



H A R V A R D | B U S I N E S S | S C H O O L

**Rising Scholars Conference
Diversity and Inequality Student Research Presentations**

Ricardo Brooks
rbrooks2@albany.edu

SUNY University at Albany

Ricardo Brooks is a fourth-year doctoral candidate in the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Department at the University at Albany, State University of New York. His research specializes in antecedents and outcomes of organizational learning and the influence of ecological factors (e.g., financial insecurity) on individual-level work outcomes.

ABSTRACT:

Alternative Antecedent for Adherence to Safety Policies and Procedures

Each year since 2011, it is estimated that between 4,693 and 5,147 American workers have died from workplace injuries (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017) equating to approximately 12 deaths per day in the United States. More staggering is the prevalence of non-fatal injuries and illnesses. A reported 2.8 million non-fatal workplace injuries and illnesses were reported from private sector employers. This number remained unchanged between the years 2017 and 2018 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018). To make matters worse, both victims and witnesses of workplace accidents are susceptible to negative health outcomes such as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), dependence on medication, or the need to see professional mental health practitioners (MacDonald et al., 2003). Moreover, the National Safety Council (NSC) estimates that work-related accidents cost the United States approximately \$161.5 Billion dollars. Injuries also cost organizations over 100 million days' worth of work-not including time lost on the day of injury, time associated with further medical treatment, and follow-ups after an individual's return to work (Council, 2017). The cost of these injuries don't include additional organizational costs such as decreased morale and motivation. It is important to note that these statistics may be deflated due to underreporting. Additionally, we highlight concerns that individuals who hold a disproportionately high number of safety oriented or physically demanding jobs also come from a socioeconomically sensitive backgrounds. For example, "blue collar" work is often male dominated and associated with lower SES. However, in particular blue collar work for particular groups (e.g., African American and single mothers) is associated with lower SES in that these individuals have less "choice" in the matter regarding "opting into" these lines of work (Clougherty et al., 2010). Therefore, while on the job these workers are required to attend to their necessary task performance, their safety performance, and likely self-regulate negative outcomes associated with a lack of financial security such as financial anxiety, intrusive concerns (i.e., cognitions), or difficult decision-making. While these financial concerns may not always be directly job-related, budding literature concerning the construct of Scarcity, the feeling of having less than you need (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013) indicate that individuals suffering from financial scarcity may experience reduced cognitive performance, failures in attentional regulation and cognitive interference (intrusive thoughts), and lack of attention to non-resource relevant stimuli (Mani et al., 2013; Shah, Mullainathan, et al., 2018; Shah, Zhao, et al., 2018). Furthermore, non-task related cognitions associated with a scarce resource can pull attention away from the task. Those cognitions are also more difficult to suppress once induced. The goal of this research is to propose an alternative framework for safety behaviors on-the-job which include the duress and reduction in personal resources that individuals working safety-oriented job may experience. Historically, the literature has identified a wide range of antecedents of workplace safety behaviors such as safety knowledge, skills, motivation, individual differences (e.g., personality and locus of control), managerial and leadership behaviors, job demands and resources, and organizational climate (Beus et al., 2016; Kaplan & Tetrick, 2011). Furthermore, according to the job-demands resources (JD-R) model, "job demands (e.g., work overload, job risks/hazards) and job resources (e.g., social support, autonomy) influence individuals' safety related behaviors through their effects on the availability of personal resources" (Beus et al., 2016, p. 361; Nahrgang et al., 2011). However, this does not take into account the additional demands that one's socioeconomic status may place on the work-related personal resources.

References

- Beus, J. M., McCord, M. A., & Zohar, D. (2016). Workplace safety: A review and research synthesis. *Organizational psychology review*, 6(4), 352-381.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. D. o. L. (2017). Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries. <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/cfoi.nr0.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. D. o. L. (2018). Employer-Reported Workplace Injury and Illness. <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/osh.nr0.htm>
- Clougherty, J. E., Souza, K., & Cullen, M. R. (2010). Work and its role in shaping the social gradient in health. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1186, 102-124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.05338.x>
- Council, N. S. (2017). *Injury facts*. <https://injuryfacts.nsc.org/work/costs/work-injury-costs/>
- Kaplan, S., & Tetrick, L. E. (2011). Workplace safety and accidents: An industrial and organizational psychology perspective.
- MacDonald, H. A., Colotla, V., Flamer, S., & Karlinsky, H. (2003). Posttraumatic stress disorder(PTSD) in the workplace: a descriptive study of workers experiencing PTSD resulting from work injury. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 13(2), 63-77.
- Mani, A., Mullainathan, S., Shafir, E., & Zhao, J. (2013). Poverty impedes cognitive function. *Science* (6149). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1238041>
- Mullainathan, S., & Shafir, E. (2013). *Scarcity: Why having too little means so much*. Macmillan.
- Nahrgang, J. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). Safety at Work: A Meta-Analytic Investigation of the Link Between Job Demands, Job Resources, Burnout, Engagement, and Safety Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 71-94. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021484>
- Shah, A. K., Mullainathan, S., & Shafir, E. (2018). An exercise in self-replication: Replicating Shah, Mullainathan, and Shafir (2012). *Journal of Economic Psychology*.
- Shah, A. K., Zhao, J., Mullainathan, S., & Shafir, E. (2018). Money in the mental lives of the poor. *Social Cognition*, 36(1), 4-19.

Elaine Costa
elaine.costa@utah.edu

University of Utah

Elaine Costa is a management Ph.D. candidate at the David Eccles School of Business at the University of Utah. Her research interests include social perception, stereotyping, judgment accuracy, and how people generally process information to draw inferences about other individuals and groups.

ABSTRACT:

Examining the Effectiveness of Interventions to Reduce
Discriminatory Behavior at Work: a Meta-Analysis

This meta-analysis examines interventions to mitigate discriminatory outcomes in the workplace. Based on the emphasis of evaluating reduction efforts in discriminatory rather behavior than in prejudicial attitudes, this analysis is focused on behavioral outcomes only (i.e., measures designed to capture participants' actions or decisions in a given situation). A mixed-effects multilevel model is utilized in every meta-analytical procedure, accounting for random effects at the paper level to address potential dependencies in effect sizes from the same manuscript. Preliminary evidence from a sample that includes 27 studies reporting 53 effect sizes and testing eighteen different interventions indicate that the procedures employed so far can be effective, but to varying degrees. Moderator analyses indicate that short-term education or reminders for individuals to refrain from biased behavior are generally ineffective. On the other hand, signaling a common identity, imagining contact, providing counterstereotypical information, and making individuals accountable for their decisions emerged as helpful interventions. An overreliance on attempts to change and measure attitudes rather than behaviors impairs the ability to uncover more effective behaviorally-focused interventions in this field.

Daniela Goya-Tocchetto
dg217@duke.edu

Duke University

Daniela Goya-Tocchetto is a Ph.D. candidate in management and organizations at the Fuqua School of Business, Duke University. Her research focuses on economic inequality and meritocratic ideology. She is particularly interested in uncovering the psychological mechanisms that enable the maintenance of unjust organizational and social arrangements.

ABSTRACT:

Myopic Meritocracy: Learning About Past Socioeconomic Inequality
Undermines the Perceived Fairness of Meritocracy

Most people believe that equality of opportunity and meritocracy are core features of a just society. Providing everyone—irrespective of race, ethnicity, and gender—with equal opportunity to compete for open positions and rewarding individuals in an unbiased fashion based solely on their achievements represent the gold standard of fairness in organizations (Scully, 2000; McNamee & Miller, 2004; Cooper 2015; Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Ladd & Bowman, 1998; Lemann, 1999; Longoria, 2009; Dobbin, 2009). That is, equality of opportunity and meritocracy appear to go hand in hand when it comes to our ideal of societal and organizational justice (Tyler, 2014). But what happens when we have meritocratic processes amongst people that had different socioeconomic opportunities in life? Growing up with access to different socioeconomic opportunities can lead to measurable differences in long term economic success. For example, just 30% of American children born to families in the bottom income quartile were expected to enroll in college, compared to 80% from the top income quartile (Bailey & Dynarski, 2011). But the effects of socioeconomic inequality on economic outcomes are not obvious to everyone in society. Socioeconomic advantages and disadvantages in one's background are not necessarily visible, and it is usual for people to try to conceal markers of low socioeconomic status in an attempt to fit in high socioeconomic status environments (Rivera, 2012; Rivera & Tilcsik, 2016). Even when people are aware of socioeconomic differences, it is common for them to engage in rationalizations and to endorse ideologies that enable them to believe that, irrespective of socioeconomic status, everyone can work hard and have an equal chance at being successful (Jost, Federico, & Napier, 2009; Jost & Hunyady, 2005; Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004; Kay & Jost, 2003; Jost, 2020). As a result, socioeconomic background tends to be left out of evaluations of the fairness of organizational meritocratic processes such as hirings and promotions. In our work, we hypothesize that people have a general tendency to myopically evaluate meritocratic process and outcomes, overlooking the influence of past socioeconomic advantages and disadvantages on current achievements. That is, people assume that meritocracy tracks talent and effort and, as a result, neglect the influences of socioeconomic background on measures of performance such as GPA and the number of internships that one can complete. We call this phenomenon Myopic Meritocracy. We define myopic meritocracy as the tendency to apply temporally myopic lenses when evaluating the fairness of meritocratic processes and outcomes. These lenses work by restricting people's perceptions in such a way that they fail to pay attention to past socioeconomic information, myopically focusing exclusively on decontextualized procedures and rules. Yet we predict that learning about

past socioeconomic inequality will psychologically affect the evaluation of the very same meritocratic rules and processes (e.g., hiring and promotion) that were antecedently believed to be fair. As our studies show, it does not take much for people to adjust their perceptions of meritocracy and believe that the very same meritocratic rules are significantly less fair. So far, we have explored the notion of myopic meritocracy across four studies (N = 1,811). In a nutshell, our studies showed that learning about past socioeconomic advantages and disadvantages amongst job candidates and employees before evaluating the fairness of meritocratic organizational processes and outcomes—such as hiring and promotions—is associated with lower levels of perceived fairness of the very same meritocratic processes and outcomes.

Hannah Waldfogel

hannah.waldfogel@kellogg.northwestern.edu

Northwestern University

I am a PhD candidate in the Management and Organizations Department at Northwestern University's Kellogg School of Management. My primary line of research examines causes and consequences of ideological differences in perceptions of social inequality.

ABSTRACT:

Ideology Selectively Shapes Attention to Inequality

Abstract: Contemporary debates about addressing inequality require a common, accurate understanding of the scope of the issue at hand. Yet little is known about who notices inequality in the world around them and when. Across five studies (N = 8,779) employing various paradigms, we consider the role of ideological beliefs about the desirability of social equality in shaping individuals' attention to—and accuracy in detecting—inequality across the class, gender, and racial domains. In Study 1, individuals higher (versus lower) on social egalitarianism were more likely to naturalistically remark on inequality when shown photographs of urban scenes. In Study 2, social egalitarians were more accurate at differentiating between equal versus unequal distributions of resources between men and women on a basic cognitive task. In Study 3, social egalitarians were faster to notice inequality-relevant changes in images in a change detection paradigm indexing basic attentional processes. In Studies 4 and 5, we varied whether unequal treatment adversely affected groups at the top or bottom of society. In Study 4, social egalitarians were, on an incentivized task, more accurate at detecting inequality in speaking time in a panel discussion that disadvantaged women but not when inequality disadvantaged men. In Study 5, social egalitarians were more likely to naturalistically point out bias in a pattern detection hiring task when the employer was biased against minorities but not when majority group members faced equivalent bias. Our results reveal the nuances in how our ideological beliefs shape whether we accurately notice inequality, with implications for prospects for addressing it.