Leveraging Diversity and Inclusion

Robert W. Livingston, PhD
Harvard University
Center for Public Leadership
What do you see? (write it down)
Why is Diversity Important?
Motives for diversity  
(Ely & Thomas, 2001)

- **1. Discrimination and Fairness**—diversity is a moral imperative. Progress measured by recruitment and retention goals. Numbers game.

- **2. Access and Legitimacy**—diversity is valued, but in its place. Diverse individuals may feel used, constrained, and exploited.

- **3. Integration and Learning**—diversity is viewed as a valuable resource. Diverse people provide unique perspectives and shapes the organization. Diversity serves as catalyst for creativity and innovation.
Integration and Learning (Page, 2007)

THE DIFFERENCE

HOW THE POWER OF DIVERSITY CREATES BETTER GROUPS, FIRMS, SCHOOLS, AND SOCIETIES

Scott E. Page
Superadditivity $2 + 2 = 5$

The more complex the task or problem, the greater the benefit of diversity
The Carpenter’s Toolbox
Which Set of Tools Would You Choose?
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- Quality
- Diversity
What’s the Nature of the Job?
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Diversity Facilitates Innovation and Breakthroughs (Johansson, 2006)
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How?
1. Differential Perception
2. Information Sharing
What did you see?
Differential Perception

“The Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently and Why” (Nisbett, 2008)
Differential Perception in Action: Gamers Solve Decade Old HIV Puzzle in 10 days

AP-October 17, 2013
Scientists from University of Washington have been struggling for the past decade to decipher the complex structure of an enzyme that exhibits behavior similar to that of an enzyme key in the development of AIDS from an HIV infection, and which might hold a critical role in building a cure for the disease. Gamers playing spatial game Foldit have managed to collectively determine the enzyme’s structure in ten days…
Information Sharing: Old Mutual Building; Harare, Zimbabwe
Barriers to Diversity
Barriers to Diversity

- #1: Awareness!
Problem Awareness—Is there a problem?
P-R-O-G-R-E-S-S Framework
(Livingston, 2018)

- **PROblem Awareness**—Is there a problem?

- **GRreater Understanding**—What’s causing the problem?

- **Empathy and Concern**—I understand, but do I care?

- **Strategy**—What can I do to solve the problem?

- **Sacrifice**—Am I willing to incur the cost, effort, or trade-offs? Do I have the determination or courage?
Perceptions of Racism (Norton & Sommers, 2011)
What is Racism?

- Prejudice and Discrimination often occur outside of:
  - 1. awareness
  - 2. intent
  - 3. control
Aversive Racism Theory (Gaertner & Dovidio)

- People simultaneously possess:
  1. Egalitarian values
  2. Anti-Black Affect (feelings)

- People push their negative feelings into the subconscious to avoid threats to self-integrity.
- However, these feelings linger to affect behaviors in situations that are ambiguous.

- e.g., Helping Study, Hiring Study (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1996)
Personnel Decisions

Recommendations

1989
Strong Qualifications
Moderate Qualifications

1999
Strong Qualifications
Moderate Qualifications

2005
Strong Qualifications
Moderate Qualifications

Black Candidate
White Candidate
Other Subtle Forms of Bias: Micro-Aggressions (Sue et al., 2007)

- Micro-aggressions are: (1) brief, (2) commonplace/everyday, (3) often unintentional slights, that often have health and performance outcomes.

Examples:

- “You are very articulate” (I didn’t think that people of your group could be intelligent)

- “Dismissing an individual who brings up race at work” (Don’t be so sensitive/Leave your cultural baggage behind)

- “Having ideas or comments ignored” (You don’t have anything valuable to contribute)

- “Waiting for the next elevator” (You are dangerous)
Psychological vs. Interpersonal vs. Structural Bias
Wealth Gap

RACIAL WEALTH GAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Wealth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>$110,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>$69,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>$7,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>$4,955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census Bureau
Other Structural Disparities...

- Income
- Mortality
- Health Care
- Nutrition
- Housing
- Unemployment
- Police Brutality
- Incarceration
- Leadership...
Diversity in Leadership

- Female Fortune 500 CEOs in 2018: 26
  - First Female Fortune 500 CEO: 1972 (Katharine Graham)

- Black Fortune 500 CEOs in 2018: 5
  - First Black Fortune 500 CEO: 1987 (Clifton Wharton)

Roughly 95% of CEOs are both White and Male!
What is unique about the Blacks that make it? (Livingston & Pearce, 2009)

- Competence
- Diligence
- Credentials

- **Disarming mechanisms** (Livingston & Pearce, 2009) — physical, psychological, or behavioral tendencies that mitigate perceived threat by increasing perceptions of warmth, humility, similarity, or deference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style of dress</th>
<th>Manner of speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighter skin</td>
<td>Political ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling/deferential behavior</td>
<td>Displays of erudition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistling Vivaldi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Steele &amp; Aronson, 1995)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What is Babyfaceness? (Zebrowitz, 1997)

The Teddy Bear Effect (Livingston & Pearce, 2009; *Psychological Science*)

- **Prediction:** high-ranking Black, but **not** White, leaders will benefit from disarming features (i.e., babyfaceness) that render them less threatening in appearance.
Babyfaceness Ratings

- Black CEOs: 2.05
- Matched White CEOs: 1.9
- Random White CEOs: 1.96
- Female CEOs: (bar not visible)
Correlations between Babyfaceness and Success (Black and White Males)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Comp</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black CEOs</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White CEOs</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Should Babyfaceness help White women?
Opposite Effect for White Women vs. Black Men

- Black CEOs: 2.05
- Matched White CEOs: 1.90
- Random White CEOs: 1.96
- Women CEOs: 1.70
Babyfaceness hurts Female Executives

Mature-faceness conveys competence and assertiveness
Gender and Backlash: The Challenges of Facing Women Leaders

Disparity in how men and women are evaluated when they use an “autocratic” style (Eagly & Johnson, 1990)
Women punished for behaving in powerful ways (i.e., subordinated)

- Large body of research showing that women suffer an “agency penalty” for appearing too tough, assertive, angry or self-promoting (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Livingston, Rosette, & Washington, 2012; Okimoto & Brescoll, 2010; Rudman, 1998; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004)


- Women are and “should“ be warm, gentle, and passive

- However, Leaders are and “should” be strong, tough and powerful
Hurricane Michael vs. Michelle

“Feminine-named hurricanes cause significantly more deaths apparently because they lead to lower perceived risk and consequently less preparedness”

Do I Care?
Which Option Would You Choose?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You Receive</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Receives</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this example, if you were to select:
- ‘A’ you would receive 500 points = 5 and the “other” would receive 100 points = 1
- ‘B’ you would receive 500 points = 5 and the “other” would receive 500 points = 5
- ‘C’ you would receive 550 points = 5.5 and the “other” would receive 300 points = 3

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0005535.t002
Am I Concerned About Other People?
Social Value Orientation (SVO; Van Lange, 1999)

- **Individualist**—Seeks to Increase Outcomes for Self, being largely *indifferent* to Outcomes for Others

- **Competitor**—Seeks to *increase* difference between Outcomes for Self and Others, in favor of self

- **Prosocial**—Seeks Increase Outcomes for Self and Others, in a relatively *equitable* manner
### Social Value Orientation (SVO) as Percentage of Population (Au & Kwong, 2004)

- **Individualist**—38%  
  550 me / 300 you
- **Competitor**—12%  
  500 me / 100 you
- **Prosocial**—46%  
  500 me / 500 you

*About Half of Population is Proself*

*Moreover, 1 out of 8 individuals has the strong desire to keep other people from having access to resources*
Assuming There is Concern, How Does One Decide What is Fair?

Equality vs. Equity

- **Equality** - everyone gets the *same* thing

- **Equity** - output is *relative* to input (i.e., you get out of it what you put into it)

  e.g., splitting a dinner bill
How to Approach Diversity?

1. Treat everyone the same
   [(e.g., “colorblindness” (melting pot)]

2. Treat people differently in a way that makes sense
   [(e.g., “multi-culturalism” (casserole)]
Sometimes People Are Not the Same
How to Manage Diverse Needs?
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Approaches to Diversity

1. **High commitment to bigotry** (e.g., Jackie Robinson)
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1. **High commitment to bigotry** (e.g., Jackie Robinson)
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3. **High commitment to diversity** (e.g., effort, attention)
Approaches to Diversity

1. **High commitment to bigotry** (e.g., Jackie Robinson) 10%

2. **Low commitment to bigotry** (e.g., colorblind) 60%

3. **High commitment to diversity** (e.g., effort, attention) 30%
Diversity in Practice

- In my experience it’s almost never the pipeline (e.g., WH)

- Real change always involves a shift in policy and practices, not just implicit bias training

- Very few organizations are willing to walk the talk

- Why? Don’t know how, A Lot of Work, Don’t see the point
Questions:

- Does your organization really value diversity and inclusion? Why?

- What does your organization envision as “success”? Numbers? Climate?

- What is your organization willing to tolerate or sacrifice to achieve success?
Thank You!