies across race. The discussion of this finding as being inconsistent across racial demographics will be expanded upon in Chapter 5.

A post-hoc Tukey test was conducted to determine between which groups the significant differences occurred. Table 10 shows that the means scores of black and white groups differed significantly at $p < .05$ for Racial Interpersonal Empathy. The results
indicate that black participants had a significantly higher mean score for Racial Interpersonal Empathy (3.73) as compared to their white counterparts who had a mean score of 3.23.

Table 11
Post-Hoc Tukey Examination of Racial Interpersonal Empathy by Race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Race</th>
<th>(J) Race</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>.499*</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>-.600</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.499*</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.961</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-.309</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>-1.053</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>-.977</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>-.433</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square (Error) = .670.

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Because Racial Interpersonal Empathy was shown earlier to have a significant positive relationship with implicit racial bias (i.e. as Racial Interpersonal Empathy increases, so does implicit racial bias) it is important to note that Racial Interpersonal Empathy is the
only ethnocultural empathic factor that varies across race. The discussion of this finding as being significantly different compared to white and other racial demographics will be expanded upon in Chapter 5.

**Demographic Breakdowns: Gender**

The next demographic breakdown to be considered was gender. Table 9 has Empathy and IAT scores broken down by gender. IAT scores indicate that females demonstrate a higher level (.53) of implicit association (e.g. IRB) compared to males (.38). The IAT scores indicated that both male and female respondents have a moderate preference for European Americans over African Americans. Males scored higher than females in terms of Empathic Awareness and Racial Interpersonal Empathy with 4.66 and 3.47 respectively. Scores for empathic feeling and expression showed means scores in a higher range with males showing a mean score of 4.00 and female respondents having a mean score of 4.10. Both males and females showed a lower mean score of all factors with a score of 2.64 and 2.82 respectively. All standard deviation scores were a 1.0 or over for males and females with the exception of Empathic Feeling and Expression which ranged from .71 to .83. The Other standard deviation scores ranged from 1.36 for cultural differences among females to a 1.03 for Racial Interpersonal Empathy among males which indicates a bit of variability in responses.
Table 12

_Empathy and IAT scores by Gender_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAT Score</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Awareness</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Feeling and Expression</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Interpersonal Empathy</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social Racial Empathy</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Differences</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As there were no significant findings indicated by the data, it has been determined that the gender of individuals is not a differentiator, when considering the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias. This will be expanded upon in Chapter 5.
Demographic Breakdown: Job Level

Table 13 has Total IAT and Mean Empathy scores broken down by Job Level. IAT scores indicate that respondents who were individual contributors had a higher implicit association (.47) compared to those who were Senior Managers (.41) or Managers (.39). The IAT scores indicated that all job levels have a moderate preference for European Americans over African Americans. Individual contributors scored higher than Managers and Senior Managers in all order variables except Racial Interpersonal Empathy with 4.87, 4.21, 3.46, 2.63 respectively.

Table 13

Total IAT and Mean Empathy Scores by Job Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual Contributor</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAT Score</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Awareness</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Feeling and</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Interpersonal Empathy</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 has Total IAT and Mean Empathy Scores broken down by age. IAT scores indicate that respondents who were 18-34 (.48) had a higher implicit association compared to those who 35-44 years old (.41), 45-54 years old (3.4) or 55 and older (.40). The IAT scores indicated that all age ranges except 45-54 years old (.34) have a moderate preference for European Americans over African Americans. Those who are 45-54 years old have a slight preference for European Americans over African Americans. Those who are 18-34 scored higher than all other age categories in all order variables with 4.72, 4.17, 3.78, 3.78, and 3.08 respectively.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-34 Yrs Old</th>
<th>35-44 Yrs Old</th>
<th>45-54 Yrs Old</th>
<th>55 or Older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAT Score</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Awareness Mean</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Feeling and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Racial Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciating Cultural</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Two: How is implicit racial bias perceived to be experienced in the workplace at the organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal levels?**

To assess how implicit racial bias was perceived to be experienced at the organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal levels, a series of 8, 60-minute qualitative interviews were completed. The interview questions, among other questions, asked
interviewees to frame their experience implicit racial bias in the context of work. This exploratory interview process was used to expand upon our understanding of the phenomenon in a way that was not distinctly identified in the SEE or IAT. After inductive analysis, each of the themes that emerged were structured according to each of the three levels of system (i.e. Organizational, Intrapersonal, and Interpersonal). The following sections include thick description and verbatim quotes about the perception of implicit racial bias according to the lived experiences of those interviewed.

Qualitative interview participants had all completed the SEE and IAT prior to their solicitation to participate in the virtual interview. The rationale of each interview question allowed for those who have participated in, been the victim of, or observed implicit racial bias to describe their perceptions. As such, it is relevant to consider the IAT score (or IRB levels) of those who may or may not be cognitively aware of what they’ve experienced. This triangulation of data allowed the researcher to assess a phenomenon that may not be cognitively recognized.

It is worth noting that at various points in each of the interviews, the interviewee indicated an expanded awareness as a result of being asked a question. For example, “This [interview] has been interesting because it made me think in terms of what those relationships [with those of a different race] are like. Um, most of the time I don’t think we do. Most of the time I think we just react.” (Participant 2). The consistency of this expanded thinking may be tied to the overall mean of the interviewees (0.37). The range of IAT scores fell from -0.63 to 1.23. Table 14 provides the Overall IAT scores of each interviewee.
Table 15

*Overall IAT Score of each Interviewee*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall score</th>
<th>Interviewee ID</th>
<th>Participant Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>R_AtZZaFxbWMV4VoZ</td>
<td>Participant 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>R_2B3rfI0Zv0IsSnN</td>
<td>Participant 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>R_1OJDWNwuS0GiDzK</td>
<td>Participant 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>R_25RdHQ8fPfx3KkB</td>
<td>Participant 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>R_3eq9UG6SavEK4RR</td>
<td>Participant 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>R_2blbbFYgXKNj74T</td>
<td>Participant 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>R_31aA7rexXMbnKd4J</td>
<td>Participant 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>R_2f6VxupUiJIOX9h</td>
<td>Participant 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a moderate preference for European Americans over African Americans existed in the IAT scores of all except one of the interviewees, it is a logical inference that awareness would grow as these topics were explored.

The following section will outline how individuals experience implicit racial bias at each of the 3 levels of system (i.e. Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, and Organizational). Identified themes are not structured according to the number of respondents who demonstrated the theme as there is not a statistically significant proportion of interviewees to support those claims. However, each theme that emerged was represented in at least 40% of interviews. Findings from the first level of system to be discussed are at the Interpersonal level.
Workplace Implicit Racial Bias Perception: Intrapersonal Level

At the intrapersonal level of system, workplace IRB perception was identified by several themes. These themes are: Privilege, Cognitive Dissonance, Avoidant Racism, and Trauma. Each of these identified themes will be demonstrated with thick descriptions of interviewee experiences.

Privilege

Carolyn McIntosh introduced a social sciences definition of the term privilege in her 1988 text, *White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences Through Work in Women’s Studies*. She defined privilege as,

> A pattern of assumptions that were passed on to me as a white person. There was one main piece of cultural turf; it was my own turf, and I was among those who could control the turf. I could measure up to the cultural standards and take advantage of the many options I saw around me to make what the culture would call a success of my life. My skin color was an asset for any move I was educated to want to make. I could think of myself as "belonging" in major ways and of making social systems work for me. I could freely disparage, fear, neglect, or be oblivious to anything outside of the dominant cultural forms. Being of the main culture, I could also criticize it fairly freely. My life was reflected back to me frequently enough so that I felt, with regard to my race, if not to my sex, like one of the real people. (McIntosh, 1988, p. 5)

Those interviewees who discussed aspects of privilege at the interpersonal level varied in the implicit association levels from a moderate preference for European Americans over African Americans to a strong preference for European Americans over African Americans. One individual stated that,

> I guess it’s almost like a fish in water sort of question [Experiencing the benefits of race in the workplace]. Um, I’m, it’s always there [privilege] so I don’t really think about it. Um, I’ve been there for 28 years. I’ve built a lot of relationships, so
they just, they’re just natural to me. I’ve built, I just reach out and it’s there. I’m sorry I can’t be more specific. It’s just like, it is every day. My whole life is like that at work. (Participant 2)

Even though the prevalence of privilege was noted in several cases by the majority of those interviewed, findings indicated that the perception of privilege was not always noted explicitly. Even as an individual would verbally indicate that they are aware that they benefit from privilege in their experiences of IRB in the workplace, there were several instances of a coinciding cognitive dissonant response.

Cognitive Dissonance

Several individuals described how hiring and promotional practices reflected a disproportionate representation of race tied to privilege and IRB (i.e. majority of white people at leadership levels or across the organization); however, when probed further, most indicated that the situation was either not something that they had deeply considered or was tied to some other cause. For example,

*Interviewer: Have you thought about it [privilege] before?*

Interviewee: No. A little bit, but I never, I don’t know.

*Interviewer: What sort of thoughts did you have around it?*

Interviewee: Well, just, I don’t know if it was in-depth thoughts or anything. Just… I guess I didn’t really think about it that much because there’s not much diversity there, so it was just kind of in the background. I don’t know. (Participant 3)

In many ways, a cognitive dissonant response presented when those questioned about the circumstances surrounding IRB in the workplace, were put in a position of confronting inconsistency between action (I don’t demonstrate or benefit directly from IRB in the workplace) and a belief (Privilege is a result of IRB in the workplace). Due to the
cognitive dissonant effect, interviewees noted that they typically hadn’t thought deeply about the topic or refused to look critically at what drove their own behaviors. For example, one interviewee noted,

Interviewer: Did this [complaining about mistreatment of blacks in meetings] play a part in, not just in the financial reasons, but just sort of her reactions in these meetings, did that play a part in your friendship [with a black coworker] falling apart?

Interviewee: Yes, it did.

Interviewer: How so?

Interviewee: Because… uh… knowing the way she felt [about blacks being mistreated in meetings] and what she did and everything [stating verbally to others that blacks were mistreated in meetings], it just wasn’t a person I wanted to hang out with. (Participant 8)

In this instance, even as the interviewee described how her colleague’s discussing racial mistreatment in a work meeting caused her [the interviewee] to distance themselves, she refused to directly articulate that the choice to stop interacting with said colleague was made because of the colleague’s discussing their racial mistreatment. Another interviewee, after mentioning the lack of diverse representation across his organization, described his internal processing of the circumstances. He stated,

Interviewer: Have you thought about it [the cause of a lack of diverse representation in his workplace] before?

Interviewee: No. A little bit, but I never, I don’t know.

Interviewer: What sort of thoughts did you have around it?

Interviewee: Well, just, I don’t know if it was in-depth thoughts or anything. Just… I guess I didn’t really think about it that much because there’s not much diversity there, so it was just kind of in the background. I don’t know. (Participant 3)
This white interviewee showed a visible discomfort with the subject, which was captured in field notes and the subsequent study journal. He began squirming, averting his eyes, and rubbing his hands together in such a way that I perceived the discussion topic as being uncomfortable and potentially leading to defensive, less honest answers. Therefore, I made the decision during the interview to not continue with the line of questioning. I noted in other interviews that posing questions, ultimately led to an expansion of awareness. I deduced, based on other interviewee visual and audio cues that these topics were difficult to explore. In some cases, the interviewee noted that they had not previously considered these topics (i.e. race, bias, behavior, motivation, privilege, etc.) or had not communicated out loud their thoughts on these topics. Visual and audio cues were noted throughout field notes and included: lengthy pauses, filler words (e.g. Um or Uhh), lack of eye contact, and slight variation in tone (e.g. higher inflections or mumbling). At the intrapersonal level of system, interviewee behavior provided a wealth of data surrounding topics where there existed little or no cognitive awareness. Cognitive dissonance could potentially be mistakenly attributed to a lack of initial awareness; however, the ability to explicitly state at other points in the interview that IRB exists in the workplace, does reflect some sense of awareness at the intrapersonal level.

**Avoidant Racism**

*Avoidant Racism*, which underscores the “distance between dominant and non-dominant groups (e.g., being ignored by a sales person in a store or denied housing because of your race).” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64) appeared in several interactions. In particularly, avoidant racism existed as an experience of non-membership in workplace
affinity groups. Workplace affinity groups or employee resource networks

May be composed of African Americans; Asian Americas; Hispanics; older
workers; workers with disabilities; gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered
people; women; members of religious denominations; global networks; and
others. Open to all employees, each network typically has a formal structure with
leaders, periodic meetings, and objectives, and often serves as an external
advisory group. Affinity groups contribute to business success through several
means: recruitment and retention, product development, creating a positive and
supportive work environment and helping to deliver the commitment to diversity
and inclusion to name a few. (A Bonnier Corporation, 2009, p. 149)

As an individual who was not a member of this particular workplace’s affinity group, the
interviewee described their experience of avoidant racism in the following way,

I think it [racial bias] would be any kind of one-on-one interaction or perhaps if
I’m working with, say, a couple of people who are in that same [affinity] group.
Example, one of my indirect reports is in one of the groups, and she has friends in
those groups, and they have a different communication style than she and I do.
And we’re friendly, we get along well, but these are, it’s almost a more intimate
communication. And it should be, I think. Certainly, the communications I have
with her and with everyone else in my group should be professional. Whereas
these [interactions amongst those who are members of an affinity group] are more
friendly first and professional second. If that makes sense (Participant 2)

Even as this individual noted a distinct difference in treatment, he also indicated that this
difference in interaction was appropriate and logical. What went unsaid, was that the
different in interaction was due to a membership tied to racial inclusion in a particular
group -- a group that he, as a white male, indicated he “did not feel welcome to join”
(Participant 2). This raises potential implications for the utilization of affinity groups and
their relationship to IRB in the workplace, which will be explored further in Chapter 5.

Trauma

Trauma is the final theme observed at the intrapersonal level of system when
looking at experienced of IRB in the workplace. In this study, trauma is defined as a
psychological response to a trigger. Traumatic symptoms can include, but are not limited to stress, depression, and anxiety. Interviewees demonstrated trauma by describing their responses to the accusation (formal or informal) of demonstrating biased behavior. One white interviewee was the subject of a formal investigation by his employer and shared that,

Yeah, I mean I felt very surprised and really had no idea how I’m supposed to respond to this [accusation of biased behavior] because… I mean, I’m, I can say I’m the same with everybody, which is nothing to (unintelligible) anything. Um, yeah, I don’t think I had a response immediately. He [the supervisor] very quickly started with the follow up part, which I guess maybe because I did look so surprised… I mean, yeah, I really, hearing that [accusation]was a big surprise, you’d expect to get a little… (Participant 4)

At this point the interviewee trailed off in his communication and became visibly upset. He demonstrated his distress by averting his eyes and crossing his arms. Eventually, he went on to say,

Um, I guess it [the accusation of biased behavior] made me, it made me... I guess it made me sort of question what I was doing in every interaction. Uh, if somebody, I mean it made me more paranoid if somebody could take something the wrong way. It really made me worry about what was going on. If somebody really did say something. I didn’t really ask that [the supervisor tell me exactly what was communicated], it was actually never cleared up. (Participant 4)

In this instance, the interviewee expressed that this hypervigilance about how others experience his behavior is something that he is constantly aware of now. This is an example of a lasting stress caused by implicit racial bias in the workplace. The subsequent chapter will discuss the findings of interpersonal level perceptions of workplace implicit racial bias.
Workplace Implicit Racial Bias Perception: Interpersonal Level

At the interpersonal level, several themes emerged. The themes perceived of Implicit Racial Bias in the workplace include: Avoidant Racism, Cognitive Dissonance, Covering, and Privilege. Each will be explored in-depth and will also include verbatim quotes. To begin, Avoidant Racism will be discussed.

Avoidant Racism

Due to 6 of 8 of the interviewees demonstrating a moderate to high level implicit racial bias themselves, it was important to note what was said as well as what was not said. Avoidant Racism was indicated more in the unsaid as opposed to what was explicitly stated. For example, when asked if there was ever a time in which the interviewee, a white male, was in a workplace experience where he was in the minority, his response was, “Where I was the only one? Yeah. That [instance] was the first. I’ve been in ones [situations since] where I’m the minority but this was the first time [in the workplace]. And this was in the late 80s, something like that.” (Participant 5). While he does not explicitly state that this occurred due to race, the individual noticed an absence of the presence of ‘non-dominant groups’ which demonstrates distance in his workplace experience. This interview went on to demonstrate the interpersonal process that he experienced in those behavioral events. He went on to describe his experience as being very comparable to others. He stated, “I’m kind of like most, I’m sure 99% of whites are not used to being in a place where they are the only white person. Just like the rural whites [who I encounter in my role], they don’t understand how it would be if the
situation were flipped” (Participant 5). The lack of representation will be returned to when describing the organizational level impact of implicit racial bias. At an interpersonal level, lack of representation was noted by interviewees as existing in two noteworthy workplace dynamics, customer or client interactions and peer interactions. IRB was experienced more frequently during customer or client interactions than coworker/peer interactions. In a majority of the instances noted, IRB was described as being demonstrated by others rather than themselves. This is in line with the expectation that moderate to high levels of IRB would most likely lead those who demonstrate racially biased behavior to be cognitively unaware of their actions. Next, I will explore the nature of the cognitive dissonance that emerged as a theme at the interpersonal level.

**Cognitive Dissonance**

In many instances interviewees demonstrated Cognitive Dissonance. This took the form of a lack of deep introspection or, in several cases, interviewees showed a need to find an emotionally satisfactory explanation for biased behavior. Cognitive Dissonance emerged as one of the other major themes found at the interpersonal level of implicit racial bias experienced in the workplace. Those interviewees who demonstrated dissonance also ranged in their IRB levels from low (.03) to moderate (.47) preference for European Americans over African Americans. Most commonly, individuals expressed a need to explain why the biased behavior that they witnessed was occurring. For example, one interviewer stated that “it [witnessing her boss’s racism] kind of unnerves me a bit, and I kind of guess that maybe it’s because of the era that he was brought up in. I’m not trying to excuse his, the way he is, but I’m saying that maybe that has a great big
influence on why he is the way he is” (Participant 1, 2019). In each case where cognitive dissonance was shown, the interviewee attempted to define a motive that allowed the individual demonstrating bias to take little or no fault for their biased actions. It was also noted, that those who described these bias events would, at various points throughout their interviews, indicate that they had never witnessed, been the beneficiary of, or demonstrated preferential or negative treatment due to race.

For example, one individual was asked to describe a time that he felt that his race or ethnicity impacted his work positively. His response was, “Um, I don’t know, I guess it’s white privilege. I don’t really notice it. (laughing) I think it’s, and it’s hard to pin down just race. I live in, it’s a smaller community so most people know me. So it’s easier to get along, and I’m not really, um. I think working with other departments that don’t know me, and I don’t know if you know, but most fire departments are overwhelmingly white.” (Participant 5). While this individual could name his experience as being privileged, he failed to make a distinction between his own experiences and how his colleague of color, a black woman, may have a distinctly different workplace encounters in an exclusively white work environment. He then went on to state that, “honestly we [my colleagues and our community] just see each other as people. And R [the black female firefighter] grew up in this town, so she’s never, well I shouldn’t say never, but in town they just know her as R. They don’t see her as a black woman on a fire department.” (Participant 5). Even as the interviewee denies that R has different workplace experiences due to her race, he does indicate some level of cognitive awareness that this may not always be the case; however, he quickly returns to his belief
that race does not negatively impact workplace treatment. Even as there is an inconsistency between actions and his beliefs, which he acknowledges as privileged, the interviewee did not change his perception or his belief.

Covering

At various points throughout interviews that included some level cognitive dissonance, covering also occurred. Covering is an act that individuals do to various degrees in the workplace in order to hide elements of their authentic selves in an effort to fit in with the dominant culture (Yoshino, 2006). In racial instances, one’s role takes priority (covers) and is perceived as being more important than racial identity. This theme expands upon how implicit racial bias is perceived to be experienced at the interpersonal level by identifying the ways in which workplace role, when tied to racial identity, benefited those involved in a biased critical event. A white male coworker described an incident where he was the only white person in a situation which immediately resulted in his discomfort and his experience of mistrust from those he was there to help (i.e. bar customers). When his black female coworker entered the space, he noted that the behavior of the bar customers changed. When describing the incident, the white male interviewee noted the following,

Interviewee: Um, all I can think of, you know, some guy passed out at the bar, and I was the first one that got there. I asked them [the other black customers in the bar] and people are just suspicious because they think I’m going to turn it over to the cops. And I’m like, no I just need to know if he took anything drug-wise so I could treat him. And it’s not, you know, it’s just that suspicion, you know. They [the other black bar customers] see that fire helmet and I’m a lieutenant and think I’m automatically going to report it to the cops and that’s why I wanted to know if he took anything. And I’m like, no I need to know what he took so I know if I need to stick him with Narcan.
Interviewer: Was the suspicion, um, was it just an immediate assumption that you would report him, or did it show up — did they ask other questions, or did you sense something in body language?

Interviewee: It was more body language, just like when I first came up on scene. But then when R [the black coworker] came up with the drug kit and stuff, they relaxed. They didn’t know R either, but yeah R is not the best person to put in, [to] try to calm the parents down.

Interviewer: But it’s also interesting that ...you experience her as not always being tactful, but in a moment in a bar [the setting of the critical racial bias event], that [her presence] immediately lends you credibility and people are put at ease...I imagine she just walked in. I think you said she just had her stuff [fireman’s gear] with her, [but] probably hadn’t said anything.

Interviewee: No. I mean the fact that she was in fire gear just like I was [and the customers relaxed].” (Participant 5)

This describes an example of covering where the dominant identity, black bar customers, were able to respond more calmly to another black individual, as a firefighter responding to a call. In this moment the black firefighter’s racial identity allowed her role to supersede her race and provided legitimacy to both her and her white peer who had the same role identifiers (i.e. fireman’s gear) that she presented. There are ways in which membership in the majority racial identity, and the subsequent biased response, was perceived as a positive occurrence in the form of privilege. Privilege is the final theme that emerged at the interpersonal level of system when interviewees described their experience of IRB in the workplace.

Privilege

Several interviewees noted the benefits of implicit racial bias in the workplace at the interpersonal level. In each instance, those interviewed noted and specifically named the experience as having a sense of privilege. One interviewee stated,

I think in general, and this is just a general, broad statement, I think it’s a lot
easier being a white male in the construction industry than it is probably being anyone of color or even being a female in this industry. Um, especially 10 years ago when I was really coming up in the business. It was just, there was never instances of uncomfortability. Um, there was never areas where I felt like I was out of place necessarily, and I think that in and of itself honestly was an advantage because I didn’t necessarily walk in anyone else’s shoes to see what they went through. (Participant 7)

The same individual, a white male, expanded upon the moment when his awareness of privilege first occurred. This was during a conversation with a black male colleague.

I have one gentleman in my team, uh, he’s not on my management but he’s part of our engineering team. And he and I have conversations often, and you know, he had pictures in his phone, of, uh, people sitting in a meeting room, and he’s African American, and he’s the only one in the room. And he went through these photos with me, and he takes the pictures because he posts them on our internal social media site and all of that to promote, you know, product line or whatever class he’s facilitating, but he asks me the poignant question of, what do you notice in these photos, and I noticed it [that the man was the only black person in each picture], but it wasn’t until he really asked me, made me think about it. And so then putting myself in his position and thinking about what that must be like, um, I completely, my eyes opened a little bit wider, um, I would say, in seeing that, you know, when I walk into a meeting room that looks like that, I don’t have any feelings whatsoever. Um, it just feels like I’m walking into a room. When he walks into that room, there’s a moment where there’s pause, and is everything okay? And I’ve never experienced that, and so that I think is a specific difference where in conversations I’ve had with one of my colleagues, they’ve had a different experience than I’ve had. (Participant 7)

Privilege is an important aspect of experiencing implicit racial bias in the workplace at an interpersonal level. Other interviewees noted privilege when describing IRB in spite of a wide range in their indicated racial preference IAT scores. In fact, privilege was named and commented upon by every person interviewed in this study.
Workplace Implicit Racial Bias Perception: Organizational Level

At the broadest level of system, workplace implicit racial bias is perceived in the following themes: Avoidant Racism, Aversive-Hostile Racism, and Hostile Racism. While these themes were visible at other levels of system, what is identified as organizational are those dynamics tied to organizational hiring practices, leadership representation, as well as lateral and horizontal interactions within organizational structure.

Avoidant Racism

To begin, it was noted in several interviews that leadership representation was exclusively, if not predominantly white. One interviewee noted, “Uh, it was all white.” (Participant 3). A senior manager described their organizations leadership makeup by stating, “Sure. Uh, peers, well I have 3 co-managers. They’re all white males, approximately within the same age group of 55 to about 40. Uh, we have a manager we report to who is also a white male, and he’s about 45.” (Participant 2). When there exists such a homogenous representation at several levels of leadership, it is symptomatic of a larger pattern of avoidant racism. The same senior manager interviewee noted the same lack of representation within his own team of direct reports. "Of the females, one is a Hispanic female. The other is white. Of the males, 9 are white. One is African-American.” (Participant 2). Another interviewee noted that not only at levels of leadership, but across the organization, there was a lack of racial diversity. He stated,

I would say one third of my entire division, no I would actually say 20% of my entire division are women. Um in terms of ethnicity, I would say less than 10%
are African American. I would say probably 15%-20% are Hispanic Americans. Um, I would say less than 5% are Asian American, and I would say the remaining, you know, 65-70% are Caucasian American. (Participant 7)

These findings demonstrate IRB in hiring as well as promotional practices across organizations. Avoidant Racism was also seen as a result of employee affinity groups, which are an organization-wide policy intended to support diversity efforts. An interviewee shared that,

And I’m not a member of any of those [affinity groups], and they make me feel a little bit shut out perhaps. These are not groups that, I mean I know all of these people. These are, I’m familiar with them on site or we know each other by name. But when they’re in that environment in that group, then I’m not part of that, and so I feel like a little bit of an outside in that point. So it makes me feel a little bit uncomfortable. That it would be, um, that it would be somewhat, um, presumptuous on my part, groping for the word, um, presumptuous on my part to try to, um, break into that. What I perceive as a private circle, a private conversation with those groups that have more, uh, a more of a shared interest than I do. And that those interests are primarily based on either the race or how they perceive themselves, whatever their sexual preferences perhaps, or something that’s outside the larger circle of the company. (Participant 2)

Ironically, in an effort to introduce a mechanism for making diverse members of the workplace feel part of an inclusive culture, white employees within the workplace perceive the organization as isolating those who don’t fit the right demographics for entry into certain communities.

Aversive-Hostile Racism

Aversive-Hostile Racism is evident in those experiences “intended to create distance with strong hostile elements after a person of Color has gained entry into an organization or institution in which they were previously excluded (e.g. having your abilities and professional skills questioned)” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64). One example that
emerged which exemplified this phenomenon was an individual’s description of his peer’s interactions with multiple supervisors. The interviewee stated that,

Interviewee: There used to be some Hispanic people working there [at his former company]. And I could kind of tell the bosses treated them a little differently.

Interviewer: How so?

Interviewee: It was like they didn’t trust them as much, or I’m not sure. I’d hear people and other coworkers that would say negative things about them and stuff.

Interviewer: Can you tell me a bit more about how you knew they weren’t trusted by the bosses?

Interviewee: Well... Well, I’m not sure. I know I heard coworkers say things like, negative things, ‘Oh, this guy doesn’t work very hard’ or... Then, uh... that’s like, I guess the bosses would generally give them, the non-white people, the lesser tasks, you know.

Interviewer: Mm hmm

Interviewee: Not as important or that you like, you have to like work with your hands really hard and, I don’t know. It was more strenuous work, I guess you could say. Maybe I’m just putting words into their mouth. It’s kind of how it felt to me.

(Participant 3)

The instances described in this case demonstrate a pattern of behavior that occurred at multiple levels of system (i.e. leader-follower interactions and peer-peer interaction). While observable in some ways, this example also shows that the perception of someone who observes racially biased behavior can reflect an internal conflict when trying to assign the motives of others exhibiting a biased behavior.

Hostile Racism

Hostile racism was the third and final theme to emerge when examining the perception of implicit racial bias at the organizational level of system within the
workplace. Hostile racism is defined as “actions meant to communicate the target’s inferior status because of his or her membership in a non-dominant racial group (e.g., being stopped by the police because of your race)” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64). One interviewee described the mandated policies introduced by his organization. His explanation of his own perception of these programs, as a white male, provided a unique lens for examining actions meant to communicate a target’s inferior status. He stated,

You know, it’s like, man. I don’t, um, you know now with these, um, not affirmative action but a lot of these other programs, um, it feels, I don’t, I mean I’m not going to say disadvantage necessarily, but not advantaged at all. It’s, I mean, it’s, you know, it’s hard to tell about if people are really being evaluated fairly because they have to… Where I work, like, basically it’s federal, so there’s points on the job application, points involved in scoring it. So, I guess, like, the big thing is not, the big thing in federal is veteran’s preference. If you’re a veteran, technically scored out of a hundred. If you’re veteran I think it’s 10 points automatically, 5 additional points if you were in combat duty, basically everybody (unintelligible) (9/11?), if you’re in the military you get automatic points. So, a lot, and then there’s 10 points for other preferences. So basically, if you score out of 100, the top score is 125, so you need to score above 100 to be on the most qualified list, which is the only one anyone will actually ever look at. Because you do have to go by numbers, look for the people most qualified. Nobody does actually, it depends, if nobody does actually pass the interview, they still may not even be able to go to the list…Um, I guess it’s reverse racism or that kind of thing. It’s, I’m, I understand it’s good. I understand where it comes from, um, but, uh… The point of my story is that it does feel frustrating though because there’s nothing… You know, I didn’t do, um, I didn’t, you know everybody’s born a certain way. You can’t change how you’re born, what you, where your parents came from, what your parents do. You can change what you do. You can’t change who you are. Um, both ways it’s not fair to just randomly give someone advantage, you know, not everybody’s a great person just because they’re this. Not everybody is a terrible person because they’re the other thing. You know, it doesn’t, it’s not fair to just automatically give one group an advantage, one group a disadvantage. It’s not fair to give a better (unintelligible) advantage, other group disadvantage. I mean both groups, I know this is complicated and everything but somehow both groups should be equal. (Participant 4)

His example of systemic advantages in hiring processes for select groups of individuals
provides a perspective into what it is to not be a member of the preferred group. It is also noteworthy to comment that in his case, this individual was in the minority in his work environment. In fact, most of his colleagues and all of his supervisors were people of color.

In summary, the previous sections discussed the findings of this study’s secondary research question, *How is implicit racial bias perceived to be experienced in the workplace at intrapersonal, interpersonal, and organizational levels?* Implicit racial bias perception in the workplace has been shown through thematic analysis of 8 qualitative interviews to emerge in several themes. At the intrapersonal level, these themes are: Privilege, Cognitive Dissonance, Avoidant Racism, and Trauma. At the interpersonal level, these themes are: Avoidant Racism, Cognitive Dissonance, Covering, and Privilege. At the organizational level, these themes are: Avoidant Racism, Aversive-Hostile Racism, and Hostile Racism. The next section will provide findings regarding this study’s third research question, *What are the resulting effects of implicit racial bias at the organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal levels?*

**Question Three: How is ethnocultural empathy perceived to be experienced at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and organizational levels?**

The following section will outline how individuals experience ethnocultural empathy at each of the 3 levels of system. Identified themes are not structured according to the number of respondents who demonstrated the theme as there is not a statistically significant proportion of interviewees to support those claims. However, each theme that emerged was represented in at least 40% of interviews. Findings from the first level of
system to be discussed are at the Interpersonal level.

**Workplace Etnocultural Empathy Perception: Intrapersonal Level**

At the intrapersonal level of system, workplace EE perception was identified by several themes. These themes are: Appreciating Cultural Difference and Negative Social Racial Empathy. Each of these identified themes will be demonstrated with thick descriptions of interviewee experiences.

**Appreciating Cultural Difference**

Appreciating cultural difference is a factor of EE wherein a person demonstrates an understanding, acceptance and ascribing value to the individual customs and cultural traditions of various racial and ethnic groups. In one instance, a white female, who also happens to have hiring power within her organization, describes how she uses ethnocultural empathy when speaking with candidates. She notes,

I guess I, maybe I, maybe I verbalized and asked more questions of people, trying to understand the situation or understand their background or um... Yeah, maybe the, maybe one of the most practical ways it comes out, at least like in the jobs that I’m in, I mentioned I have 18 interviews this week that I’ve done, but I interview a lot of people, um, for jobs and promotions and things like that. And often times people come to me we’ve hired from some outside company and all I see is a paper resume. I don’t know anything else about them, right, and then they show up, and you see them face-to-face. And usually when we do these interviews here at the company that I work for, we usually, there’s usually more than one person interviewing them at a time. It’s usually a panel. There’s usually three of us. And so, uh, you know, I think sometimes, you know, when people push past something, I can see it faster, whereas when someone just pushes past something and makes an assumption based on what’s on the paper and how they appear or something, um. I don’t know. I dig in and sometimes ask a lot more questions about background. (Participant 6)

In this example, the woman was able to clearly articulate that her curiosity when looking
beyond the surface of a resume or an appearance, leads her to find value in the nuance of a candidate’s lived experiences and unique cultural attributes. In doing so, she clearly demonstrates an internal process of appreciation for cultural difference.

**Negative Social Racial Empathy**

Negative Social Racial Empathy is defined as a difficulty in demonstrating an affective and cognitive response that includes sharing the emotional experience, thinking about, and understanding the mental state of another who’s racial or ethnic identity differs from one’s own. One individual demonstrated this empathic factor when describing his moment of clarity during a workplace diversity & inclusion training conference. The following excerpt is a direct quote of his intrapersonal processing:

And it was, I mean, my eyes are now wide open when we talked about, because the topic of white privilege came up. And I never really understood, I understood what it meant, but I never spent time really dwelling on it or thinking about it. And in this conference, I really put myself, and the curators put you in discussions and conversations that quite honestly were uncomfortable. Uh, but what you walked out of there with was that, you know, in my role, there’s people that carry a heavier backpack. And for lack of a better description of what that is, and we’re all with the same goals, the same hard work, same mentality, same moral compasses. We’re all driving towards the same thing, but some of the people that we are working with carry a heavier load simply because of the color of their skin or because of their gender. And that, you know, I never fully, it never fully hit me until I was sitting in that conference and in these small group discussions with people that were different from myself. And what I walked out of that with is as a leader, boy do we have a big responsibility, uh, to equal the weights of everyone’s backpack. Uh, I never got that in 42 years until I went and sat through this workshop, and then I realized that I have a pretty big responsibility. So, it’s interesting because the timing of this is really great. This is an area where we focus on diversity and inclusion, but it’s been so focused on gender inclusion that I began to wonder if we’ve missed the boat in making sure our team member of color, that they are also feeling included, so I take it for granted where I live in Northern California, which is a pretty accepting and open place. Um, but it’s an area that we need to have, that I need to take responsibility for and focus on in making sure that that backpack is the equal weight across the whole board for
everyone who wants to make those advancements. (Participant 7)

What is key in this description is that he continued to try to demonstrate empathy despite a feeling of discomfort. An aversion to discomfort is one reason that others may avoid an empathic response or lead to a cognitive dissonant effect. In this case, the interviewee still continued to engage in actively taking on the emotions of others who differ from him racial.

**Workplace Ethnocultural Empathy Perception: Interpersonal Level**

At the interpersonal level of system, the perception of workplace ethnocultural empathy was most clearly demonstrated in peer-to-peer interactions. The only ethnocultural empathy factor that emerged as a common theme was appreciating cultural difference.

**Appreciating Cultural Difference**

As the only ethnocultural empathy factor with significant predictive relationship to bias, having appreciating cultural difference be the only perception of workplace EE to arise from the interviews is noteworthy. One interviewee discussed her conversations with a colleague as an example of appreciating cultural difference. She, a white woman, stated that,

I think that especially when it’s a different ethnicity, having empathy is understanding that you might have to word something a little bit differently for them, with their background, for them to understand it, versus how you may with somebody else. And understand that they’re not, because they don’t understand what you’re saying doesn’t mean that they’re (ignorant?). It just means they have a, like I was saying with the Afghan gentleman, how I say something to you, and you get it, and I say it to him, and he doesn’t get it, then I realize, well, this is his
second language, or his third language. And they are taught proper English, whereas we speak however we feel, so he’s not grasping it because my speech is different, so I have to go back and reiterate. So, I’m trying to have empathy towards him. It’s not his fault, you know, put myself in his shoes. How would I feel if the situation was reversed? It would be really nice if they could find another way to tell me. That way, I don’t feel like an ignorant fool, standing here, ‘Um, I don’t understand.’ Um, it’s more or less for me pretty much trying to be that other person, seeing things through their eyes, getting and understanding of how they could possibly feel. And adjusting myself to be more helpful and beneficial towards them. (Participant 1)

In this quote, the interviewee indicates that instead of inferring something negative when interacting with an individual with a different accent, she was able to recognize and appreciate his aptitude for learning multiple languages. Even as this was occurring, she valued her peer’s learning ability and, in turn, recognized that his use of the English language was more formal than her own. In taking time to appreciate a cultural difference as she encounters it, the interviewee imagined a reverse in roles, how she would feel, and willingly adjusted her speech accordingly.

**Workplace Ethnocultural Empathy Perception: Organizational Level**

At the organizational level of system, workplace ethnocultural empathy was not perceived in any of the interviews conducted. While aspects of empathy were demonstrated at the intrapersonal level of interviewees responsible for hiring and promotional decisions, these cases did not reflect organizational efforts that were seen as being empathetic.

The previous sections discussed the findings of this study’s third and final research question, *How is ethnocultural empathy perceived to be experienced in the*
workplace at intrapersonal, interpersonal, and organizational levels? Ethnocultural empathy perception in the workplace has been shown through thematic analysis of 8 qualitative interviews to emerge in several themes. At the intrapersonal level, these themes are: Appreciating cultural difference and negative social racial empathy. At the interpersonal level, the theme that emerged was appreciating cultural difference. At the organizational level there were no themes that emerged.

**Conclusion**

In summary, the purpose of Chapter 4 was to relay the findings of this study’s data collection and analyses. The chapter was structured according to each of this study’s 3 research questions. Findings were discovered through quantitative analysis of 146 IAT and SEE respondent scores as well as thematic analysis of 8 one-hour qualitative interviews. In answer to question one— *What is the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias?* The hypothesis was that there is a negative correlation between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias for employees in the workplace according to responses in the Implicit Association Test and Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy. Ethnocultural empathy increases as implicit racial bias decreases. It was determined that the hypothesis was false. Across all 5 identified factors of ethnocultural empathy, only 2 were shown to have a significant relationship with implicit racial bias. It was demonstrated that there is a relationship at a \( p < .01 \), between implicit racial bias and appreciating cultural differences (\( .212 \)). A significant positive relationship between appreciating cultural difference and implicit racial bias indicates that as appreciating cultural difference increases, implicit racial bias increases. A Pearson correlation analysis
also demonstrated a significant relationship (.138) at a p < .05 for implicit racial bias and Racial Interpersonal Empathy. This significant positive relationship indicates that as racial interpersonal empathy increases, so does implicit racial bias. These results show that the higher an individual scored on the IAT survey, the higher the levels of racial interpersonal empathy and appreciating cultural differences. There was no relationship of significance identified for the other factors of Ethnocultural Empathy: empathic feeling and expression, Negative Social Racial Empathy or empathic awareness. A linear regression was run to see if the IAT score could be predicted using the RIE and ACD scores. The regression was significant with an R-squared of .03 which indicates there is predictive value associated with these two variables. Essentially, RIE and ACD scores can be used to predict IRB.

In answer to question two of this study (i.e. How is implicit racial bias perceived to be experienced in the workplace at the organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal levels?), thematic analysis determined several key findings. At the broadest level of system, organizational, workplace implicit racial bias was perceived in the following themes: Avoidant Racism, Aversive-Hostile Racism, and Hostile Racism. At the intrapersonal level of system, workplace IRB perception was identified by several themes. These themes were: Privilege, Cognitive Dissonance, Avoidant Racism, and Trauma. At the interpersonal level, several themes emerged. The themes perceived of implicit racial bias in the workplace included: Avoidant Racism, Cognitive Dissonance, Covering, and Privilege.

In answer to question three of this study (i.e. How is ethnocultural empathy
perceived to be experienced in the workplace?), thematic analysis determined that there were themes at the intrapersonal and interpersonal levels of system. At the intrapersonal level of system, workplace ethnocultural empathic perception was identified by two themes. These themes were appreciating cultural difference and Negative Social Racial Empathy. At the interpersonal level of system, the perception of workplace ethnocultural empathy was most clearly demonstrated in peer-to-peer interactions. The only ethnocultural empathy factor that emerged as a common theme was appreciating cultural difference. At the organizational level of system, workplace ethnocultural empathy was not perceived in any of the interviews conducted. The following Chapter 5 will synthesize and further discuss the results outlined in Chapter 4.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In the following chapter, I explore my interpretations of this study’s findings. When considering these interpretations in their totality, this discussion reflects a summation of the meaning that I have made of this study’s research questions, literature review, and conceptual framework. I will explore these findings as well as the practical and theoretical implications thereof. Following a magnified discussion of this study’s findings, I will present implications for future research, implications for future practice and outline the limitation of this study.

Findings

After synthesizing the findings from Chapter 4, four findings emerged from the data. Within each finding are multiple themes that are explored in greater detail. In addition, when presenting themes, I will refer back to verbatim quotes as well as quantitative results to support my interpretations. Each theme is also compared against academic literature or practice.

Finding #1: Ethnocultural empathy is a psychological phenomenon that contributes to an individual’s level of implicit racial bias.

Finding #1 answers research question #1: What is the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias? As referred to throughout this
dissertation, implicit racial bias influences how individuals engage with one another, both in their private and public lives. The far-reaching consequences of implicit racial bias are visible in interpersonal transformations at a broader societal level as well as within workplace contexts. The negative effects of implicit racial bias are seen in conflict across racial lines, talent acquisition practices, employee engagement, and leadership advancement gaps. This study focused on probing those elements, such as ethnocultural empathy, that can influence implicit racial bias. It was found that certain factors of ethnocultural empathy have a significant relationship to implicit racial bias. In the following paragraphs, I discuss 3 factors of EE found by this study to have a significant relationship to implicit racial bias: 1) Appreciating Cultural Differences 2) Racial Interpersonal Empathy and 3) Negative Social Racial Empathy.

Appreciating Cultural Differences

The quantitative analysis results found that appreciating cultural difference, a factor of ethnocultural empathy, has a significant positive relationship at a .01 level with IRB. As an individual demonstrates “increased understanding, acceptance, and valuing of cultural traditions and customs of individuals from differing racial and ethnic groups” (Wang et. Al, 2003, p. 224), their implicit racial bias strengthens.

It was also shown through this study that an appreciating cultural difference score could be used to predict implicit racial bias. Appreciating cultural difference was proven to be a strong indicator across all participant demographics. Taken together with the thematic analysis results, alongside a self-reported score (i.e. SEE instrument) which indicates that there is, at least at a cognitive level, an awareness of ethnocultural empathy. There is also a marked disconnect with one’s own biased thoughts and behaviors both in
the moment and in hindsight. One interviewee, a white male, described his perceptions of racial or ethnic cultural awareness as the following:

Now I don’t want to come off, I don’t want to make myself sound like some sort of race-blind superman. But I get really tired of people trying to differentiate by anything. You know, I’m X, I’m Y, I’m Z, I’m different than you. And therefore, I am better, worse, more advantage, disadvantage, um, you should give me stuff, I should give you stuff, because I am. We’re all just people. (Participant 2)

What he communicates reflects a socially encouraged form of valuing one another equitably (i.e. colorblindness), yet his IAT score indicated a moderate level of preference for European Americans over African Americans (0.35). Even as he purports to hold egalitarian views, he demonstrated in one of his critical incident examples a lack of valuing the cultural norms for a person of another race. The findings from this study are consistent with the literature, which demonstrate the same dichotomous response (Delk, 1995; Kim & Keisel, 2018). This literature adds relevance to the study’s findings when considering the social and motivational drivers surrounding empathic response. For example, when describing a new neighbor who is a black woman who just purchased her first house, the same interviewee stated:

Interviewee: I get a sense of irresponsibility from her. You now, this [cleaning up snow on the sidewalk] is a really basic thing that anybody who lives in a house should do. In our climate, this is not a surprise. It snows in Minnesota in the winter time. And people need to get by your house on the sidewalk, so you need to shovel your sidewalk. So that’s, yeah, to me that's an indication, if you aren't going to do that, what else aren't you going to do? Because actions have effects. The actions you do or do not take affect how I, how things look in my neighborhood.

Interviewer: You mentioned originally, when describing her situation, she communicated to you this was, uh, her first house that she’s living in or maybe-

Interviewee: That she had purchased.

Interviewer: And so, um, you also mentioned, taking that into consideration, that you said something to her [about shoveling her sidewalk].
Interviewee: Yeah

Interviewer: *Will you continue to take that into consideration in your interactions?*

Interviewee: A little bit. I mean, it’s there, but I expect to see progress. I expect to see some sort of change. I mean, yeah that makes sense the first time. You’re used to having your landlord shovel your sidewalk. So, for the first time that it snowed at your own house, you didn’t think of it. Well now you’re aware of the problem, or aware of the issue, then you should take care. It shouldn’t really be an issue anymore. (Participant 2)

Even as the interviewee expressed empathy earlier, his emotive response didn’t reflect empathy when put into a specific situation. He did not value his neighbor’s unique experiences. She is a single black mother with multiple kids who may need additional support as a new homeowner during her first winter. Once he became inconvenienced, it was now socially acceptable to demonstrate bias. Research shows that,

Those who speak of “Aversive racism” (Gaertner and Dovidio, 1986) maintain that although many Anglos are reluctant to discriminate against minorities in circumstances where doing so could cause them to be branded as racists, they will discriminate if they can justify their behavior on socially acceptable grounds. (Sigelman, Sigelman, Walkosz, & Nitz, 1995, p. 246)

The literature refers to this aversive racism as “intended to create distance with strong hostile elements after a person of Color has gained entry into an organization or institution in which they were previously excluded (e.g. having your abilities and professional skills questioned)” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64), which is consistent with this particular finding from the study. As a new member of the neighborhood community, the neighbor woman’s treatment would be considered an attempt to create distance. In fact, at other points in his interview the interviewee stated,

the racial makeup of this area has changed gradually over the years as the people
who were here when I grew up aged out. Passed on or they moved out or whatever. Then the neighborhood filled, or refilled, as neighborhoods do, with people of different races. And maybe it’s a less intimate connection than it was… I think there might be a feeling of maybe feeling a little outnumbered. A little, um, there’s a lot of, you know, as people we’re uncomfortable with strangers. We’re uncomfortable with different, whatever is different from us. And so I think some of these conversations I’ve had with people who still live in the neighborhood they still feel a little outnumbered. And they don’t, they’re not as comfortable with their new neighbors as they were with the people who lived next to them for 20 years. (Participant 2)

When comparing the relationships between appreciating cultural difference, implicit racial bias and aversive racism, every interviewee with an appreciating cultural difference score above 1.4 showed aversive racism or aversive-hostile racism in their interviews. These findings could be a used to dictate future research and will be explored further in subsequent sections.

**Racial Interpersonal Empathy**

The quantitative analysis indicates that there is a positive relationship between racial interpersonal empathy and implicit racial bias. As racial interpersonal empathy increases, the preference for European Americans over African Americans increases. Racial interpersonal empathy is defined as the ability to sense and respond to social pain or experience of another who’s race or ethnicity differs from one’s own. This finding aligns with current research which indicates that “individual differences in social anxiety may influence empathic accuracy for others’ social pain” (Auyeung & Alden, 2015, p. 39). Social anxiety is a negative sensation born out of experiencing social pain. When triangulating racial interpersonal empathy scores, IAT scores, and the presence of privilege in each of the interviews conducted, the absence of an individual being prone to social racial pain experiences, would explain a higher implicit racial bias. Findings from
this study also show that racial interpersonal empathy scores can predict implicit racial bias. The regression was significant with an R-squared of .03. Several interviewees described this in their discussions of difficulty demonstrating empathy for those of another race or ethnicity. For example, one person stated:

I kind of think that, for real, I’ve got it easy because of my color. I don’t have to worry about or consider things as much as anybody else has to. Um, so it’s really difficult for me. I can see it with my friends that are not white. Anybody that’s Asian, I can see where the situation is different for them, but it’s difficult for me to actually point it out when it is happening to me because of my color. And I think it’s really difficult for, I’m sorry, but for white people to get that. (Participant 1)

In every interview, it became apparent that individual can recognize their privilege, but this did not mean that they were any less inclined to demonstrate empathy or not demonstrate implicit racial bias. This will be expanded upon in subsequent sections as it relates to implications for future study and practice.

**Negative Social Racial Empathy**

Quantitative analysis demonstrated that there is a significant positive relationship between negative social racial empathy and implicit racial bias. As negative social racial empathy increases, so too does the strength of the association that European Americans are better than African Americans. While negative social racial empathy was not found to have a predictive relationship with implicit racial bias, these findings are in line with current literature that discuss the mechanisms of negative empathy—a high level form of empathy that is “a potentially regressive aesthetic experience, consisting in a cathartic identification with negative characters, which can be…open to agency (indifferently leading either to prosocial or antisocial behavior)” (Ercolino, 2018, p. 243). The
processes involved in negative empathy theory reflect the concepts of Festinger’s Cognitive Dissonance noted in earlier chapters. For the purposes of this study, Cognitive Dissonance was considered a potential motivational driver for implicit racial bias. Researchers suggest that “in negative empathy, the subject experiences a sort of resistance against what is perceived as an “enemy request” by the object” (Lipps, 1909, p. 107); there is “a resistance against the introduction of something unpleasurable inside of her-/himself, which generates interior detachment)” (Lipps, 1909, 229). As another consistent theme within qualitative interviews, cognitive dissonance was demonstrated in each of the interviews conducted.

Summary

This study found 3 specific aspects factors of EE that contribute to implicit racial bias response: 1) Appreciating Cultural Differences 2) Racial Interpersonal Empathy and 3) Negative Social Racial Empathy. In this section, I described the ways in which thematic analysis definitions demonstrate that my interpretations of the inductive and deductive results support the relationship. I also reviewed where and how research literature is in alignment with these findings. Therefore, this finding is supported by evident from the thematic analysis, SEE and IAT coding of data. Furthermore, analyzing the 2 data sets together provides additional support for this finding.

Finding #2: Implicit racial bias in the workplace is perceived to be happening predominantly to other people, the result of other people’s actions, and while having no lasting impact on those who observe it.

Finding #2 answers research question #2: How is implicit racial bias perceived to
be experienced in the workplace at the organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal levels? This research question was answered through inductive analysis of 8 qualitative interviews. The study explored the individual experiences of those in a variety of hierarchical positions, ages, and genders. Each interview question provided insight into how individuals perceive this phenomenon at all 3 levels of system: organizational, interpersonal, and intrapersonal. Among these levels of system, 3 types of racism emerged: Avoidant Racism, Aversive-Hostile Racism, and Hostile Racism. Alongside these findings, this study identified Privilege and Cognitive Dissonance as reoccurring throughout critical event incidents. In the following paragraphs, I discuss how these 5 themes intertwine with one another when encountered in the workplace.

Avoidant Racism

To begin, avoidant racism is defined as the “distance between dominant and non-dominant groups (e.g., being ignored by a sales person in a store or denied housing because of your race).” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64). The distance between dominant and non-dominant groups existed at all 3 levels of system. It was reflected in interactions with senior leadership for example. One interviewee described the following situation with her company’s owner:

I picked that [IRB] up just with interactions, especially with the owner. Um, how he interacts with, uh, like, you know, clients that are any other color is very stilted, and it’s not… at first I thought it was because they were clients versus, you know, his workers, but I realized not actually. So when the clients are of another color, he’s very stilted (grimacing) like that. But if he’s speaking with people of the same color, that are white, he’s like, you know, old long-time friend, even if he’s never spoken to them before, never seen them before. It’s like an old long-time friend he hasn’t seen in ages, ‘Hey buddy, how ya doin’?’ So with me, I’ve seen that between me and, uh, the fella from Afghanistan, and how the boss has interacted between us. Um, we have closely the same capacity, so you would
think the interaction would be typically the same, but it’s not. (Participant 1, 2019)

In conjunction with noting this observed behavior, interviewees also commented that IRB behaviors did not directly impact them. One person described it as “a classic insider - outsider thing. The insiders have a shared language. They have, uh, you know, the shared jokes or the little lines that mean more to them than the people on the outside” (Participant 2). He went on to say that,

being an outsider to that particular group, I don’t share in that interaction. I don’t feel as closely connected. Um, they [coworkers of color] seem to be more connected to each other and more able to communicate more directly perhaps. Or they have some sort of shared knowledge that I don’t have. So, I just kind of, it feels like I’m kind of on the outskirts looking in. (Participant 2)

When the same interviewee was asked how such observations affected him beyond the moment, his response was, “Not a lot.” (Participant 2). These findings are in line with literature. The Pew Research Center reports that there is

No consensus among American adults about the state of race relations in the U.S.: 48% say race relations are generally bad, and 44% say they are generally good. Opinions on fundamental questions about race relations—where we are, how they can be improved, and how much attention the issue warrants—are sharply divided along racial lines (2016, p. 31-36)

As discussed in Chapter 4, privilege was a noted theme present throughout every interview conducted. Regarding privilege, the majority of participants described it as something that they held which meant that, as one person noted: “I kind of think that, for real, I’ve got it easy because of my color. I don’t have to worry about or consider things as much as anybody else has to. (Participant 1). As such, in no instance did an interviewee discuss long-term psychological or emotional effects of implicit racial bias in
the workplace. It should also be noted that all of those interviewed categorized
themselves as white or other. Avoidant racism was also noted in organizational hiring
practices and leadership representation. In all instances except one, each interviewee
described their leadership team’s makeup as being exclusively or predominantly white.
This reflects a preponderance of racially diverse underrepresentation across
organizations, which is in line with current literature. These findings, taken together,
provide evidence that helps explain why IRB in the workplace is perceived to be
happening predominantly to other people, the result of other people’s actions, and while
having no lasting impact on those who observe it.

**Aversive-Hostile Racism**

As it relates to perception of IRB in the workplace, this study found that
individuals perceive aversive-hostile racism at the organizational level of system. This
form of racism is reflected in leader-follower, peer and client interactions. The following
quote reflects both leader-follower and peer-peer forms of aversive-hostile racism:

> I know I heard coworkers say things like, negative things, ‘Oh, this guy doesn’t
work very hard’ or… Then, uh… that’s like, I guess the bosses would generally
give them, the non-white people, the lesser tasks, you know. (Participant 3)

Regarding situations of aversive-hostile racism, there was also a demonstrated lack of
immediate or long-term impact. In fact, in many instances nothing was said to the
individuals involved either during or after. One interviewee noted:

Interviewee: I guess it’s like, uh, it [the IRB incidents] affected how I thought.
Thinking like, well, I guess these kinds of attitudes [IRB] are pretty much
universal where I’m from. I don’t know. I never really noticed that or thought
about that before. So then when I moved up there [to the north], I guess I mean
up there it’s [IRB] more of like, uh, I guess more hidden. If that makes any sense.
Interviewer: How do you think it's [IRB] hidden?

Interviewee: Well, like people here will be more willing to openly say stuff. But over there it seems like people would use euphemisms and stuff like that. Like, ‘Oh that’s the bad part of town.’ Whereas here someone might just outright say something negative about someone because of their color, you know?

Interviewer: Mm hm. And other than thinking a little bit differently or thinking about it more than you did previously, did it change how you interacted with people in your private life?

Interviewee: Uh, I didn’t really interact with that many people because I didn’t really go out that much, but I don’t know. I mean I liked most of the people that were up there… I don’t think it did affect how I interacted. It might have, but I didn’t notice it. (Participant 3)

These findings are in line with literature which suggests that “People often don’t support efforts to eliminate oppression because they feel nothing can really change” (Goodman, Motivating people from privileged groups to support social justice, 2000, p. 1078). The impact of perceiving implicit racial bias is fleeting and presents as a lack of ethnocultural empathic response. In essence, implicit racial bias in the workplace happens to other people and has no lasting impact on those who observe it at organizational, interpersonal or intrapersonal levels.

Hostile Racism

This study found that individuals perceive hostile racism at the organizational and interpersonal levels of system. When “actions meant to communicate the target’s inferior status because of his or her membership in a non-dominant racial-group (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64) were presented in interviewing, it was reflected in client interactions as well as in peer interactions. For example, an interviewee shared a critical incident that
occurred when they were stopped by the police. That individual noted a discrepancy in how they were treated as opposed to how their black coworker would’ve been treated in the same circumstance. They said,

I think I got better treatment because I’m white and not black. If R [his black colleague] had been pulled, she would have probably been shoved against the car…. He was calling me sir. I mean he’s pushing me up against the front of a car but he’s still calling me sir. (Participant 5)

**Effects of implicit racial bias.** In this section, I discuss my interpretation of the relationship between hostile racism and privilege as well as their subsequent effects.

When individuals who experience racial privilege perceive themselves as the victim of any form of racism, findings reflected moments of empathic response. The same individual who described a negative interaction with a police officer stated the following:

Interviewee: I’m still pissed [about the IRB incident]. Honestly, I can only imagine how blacks in inner cities feel. You know, I get a little jump in my heart when a cop goes by. And I wonder if he’s going to stop and pull me over for something or other.

*Interviewer: You mentioned you can only imagine how others may feel. Does this incident make you more empathetic towards others in that situation?*

Interviewee: I like to think that I always kind of was. But yeah, I mean it makes me, um. You know I think it’s, it’s one thing to know that in the abstract, like, um, blacks get treated worse by cops than whites. But then this is like, I have a get out of jail free card (Participant 5)

These findings are also reflected in the literature where “life difficulties are framed in light of the shared human experience, so that one feels connected to others in the midst of personal struggle” (Neff & Pommier, 2013, p. 161). Interestingly, at no time did any of those interviewed communicate those instances where they demonstrated biased behavior
or contributed to the IRB incidents. This denotes a level of cognitive dissonant response that is a strong theme throughout. Taken together, these findings provide evidence that IRB in the workplace is perceived to be happening predominantly to other people, as the result of other people’s actions.

Summary

The evidence presented in the previous sections provides support for several findings related to the perception of implicit racial bias in the workplace. These findings answer research question #2: How is implicit racial bias perceived to be experienced in the workplace at the organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal levels?

Specifically, this study found that individuals experience all 3 forms of racism (i.e. Avoidant Racism, Aversive-Hostile Racism, and Hostile Racism) across all levels of system. This study also found that those with a preponderance of privilege are less likely to empathize when encountering an implicit racial bias event, except in those instances where they have been the recipient of what they perceive as biased behavior. Finally, this study found that the impact of perceiving implicit racial bias is fleeting and presents as a lack of ethnocultural empathic response.

Finding #3: Ethnocultural empathy in the workplace is perceived to be demonstrated predominantly through appreciating cultural difference.

The results from this study indicate several important findings related to the perception of ethnocultural empathy. These findings answer research question #3: How is ethnocultural empathy perceived to be experienced in the workplace? In the following paragraphs, I provide a brief summary of the results related to research question #3. I
then provide my interpretation of these results.

This study found that at the intrapersonal and interpersonal levels of system, ethnocultural empathy in the workplace is perceived by appreciating cultural difference. At the organizational level of system, no themes of ethnocultural empathy emerged. This finding is described in further detail below.

**Appreciating Cultural Difference**

When considering the intrapersonal level of system, the moment of acknowledgement that someone else is behaving in a way different than your own is an important aspect to appreciating cultural difference. Findings indicate that participants interpreted ethnocultural empathy as appreciating and being mindful of another’s difference would best describe ethnocultural empathy in the workplace. For example, one interviewee noted:

> having empathy is understanding that you might have to word something a little bit differently for them, with their background, for them to understand it, versus how you may with somebody else. And understand that they’re not, because they don’t understand what you’re saying doesn’t mean that they’re ignorant (Participant 1, 2019)

Even as this individual could clearly articulate their perception of ethnocultural empathy, it is important to refer back to findings which indicated that as appreciating cultural difference increased, implicit racial bias increased. This same individual had a moderate level of implicit racial bias. When taking into consideration all of these elements, it reinforces the literature which suggests that there is, at a cognitive level, an awareness of ethnocultural empathy; however, even as an individual purports to hold egalitarian views, they are still capable likely to demonstrate bias. (Delk, 1995; Kim & Keisel, 2018).
Findings at the interpersonal level of system showed a similar

At the interpersonal level of system, there exists in the findings of this study the same dichotomous response between what is communicated regarding the perception of EE in the workplace and IRB. Appreciating cultural difference was the only factor of EE perceived. One interviewee described her use of appreciating cultural differences in her hiring processes. She stated that, I verbalized and asked more questions of people, trying to understand the situation or understand their background or um… Yeah, maybe the, maybe one of the most practical ways it comes out, at least like in the jobs that I’m in, I mentioned I have 18 interviews this week that I’ve done, but I interview a lot of people, um, for jobs and promotions and things like that. And often times people come to me we’ve hired form some outside company and all I see is a paper resume. I don’t know anything else about them, right, and then they show up, and you see them face-to-face…I think sometimes, you know, when people push past something, I can see it faster, whereas when someone just pushes past something and makes an assumption based on what’s on the paper and how they appear or something, um. I don’t know. I dig in and sometimes ask a lot more questions about background (Participant 6)

What is reaffirmed in earlier quantitative findings is that her appreciation of cultural difference does not impede the avoidant racism or implicit racial bias apparent in the lack of diversity within the teams where she is responsible for hiring. When asked about the racial makeup of her team she states that,

I honestly off the top of my head don’t know the statistics of the breakdown, but it’s very diverse. It’s southern California, plenty of representation from the African American community, Asian community here in L.A., as well the
Hispanic community here in L.A. Um, we also have people on our team that were born outside the U.S. It’s a very global company, so it’s fairly common. Part of our culture is lots of people from lots of places, so lots of people on the team who are not native English speakers, you know, um, yeah, pretty diverse team here (Participant 6)

However, when asked about more specific percentages of diverse individuals among her staff, the same individual stated her direct reports are “probably less than, it’s less than 30% [non-white]” (Participant 6). The majority of interviews discussed a similar disconnect in cognitive awareness of what it means to appreciate cultural difference, which also demonstrating a lack of ethnocultural empathy and increased levels of implicit racial bias. These findings, taken together, provide evidence that help to explain why negative impacts of implicit racial bias are generally present within workplace environs.

Summary

When viewed together, these results provide evidence of the predominance of ethnocultural empathy as being perceived in appreciating cultural difference in the workplace. This study found that appreciating cultural difference existed at both the intrapersonal and interpersonal levels of system. Generalized beliefs of ethnocultural empathy indicated that individuals were cognitively aware of what empathy towards another race or ethnicity entails. There was also an observation that all individuals, no matter their implicit racial bias levels, could recognize what ethnocultural empathy refers to; however, those same individuals demonstrate, on average, a moderate level of implicit racial bias.
Findings #4: In measuring Ethnocultural Empathy, it must be taken into account that there are five distinct factors.

The original Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy included four factors; however, this study’s five factor solution makes the best argument for this sample. There is more clarity in identifying relationships by evaluating ethnocultural empathy according to five distinct factors. As a result of this study’s factor analysis, two distinct and separate variables, Negative Social Racial Empathy and Racial Interpersonal Empathy were identified. These newly defined variables clarified more distinctly, the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias.

Implications for Future Research

While this study provides useful conclusions that contribute to the bodies of knowledge related to ethnocultural empathy, implicit racial bias, and experiences of both within the workplace, there are several important implications for future research: 1) future studies should consider appreciating cultural difference and its ramifications in organizational behavioral research; 2) future studies should focus on what factors reduce appreciating cultural difference; 3) future research should examine what factors increase negative social racial empathy when considering a shift from cognitive to prosocial emotive response; and 4) future studies should focus on the relationship between empathy and other forms of bias. Each of these opportunities for future research is discussed in the following paragraphs.

First, the literature review revealed the limited number of studies examining
ethnocultural empathy in workplace settings. The few examples of studies incorporating ethnocultural empathy were focused on student populations, and not employees within organizations. I also did not find any studies that specifically explored how appreciating cultural differences is seen within workplace environments, except to note that in diversity training programs that included appreciating cultural difference as an element of learning, there was little to no lasting impact on organizational behavior. The scant representation of practical research in this area warrants greater attention. Future studies should consider appreciating cultural difference and its ramifications in organizational behavior.

Second, this study found evidence that appreciating cultural difference has a significant relationship to implicit racial bias. Understanding these and other ways in which aspects of empathy relates to implicit racial bias requires more research focused directly on examining the relationship between appreciating cultural difference and implicit racial bias. The primary method of data collection concerning perceptions of appreciating cultural difference in the workplace was a 1-hour interview with 8 participants. Future research on this topic should consider using more robust data collection techniques. Although this study was able to determine a significant relationship, it did not discuss beyond a self-reporting mechanism (i.e. SEE and qualitative interviews), how appreciating cultural difference demonstrates itself. With that in mind, additional resource that may not be influenced by rater bias, could determine with greater veracity the nature of the relationship between appreciating cultural difference and implicit racial bias.
Third, as described in Chapters 4 and 5, negative social racial empathy was found to have a positive relationship with implicit racial bias. One possible explanation for this significant relationship explored the mechanisms of negative empathy and its similarities to Festinger’s Cognitive Dissonance theory. However, I was unable to include participants of color in the interview. As such, while the findings from this study add to our understanding of the relationship between NSRE and IRB at across a broader society, it cannot be inferred that the same theme of cognitive dissonance would emerge in the qualitative interviews. It cannot be assumed that cognitive dissonance with regards to empathy or implicit racial bias would demonstrate itself when discussing perception with a more diverse participant pool. For these reasons, a larger study with more qualitative interviews is needed to understand whether the findings from this study are generalizable across races.

Fourth, the findings of this study were able to clearly demonstrate significant relationships in 3 factors of ethnocultural empathy as being related to implicit racial bias. Due to the strength of the evidence related to implicit racial bias found in this study, future studies warrant a more robust measure of the other aspects of psychological factors that have a significant relationship with IRB. The measures used to assess ethnocultural empathy for this study were based on several items within the SEE. Although this method was appropriate to answer the study’s research questions, future research should consider a new set of items that may further refine the definition of ethnocultural empathy. If a more customized means of measuring empathy is utilized by researchers, it is recommended that these measures be used to test empathy’s relation to implicit bias in
other forms (e.g. gender, age, weight, etc.). By adding to the body of knowledge, practitioners can develop interventions to address Diversity, Equity and Inclusion practices. As a result, research will then be needed to assess whether specific types of interventions do, in fact, mitigate the negative effects of implicit racial bias.

**Implications for Practice**

The findings from this study offer important implications for practitioners: 1) New considerations for training about privilege as a means of reducing bias; 2) Future interventions that specifically affect negative social racial empathy; 3) Future interventions that specifically affect racial interpersonal empathy; and 4) New interventions that specifically affect appreciating cultural difference.

First, given the finding that cognitive awareness of privilege does not reduce implicit racial bias, new assessment of anti-bias training is required. As it stands, discussions about building awareness of privilege is meant to allow individuals to recognize their privilege in interpersonal interactions such as hiring practice or workplace dynamics. Current anti-bias training approach assume that by building awareness, implicit bias can be mitigated. The findings of this study prove one aspect of why existing practitioner approaches, built around increasing awareness of one’s own privilege, are counterproductive when attempting to effect implicit racial bias. As such, with the findings of this study we can begin to restructure practitioner’s approaches to anti-bias training that include privilege awareness-building as a mechanism for reducing the negative effects of implicit racial bias.
As a significant relationship between negative social racial empathy and implicit racial bias has been demonstrated here, practitioner interventions must now design new approaches to reducing negative social racial empathy. Measuring the efficacy of interventions in successfully reducing negative social racial empathy could create a cognitive and affective approach to reducing an emotional factor that reduces bias. This measurement could take the form of pre- and post-intervention assessments of negative social racial empathy measures.

Next, based on the findings of this study, racial interpersonal empathy has been shown to have significant predictive effect on implicit racial bias. As such, reducing racial interpersonal empathy through targeted intervention could, in turn, reduce the negative effects of implicit racial bias in the workplace. As new approaches to interventions are explored, aspects of this study could be used to assess the efficacy of new interventions as well provide a more accurate barometer for measuring success in diversity, equity and inclusion approaches within the workplace.

Finally, the findings of this study indicate that appreciating cultural difference has a significant relationship to implicit racial bias. By designing interventions that reflect a targeted focus on addressing appreciating cultural difference, there is an opportunity to drive practical and relevant training in order to mitigate bias at an intrapersonal level. To begin at the intrapersonal level could lead to a subsequent effect at the interpersonal and organizational levels of system. Each incremental improvement could, in turn, begin to mitigate the negative effects of implicit racial bias.
Summary

In conclusion, the ramifications of a clearly established understanding of several psychosocial factors which are capable of development and driven by human agency, warrants efforts to create interventions that directly impact these factors. In light of these facts, practitioners can and should consider: 1) New considerations for training about privilege as a means of reducing bias; 2) Future interventions that specifically affect negative social racial empathy; 3) Future interventions that specifically affect racial interpersonal empathy; 4) New interventions that specifically affect appreciating cultural difference. In doing so, practitioners can begin to more proactively improve diversity efforts in a variety of organizations.

Limitations

One of the limitations of this study’s methods is that the researcher cannot definitively indicate whether ethnocultural empathic response is a blending of both affective and cognitive approaches. Based on the results of this study, determining a clearer understanding of a blended cognitive-affective approach was found and can be expanded upon in a secondary study. Due to the constraints of data collection reflecting self-reporting in the SEE as well as in qualitative interviews, a methodology that provides non-biased data could increase our perception of empathic response. In addition, the interviews conducted during this study excluded individuals of color who have a unique perspective of implicit racial bias and ethnocultural empathy within the workplace. This could drastically impact the findings of this study. Next, the findings of this study did
provide generalizable results as there were not enough interviews conducted to infer any additional meaning regarding perception of ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias in the workplace. Increasing the number of interviews would further expand upon the findings explored in this study.

Additionally, given the correlations found between implicit racial bias and Appreciating Cultural Difference (.212) as well as Racial Interpersonal Empathy (.138), while significant for this sample size, Cohen’s (1988) notion of sample size and statistical power would indicate that these correlations were rather low. Future research should consider ways in which to find, based on my hypothesis, a means of increasing the correlation. Methodological considerations such as an increased interview sample size in future studies may affect the strength of correlations. It would also be of value to consider additional measures, alongside the two identified for this study, to utilize when assessing bias and empathy.

When considering the participants of this study, it is important to note that given the data collection methods of utilizing M-Turk. This methodological approach does create limitations. The anonymous nature of the M-Turk platform, particularly the methods of self-selection inherent in the platform, could affect the demographics, motivating drivers, empathy levels, and bias levels of this study’s population. When taken into consideration, this could have skewed the results. The structure of the sample size, particularly for interviews, created limitations in interview perspectives as well. The interviews themselves were from a limited racial composition of predominantly white interviewees. A more diverse, racial and gendered population of participants, would
provide a stronger indication of inferred findings. While the larger sample for quantitative survey completion did include a broader sample population, those who would access and frequent a platform such as M-Turk, may affect results when considering intensive interpersonal interactions. The M-Turk platform’s inherent anonymity might encourage those who would avoid personal interpersonal interaction. This, in turn, could be reflected in empathy and bias data.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to gain insight into the nature of the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias. The research methods employed for this study utilized qualitative and quantitative techniques. Qualitative data was collected via semi-structured interviews with 8 individuals over the age of 18 with workplace experience. Quantitative data was collected using the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy and the Implicit Association Test. The study was designed to collect data to answer the following research questions:

**Question One:** What is the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and implicit racial bias?

**Question Two:** How is implicit racial bias perceived to be experienced in the workplace at the organizational, intrapersonal, and interpersonal levels?

**Research Question Three:** How is ethnocultural empathy perceived to be experienced in the workplace?

The study’s results led to four findings. First, ethnocultural empathy is a psychological phenomenon that contributes to an individual’s level of implicit racial bias.
Second, implicit racial bias in the workplace is perceived to be happening predominantly to other people, the result of other people’s actions, and while having no lasting impact on those who observe it. Third, ethnocultural empathy in the workplace is perceived to be demonstrated predominantly through appreciating cultural difference. Fourth, in measuring ethnocultural empathy, it must be taken into account that there are five distinct factors. The study’s findings have important implications for future research as well as for practice. Regarding future research, studies should consider appreciating cultural difference and its ramifications in organizational behavioral research. Future studies should focus on what factors reduce appreciating cultural difference. Future research should examine what factors increase negative social racial empathy when considering a shift from cognitive to prosocial emotive response. Finally, future studies should focus on the relationship between empathy and other forms of bias. Regarding practice, this study presents implications for new considerations regarding training on privilege as a means of reducing bias. Future interventions should explore design approaches that specifically affect negative social racial empathy. Third, future interventions should consider designs that specifically affect racial interpersonal empathy. Finally, new interventions should consider approaches that specifically affect appreciating cultural difference.

This study provides valuable insight that can drive the work of scholars in the applied behavioral sciences, psychological, and sociological academic fields. These findings can also benefit those motivated practitioners seeking renewed strategies for how to tangibly impact diversity, equity, and inclusion practices. Organizations which are uncertain about how best to meet the challenges associated with burgeoning social
conflict, must strive to evolve. While certainly complex, continuing to identify psychological factors that can mitigate the negative effects of implicit racial bias is of utmost importance in the workplace and across society.
Hello D73 Team,

We have a unique opportunity to participate in a groundbreaking and confidential study being conducted by a classmate of mine at the University of Pennsylvania. In our effort to better understand the dynamics of inclusion, I have invited her to support us along the journey. This survey is 100% voluntary.

**Who is invited?**

All team members in Division 73 are invited to participate.

**What will you be asked to do?**

The online portion of the study takes no more than 20-30 minutes. In addition, you may be asked to take part in a qualitative interview in 2019. You will need to use a computer with a keyboard in order to complete the online portion.

**How you can participate?**

Consider this email to be a formal invitation. The online portion of the survey will be open until December 31st, 2018. Please use this link:

[https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/Launch?study=/user/nlofaro/contract.ethomas.race/manager.expt.xml&refresh=true](https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/Launch?study=/user/nlofaro/contract.ethomas.race/manager.expt.xml&refresh=true)
What happens if I do not choose to join this study? Can I leave the study before it ends?

Your participation is entirely voluntary. You have the right to drop out of the study at any time.

Team, I appreciate your participation if you feel so inclined.

Thank you and have a wonderful day,
## Appendix B: Interview Questions & Rationale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Follow Up</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you share with me your role and a brief description of your responsibilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collects demographics data that may prove useful in thematic analysis of workplace context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe the racial or ethnic make-up of the teams that you work within? Lead? Report to?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identifies peer relationships and leader-follower relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you tell me about a time where you felt that your race or ethnicity impacted your work positively?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify what situations (e.g., interview, critical conversations, leadership scenario, mentorship, etc.) occur that are impacted by race. This also allows participants to begin with a positive association of race/ethnicity and build rapport before approaching more psychologically sensitive topics that may approach negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
associations. This may also potentially demonstrate individual perception of privilege.

<p>| <strong>Can you share what you felt in that moment?</strong> | Articulate the emotional and cognitive awareness of the participant, allowing for an expanded view of cognition in common critical incident responses |
| <strong>Can you share what you noticed of others who observed or participated in this moment?</strong> | Understanding the perception of the emotional and cognitive awareness of active/passive observers allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses |
| <strong>How did this incident alter your interactions moving forward?</strong> | Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness of the observers allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses. This potentially may demonstrate empathic action. |
| <strong>Can you tell me about a time where you felt that your race or</strong> | Identify what situations (e.g., interview, critical conversations, leadership scenario, mentorship, etc.) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ethnicity impacted your work negatively?</strong></th>
<th>demonstrate negative racial bias. This identifies perceptions of biased behavior.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can you share what you felt in that moment?</strong></td>
<td>Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness of the participant allows for an expanded view of cognition in common critical incident responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can you share what you noticed of others who observed or participated in this moment?</strong></td>
<td>Understanding the perception of the emotional and cognitive awareness of active/passive observers allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How did this incident affect you beyond this moment?</strong></td>
<td>Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness (implicit and explicit) of the individual. How did they interpret the learning? What cognitive or behavioral changes emerged as a result?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you tell me about a time where you felt that your race or ethnicity impacted your private life positively?</td>
<td>Identify what situations allowed for demonstrations of personal versus work-specific relationship dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you share what you felt in that moment?</td>
<td>Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness of the participant allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you share what you noticed of others who observed or participated in this moment?</td>
<td>Understanding the perception of the emotional and cognitive awareness of active/passive observers allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did this incident affect you beyond this moment?</td>
<td>Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness (implicit and explicit) of the individual. How did they interpret the learning? What</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you tell me about a time where you felt that your race or ethnicity impacted your private life negatively?</td>
<td>Identify what situations allows for demonstrations of personal versus work-specific relationship dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you share what you felt in that moment?</td>
<td>Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness of the participant allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you share what you noticed of others who observed or participated in this moment?</td>
<td>Understanding the perception of the emotional and cognitive awareness of active/passive observers allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did this incident effect</td>
<td>Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness (implicit and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe empathy in the workplace when interacting with those of a different race or ethnicity?</td>
<td>Additional descriptors for defining ethnocultural empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else that you would like to share?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>you beyond this moment?</strong></td>
<td>explicit) of the individual. How did they interpret the learning? What cognitive or behavioral changes emerged as a result?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Interview Protocol

Interview Information:

Interviewer Name(s):

Name and Title of Person Interviewed:

Title:

Date and Time of Interview:

Type of Interview (in person/phone/video):

Recorded for Transcript: Notes Only Both

Introduction Protocol:

I want to thank you again for agreeing to speak with me today about your perspectives and experiences of bias.

I realize that you know I am a doctoral student at the University of Pennsylvania; as part of my studies, I am conducting interviews that will assist in the ability to understand the relationship between bias and empathy.
During our 60 minutes together, I will ask four questions to gain an understanding of your experiences, both personally and in professional settings.

As mentioned in the confirmation email, the form that exploration will take is simply a conversation. As this study is confidential, and in support of my growth, I want to encourage your candid assessment and input. I truly appreciate your willingness to share these insights.

Before we begin, while I have a signed copy of the informed consent form, emailed when our interview was confirmed—and thank you for returning that promptly—I would like to take time now to outline the main points of the form and obtain your verbal agreement.

To review, I agree that all information shared during this interview will be treated confidentially. No names will be submitted from the interviews, with only myself and my professors viewing the data, which will be used only in support of this assignment. No other company or entity will receive any information about what is said in this interview, including yours. No remuneration is being provided for your participation today, other than my sincere gratitude. Unless you have any questions, will you verbally assert your understanding of that agreement? Thank you!

With your permission, I’d like to record our conversation. While I will be taking written notes, the recording will allow me to later capture nuances that I may have missed. Let me reiterate that the transcript of our conversation will only be shared
with my instructors of my program and used in support of my research.

I know that was a lot! So, before we start, what questions do you have?
Ok, great! With your permission, let’s begin … {Begin Recording}

Interview Questions:

1. Can you share with me your role and a brief description of your responsibilities?

   [This question allows me to get demographics data that may prove useful in thematic analysis of workplace context.]

2. Can you describe the racial or ethnic make-up of the teams that you work within? Lead? Report to?

   [The answer to the question identifies peer relationships and leader-follower relationships.]

3. Can you tell me about a time where you felt that your race or ethnicity impacted your work positively?

   [The next step is to identify what situations (e.g., interview, critical conversations, leadership scenario, mentorship, etc.) occur that are impacted by race. This also allows participants to begin with a positive association of race/ethnicity and build rapport. We will then move to more negative associations.]

   a. Can you share what you felt in that moment?
[Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness of the participant allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses.]

b. Can you share what you noticed of others who observed or participated in this moment?

[Understanding the perception of the emotional and cognitive awareness of active/passive observers allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses.]

c. How did this incident alter your interactions moving forward?

[Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness of the observers allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses. This potentially may demonstrate empathic action.]

4. Can you tell me about a time where you felt that your race or ethnicity impacted your work negatively?

[The next step is to identify what situations (e.g., interview, critical conversations, leadership scenario, mentorship, etc.) surround biased event. This identifies perceptions of biased behavior.]

a. Can you share what you felt in that moment?

[Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness of the participant allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses.]

b. Can you share what you noticed of others who observed or participated
in this moment?

[Understanding the perception of the emotional and cognitive awareness of active/passive observers allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses.]

c. How did this incident affect you beyond this moment?
[Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness (implicit and explicit) of the individual. How did they interpret the learning? What cognitive or behavioral changes emerged as a result?]

5. Can you tell me about a time where you felt that your race or ethnicity impacted your private life positively?

[The next step is to identify what situations allows for demonstrations of personal verse work-specific relationship dynamics.]

a. Can you share what you felt in that moment?
[Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness of the participant allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses.]

b. Can you share what you noticed of others who observed or participated in this moment?
[Understanding the perception of the emotional and cognitive awareness of active/passive observers allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses.]

c. How did this incident affect you beyond this moment?
6. **Can you tell me about a time where you felt that your race or ethnicity impacted your private life negatively?**

[The next step is to identify what situations allows for demonstrations of personal verse work-specific relationship dynamics.]

   a. **Can you share what you felt in that moment?**

   [Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness of the participant allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses.]

   b. **Can you share what you noticed of others who observed or participated in this moment?**

   [Understanding the perception of the emotional and cognitive awareness of active/passive observers allows for an expanded view of common critical incident responses.]

   c. **How did this incident effect you beyond this moment?**

   [Understanding the emotional and cognitive awareness (implicit and explicit) of the individual. How did they interpret the learning? What cognitive or behavioral changes emerged as a result?]
7. How would you describe empathy when interacting with those of a different race or ethnicity?

8. Is there anything that you would like to add?

Well, I would like to thank you for your insightful answers and again for your willingness to invest your time and knowledge towards my project.

I will let you return to your day. Goodbye!
## Appendix D: Code Chart Qualitative Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>SUB-THEME</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Avoidant Racism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Underscores the “distance between dominant and nondominant groups (e.g., being ignored by a sales person in a store or denied housing because of your race).” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Hostile Racism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Describes “actions meant to communicate the target’s inferior status because of his or her membership in a non-dominant racial-group (e.g., being stopped by the police because of your race)” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHR</td>
<td>Aversive-Hostile Racism</td>
<td>Experiences “intended to create distance with strong hostile elements after a person of Color has gained entry into an organization or institution in which they were previously excluded (e.g. having</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
your abilities and professional skills questioned)” (Carter et al., 2016, p. 64)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Privilege</td>
<td>A pattern of assumptions that allow an individual to think of themselves as belonging, in major ways, within a social structure that they benefit from. These assumptions that the individuals’ hold reflect the cultural standards and are therefore capable of being taken advantage of and influencing to the individual’s benefit (McIntosh, 1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL</td>
<td>Organizational Level</td>
<td>Systemic behaviors and processes within a workplace setting. Organizational level behaviors may include such processes as talent acquisition, mentorship, promotion, hierarchical structures or compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRA</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Level</td>
<td>Refers to the concept of internal action that may occur. Action can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive dissonance (CD)</td>
<td>Cognitive dissonance is the clash or discrepancy evoked because of cognitions about the world and ourselves being called into question. The state of tension that emerges is known as a cognitive dissonant effect. As the consequence of experiencing dissonance is an unpleasant sensation, we are motivated to eliminate or reduce this tension and achieve consonance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma (TR)</td>
<td>Trauma is a psychological response to a trigger. Traumatic symptoms can include, but are not limited to stress, depression, and anxiety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering (CV)</td>
<td>Covering is something that we all do to various degrees in the workplace to hide elements of our authentic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
selves in an effort to fit in with the dominant culture. In racial instances role takes priority and is perceived as more important that racial identity.

| INTER | Interpersonal Level | Interactions that occur between people such as between silo’d teams, cross-functional project teams, workplace departments, divisions or hierarchical groups (e.g. individual contributor, external customer, internal customer, supervisor). Interactions between people can also include 1:1 contact such as in the case of peer-to-peer, leader-to-follower or employee-to-customer (external or internal).

<p>| ACCEPTANCE CULTURAL DIFFERENCE (ACD) | | ACD stipulates an understanding, acceptance and ascribing value to the individual customs and cultural traditions of various racial and ethnic groups. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnocultural Empathy Factors</th>
<th>Negative Social Racial Empathy (NE)</th>
<th>A noted difficulty or discomfort with taking on the perspective of another race.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racial Interpersonal Empathy (RIE)</td>
<td>The experience of feeling another’s emotions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathic Awareness (EA)</td>
<td>EA considers the knowledge that one’s lived experience may differ from those of people from differing racial or ethnic groups. There is a hyper focus on discriminatory or unequal treatment by or of diverse groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathic Feeling and Expression (EFE)</td>
<td>EFE addresses concern via thoughts, feelings, words, or actions about expressed discriminatory or prejudiced attitudes or beliefs. In addition, this factor considers the emotional or physical response to the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
emotions or lived experiences of people from differing racial or ethnic groups from that of the participant.
Appendix D- Doodle Interview Email Invitation

Hello,

This invitation is in regards to the Empathy study that you participated in at the end of 2018. You have been identified as a respondent to complete the interview portion of the study.

Please respond to this invitation by indicating your availability for a 1-hour video conference. Please indicate as many windows of availability as suits your schedule. If a video conference is not possible, there is always the option to schedule a phone call instead.

I appreciate your continued involvement in this study and look forward to talking with you shortly!

Sincerely,
Carla Thomas
Researcher
University of Pennsylvania
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