CrossMark

FEMINIST FORUM COMMENTARY

Hidden in Plain Sight: Locating, Validating, and Advocating the Stigma Experiences of Women of Color

Adrienne R. Carter-Sowell[1] · Carla A. Zimmerman[1]

Abstract In this commentary, we reflect and expand on Remedios and Snyder's (2015) target paper "How Women of Color Detect and Respond to Multiple Forms of Prejudice." We, initially, address the perceived lack of available women of color participants for human behavior studies conducted in the United States. We offer remedies to this expectation of deficits in order for researchers to retool their recruitment plans for traditional undergraduate subjects. Specifically, we highlight the changing demographic profiles of U.S. undergraduate students and we draw attention to potentially overlooked campus-based sources of women of color participants. Next, we discuss validated measures for researchers interested in assessing individuals with multiply-stigmatized group identities. The individual difference measures (double consciousness and chronic ostracism experiences) as well as an explicit evaluation (Strong Black Woman schema) may inform pending research examining group processes, health-related indicators, and predicted behaviors. Moreover, we identify critical areas of psychological research that can inform administrators of public policies and enlighten stakeholders for institutional transformations. In particular, we focus on factors that affect representation and retention of women in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields in the Unites States. In sum, these suggestions have extensive implications for enhancing research on the stigma experiences and responses to prejudice for women of color, by providing U.S. researchers with practical solutions for recruiting women of color and measuring their experiences.

✉ Adrienne R. Carter-Sowell
acsowell@tamu.edu

[1] Department of Psychology and Africana Studies Program, Texas A & M University, College Station, TX 77843-4235, USA

Introduction

In this commentary, we discuss possible remedies to perceived barriers of inclusion for women of color in human behavior research conducted within the United States. Additionally, we reference current literature on stereotyping processes, and suggest newly developed and validated measures to assess stigma experiences of multiply-stigmatized targets. All empirical studies cited within were conducted in the United States, unless otherwise noted. Furthermore, we reveal the hidden biases present in the workplace that may impair the psychological and emotional well-being of U.S. women of color workers. Taken as a whole, we build on the framework laid out by Remedios and Snyder (2015) in order to provide novel solutions for the practical challenges faced by researchers interested in studying the processes by which women of color living in the United States detect and respond to prejudice.

Recent anniversaries, such as the 50th Anniversary Edition of *The Feminine Mystique* (Friedan 1963/1997/2013) and the 50th Anniversary of Bloody Sunday (Chandler and Lucas 2015), set the stage for a critical assessment of how women of color have been hiding in plain sight from psychology scholars who study stigma experiences. The commemorations of these landmark events raise an important question. Why are women of color celebrated as present and relevant in these milestone moments in U.S. history, yet as an intersectional group, they are absent from research studies considering responses to prejudice?

The concept of intersectionality emphasizes that each person belongs to multiple social groups and thus meaningful consequences occur according to perceived belonging in simultaneous social categories (Cole 2009). As the theoretical

Springer

paper by Remedios and Snyder (2015) suggests, the processes by which women of color, detect and respond to prejudices differ from the reactions by majority members. This predicted response difference is linked to the multiple identities women of color possess that are associated with experiences of racism, sexism, and intersectional biases (Bowleg 2008). Hence, a comprehensive, analytic overview of the existing process models of stigmatization and the prevalent strategies for coping with discrimination, such as that given by Remedios and Snyder (2015), is warranted. In order to expand on their review, we focus on the perceived barriers to research on women of color.

Implementing an Asset-Based Orientation Over Deficit Focused Expectations

Remedios and Snyder (2015) provide a thorough explanation of the challenges facing stigma researchers that contribute to the perception of barriers for including women of color in data collection, measurement and operationalization in studies. Clearly, attention to increasing the number of participants of color in research is potentially the best strategy to developing protocols that may remedy gender and racial disparities. Nonetheless, the practice of focusing on the barriers to participation by women of color in stigma research fosters a long established belief in the inevitable scarcity for collecting data from diverse sources. Furthermore, describing the deficits in measurement tools that capture the unique experiences of multiply-stigmatized individuals sustains reliance on White female respondents as the normative group. Commonly, researchers use a group-centered view of intersectionality, focusing on the intersection of identities without consideration of the individual, social, and institutional processes that affect an individual's experience within these groups (see Choo and Ferree 2010 for a discussion of these alternative viewpoints of intersectionality). Consequently, what researchers mean by intersectionality may limit the development of contextual and culturally relevant theories regarding the unique stigma experiences of women of color. In sum, deficit focused expectations have led psychology scholars to ignore how existing process models of stigmatization, when applied to the stigmatization of women of color, leave important research questions unanswered. Meanwhile, implementing an asset-based orientation may shift research momentum to build the literature on strategies for coping with multiple stigmas.

What is an asset-based orientation? An asset-based orientation primarily recognizes the strengths of the individual, association, and institution based on the identified group's perceived needs (Yeneabat and Butterfield 2012; conducted in Ethiopia). Mengesha et al. (2015) selected seven principles to assess asset-based community-driven development efforts in Ethiopia. Rodriguez and Morrobel (2004) examined Latino

Youth Development programs using metrics consisting of asset-based and deficit/risk based measures developed by the Search Institute (Benson et al. 1999). The results from their review of the literature showed a prominence of publications featuring deficit models, while asset oriented studies were available only in Latino-focused journals (Rodriguez and Morrobel 2004). Ponjuan (2013) suggests that rather than intervention activities, the promotion of positive programs and modified research designs can create new knowledge, spawn mutually beneficial collaborations, and altogether lead to greater understanding of the stigma experiences of Latino students. One example of a positive program for women of color is the Society of STEM Women of Color (SSWOC), incorporated in 2014. The SSWOC professional organization is guided by four principles designed to foster a visible and viable community of women of color faculty who are active in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) disciplines at research universities and institutions in the United States. Moreover, the SSWOC has successfully developed research collaborations and conducted asset-based assessments among the membership to illustrate the influence of self-efficacy on career achievements for STEM women of color (Mack et al. 2015). Stigma researchers can be encouraged by this example and adopt similar asset-based orientations and culturally competent outreach strategies (Mack et al. 2015) to discover how women of color are hidden in plain sight as potential participants, research collaborators for interdisciplinary stigma research, and improved scholarship.

Challenging the Perceived Lack of Access to Non-White Female Participants on College Campuses

Aptly, Remedios and Snyder (2015) cite scholars, such as Shelton (2000), on the pragmatic dilemma researchers may face due to the limited availability of women of color participants partaking in subject pools at predominately White universities. Moreover, Remedios and Snyder (2015) highlight the proven techniques researchers employ to recruit racial minority participants, including posting ads for online research studies (Gosling and Johnson 2010), conducting studies at community gatherings (Apfelbaum et al. 2008), and using archival or other large data sets with appropriate demographic records (Babbitt 2011),

These aforementioned recommendations are sensible ones, but there is another campus source available to researchers for women of color participants. These individuals are hidden in plain sight as part of the changing statistics of U.S. higher education. In 2009, more than 61 % of all associate's or bachelor's degrees earned by Hispanics were earned by female students (NCES 2010). Similarly, in 2006, data published in *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* (JBHE) reported

that Black women earned about two thirds of all African-American bachelor's degree awards and accounted for 63.6 % of all African-American student enrollments. Surveys conducted by JBHE showed that Black women, compared to black men, received 70 % of all master's degrees, and more than 60 % of all doctorates. Also, findings are that Black women, compared to Black men, hold a majority of all African-American enrollments in law, medical, and dental schools. In sum, with over 3.5 million female Black or Hispanic students enrolled in undergraduate or post-baccalaureate programs (National Center for Education Statistics 2014) women of color are a growing demographic group on college campuses from the undergraduate classes through professional and doctoral degree programs. Hence, human behavior researchers can study stigma experiences with women of color, there just needs to be a more comprehensive recruitment plan to secure these sample populations.

Yet another, hidden in plain sight, source for women of color participants can be located on campus but outside of the traditional subject pools. Specifically, researchers who are interested in human participants can select participant populations beyond the students enrolled in introductory psychology courses. Researchers can broaden participation by recruiting campus staff, temporary workers, and work study students to their projects. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are almost 1 million Black women working in food preparation and service, building and grounds maintenance, and transportation related occupations (U.S. Census Bureau 2013). Given this labor statistic, the demographic profile of workers in dining and hospitality services, custodial jobs, and parking and transportation enforcement are likely to be consistent with the intersectional identities that stigma researchers seek. Additionally, given the nature of their work, these potential participants are apt to have multiple stigma experiences readily available to report. In order to successfully expand recruitment in this manner, researchers may need to reconfigure the scheduling of studies, train the research staff to emphasize the confidentiality, consent, and debriefing processes to participants, as well as provide translation options of the instructions, measures, and scales. Lastly, researchers can modify the explanation of benefits, risks, and compensations to fit the needs and interests specific to this campus employee participant pool.

Likewise, research themed consortiums on academic campuses may offer researchers shared access to participants. For example, housed within the College of Liberal Arts at a large, public, southwestern university, researchers may affiliate with members of the Diversity Science group within the Psychology Department (http://psychology.tamu.edu/html/diversity-science.html), partner with the Race and Ethnic Studies Institute in the Sociology Department (http://resi.tamu.edu) or join the Project for Equity, Representation, and Governance in the Political Science Department (http://perg-tamu.com/). In general, these types of work groups promote collaborative research and interdisciplinary perspectives that can combine recruitment efforts and pool resources. Accordingly, researchers of stigma experiences may then provide women of color participants with novel study designs, efficient data collecting methods, and better compensation options for partaking in an integrated program of research rather than a series of disjointed or loosely affiliated studies.

Altogether, these examples confirm that women of color are present on college campuses and are relevant to research questions of interests. Regrettably, the lack of visibility for these individuals perpetuates hidden in plain sight conditions and as noted by Remedios and Snyder (2015), a common practice may continue to eliminate data from female participants of color. Nonetheless, it is evident that through creative outreach and modifications to standard research protocols, stigma researchers can combat the perceived lack of access to non-White female participants on college campuses.

Assessing the Unique Experiences of Multiply-Stigmatized Targets: Show Me the Measures!

Fittingly, Remedios and Snyder (2015) mention the lack of measurement tools that are known to researchers and validated to capture multiple identities. The standard of the field is for scales to examine one stigmatized identity at a time, such as gender identification (McCoy and Major 2003). Fortunately, emerging scholars are developing the measurement tools missing from the literature on race and gender stigma, intersectionality, and multiple identities. These newly developed assessments can advance hypotheses about how women of color experience stigma as well as strengthen predictions concerning how women of color cope with having multiple race and gender stigmas.

For example, researchers (Powell et al. 2015) investigate the topic of double consciousness and health outcomes in women of color by using the BRFSS- Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey to examine the extent to which the effects of double consciousness as a woman of color (Black and Latino) impact health outcomes (obesity, diabetes, and hypertension). Double consciousness refers to the act of balancing and navigating two identities. For Black women in particular, double consciousness refers to navigating their African and U. S. identities in the society. Previous studies have investigated the impact of discrimination on health outcomes in African-Americans in general, but have only recently examined the relationship between double consciousness (as an indicator of internalized perceived race-based discriminations) on health outcomes, particularly for women of color. Given the unique professional and personal challenges faced by women of color in society, double consciousness may

serve as an appropriate determinant to investigate in this population. Furthermore, the findings can extend to disciplines in African-American and Latino studies, psychology areas, and health care fields, in which such scholarship benefits the education, study, or treatments for women of color.

Additionally, researchers (Belgrave et al. 2015) have developed a culturally relevant measure of gender role beliefs of Black women that can assist researchers in understanding the influence of gender roles on a variety of indicators of Black women's health and well-being. These researchers trained in health psychology and diversity science methodologies have learned of the salience of the Strong Black Woman (SBW) gender schema (Abrams et al. 2014), its relation to stress, and its perceived influence on physical and mental health. Future research plans from this multidisciplinary team intends to garner a better understanding of this construct to identify defining characteristics of the SBW gender schema and use biometric, physiological, and psychological measures to examine influences of emotion regulation, stress, and a culturally relevant gender schema on cardiovascular disease risk in Black women. Undoubtedly, advances in this specialized program of research will expand the measurement tools used by other stigma researchers to assess how women of color respond to multiple forms of prejudice.

Next, Remedios and Snyder (2015) suggest that issues mainly faced by women of color, like intersectional invisibility (Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach 2008), deserve attention in the literature. Building on this mandate, Williams and Carter-Sowell (2009) reported that chronically ostracized (ignored and excluded) individuals are a distinct group, compared to individuals who perceive little to no social rejection. Goodwin et al. (2010) found that African-American research participants (members of a stigmatized group) experienced ostracism to be relatively more threatening than did Caucasian research participants (members of a non-stigmatized group). Researchers (Riva et al. 2014) found that social and physical pain overlap in chronic conditions and that both social and physical chronic pain persistently impair self-regulatory resources and threaten the same basic psychological needs of targeted individuals. Subsequently, this line of research produced a validated Ostracism Experiences Scale (OES) created to assess individual differences in general perceptions of being ignored and excluded by others (Carter-Sowell 2010). This work led to a modified Ostracism Experiences Scale for Adolescents (OES-A) that assesses different ostracism subtypes: the socially rejected and the socially neglected. The OES-A measure was validated among 800 high school seniors across several schools and included adolescent age, males and females, with a representative percentage of participants self-reported as African-American, Hispanic/Latino, or Caucasian (Gilman et al. 2013). These measures (OES and OES-A) allow researchers to evaluate the important distinctions among ostracized targets as

individuals, grouped individuals, and individuals who belong to stigmatized or marginalized groups.

Indeed, the long standing barrier to studying the stigmatization of women of color is the lack of measurement tools available to researchers. The recently validated assessments that have been identified in this commentary are designed to capture the unique experiences of multiply-stigmatized targets and will certainly advance research efforts across the spectrum of human behavior research areas. Similar to the cautions from Fisher et al. (1997) for researchers not to only include more ethnic minorities in their studies but to advance a grounded theory, here too, the reorientation in assessments should inspire psychology scholars to develop new operational definitions of what researchers mean by intersectionality.

The current literature on stereotyping processes may provide benchmarks for suggesting future areas of stigma research. For this purpose, we will discuss two processes – the stereotype content model (Fiske et al. 2002) and crossed-categorization contexts (Crisp et al. 2010). Fiske et al.'s (2002) stereotype content model (SCM) examines how stereotypes of social groups vary based on dimensions of warmth and competence. Cuddy et al. (2009) assessed the stereotype content of social groups across cultures. Additionally, research relying on the stereotype content model has examined general perceptions of Black people (Fiske et al. 2002). The differences in stereotype content (Fiske et al. 2002) suggests that the content of stereotypes for Black people shifts in response to its intersection with social class. The same manner of change should be expected when examining, for example, Black women in relation to Black people in general, or women in general. However, presently, research using the stereotype content model has only looked at subgroups of women without examining subgroups based on ethnicity (Eckes 2002; conducted in Germany), or intragroup perceptions of Black subgroups, which included only one female subgroup – Black mothers (Williams and Fiske 2006).

Cuddy et al. (2008) predict that behavior towards social groups is based on the content of stereotypes and the intergroup emotions aroused by these stereotypes - for example, groups who are seen high in competence but low in warmth are viewed with envy, and treated with passive harm (e.g., social exclusion). Further research into the content of stereotypes for women of color can help identify ways in which prejudice and discrimination is experienced by women of color, compared to others in their ethnic or gender group. Attributions to racism, sexism, or the intersection of both could perhaps be predicted based on the overlap of content between stereotypes – for example, Ghavami and Peplau (2013) found that stereotypes of White, Asian, Middle Eastern, Hispanic, and Black women differ from one another in how much they vary from general stereotypes to specific stereotypes relating to ethnicity or gender. Additionally, Ghavami and Peplau (2013) found that Eastern, Hispanic, and Black females are stereotyped differently to their male counterparts. Conversely,

the researchers also found that White and Asian females are stereotyped similarly to their male counterparts. Furthermore, Ghavami and Peplau (2013) documented that cultural stereotypes of 'women's' traits were most commonly reported in assessing White women, less commonly reported in assessing ethnic minority (Asian, Middle Eastern, Hispanic) women, and least reported in assessing Black women. In sum, stereotypic gender, ethnicity, and group attributes are not simply a result of combining ethnicity and gender stereotypes. As discovered by Ghavami and Peplau (2013) unique attributes can exist for both gender and ethnicity stereotypes among five demographic groups of women.

The reduction of intergroup bias, even among high identifiers, is seen in Crisp et al.'s (2010) studies conducted in Great Britain. How can crossed-categorization contexts affect the experiences of women of color? Crossed-categorization contexts are those circumstances in which multiple subgroups can be considered ingroups. For example, an individual Black woman, in a setting with diverse ethnicity and gender representations, may be perceived as an ingroup member by Black men and an ingroup member by other women, plus she may be seen as a double ingroup member by other Black women in this environment. In contrast, the experience of an individual Black woman, in a male dominated or White females only setting, would likely stir different experiences altogether. Unmistakably, both ethnic and gender categories matter when studying contexts and generalizing the stigma experiences of women of color.

Another important extension of crossed-categorization contexts research should involve how the experiences of multiracial women may differ from mono-racial women. For example, Black-White Biracial Americans interviewed by Khanna and Johnson (2010) expressed that their biracial identity was concurrently not White or Black enough for others. Hence, these biracial individuals reported routinely presenting a preferred racial identity, at the same time concealing another part of their racial ancestry, during face-to-face social interactions with others (Khanna and Johnson 2010). Unquestionably, the crossed-categorization contexts encountered by mono-racial/multiracial/biracial women can influence the spectrum of perceived stigma experiences.

Uncovering Hidden Biases in Workplace Settings, Policy Practices, and Institutional Transformations

Convincingly, Remedios and Snyder (2015) layout the problem for a Black, female engineer, who receives a negative evaluation from her boss and afterward is left alone to process, cope, and recover from the stigmatizing experience. It is well documented (Lubinski and Benbow 2006) that compared to men, women are less likely to enter in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) domains and, at each critical

decision-making point, women, compared to men, are more likely to drop out of the STEM fields. Dilemmas such as this one illustrate why the STEM fields have not sustained a representative workforce inside and/or outside academia, despite the increase in the number of women and minorities obtaining doctoral degrees. Women of color, who have achieved landmark successes in higher education careers, subsequently are viewed as 'super-women.' Marginalized individuals navigate exclusion, stigma, and disparities across multiple domains simultaneously, including exclusion by colleagues (Maranto and Griffin 2011) along with the devaluation of and increased demand for service activities (Turner et al. 2011; Turner 2002). These differing stereotypes and prejudices invoke an identity conflict along with feeling as though one's identity is divided into several parts (Dickens 2014). Moreover, women and minorities in faculty STEM positions may be less likely to advance due to factors related to their interests. For example, a faculty woman of color interviewed by Turner et al. (2011) described how her extensive diversity-related service work was excluded from consideration as part of her tenure file. Hence, identifying the implicit and explicit factors that undermine women's interest in STEM careers has received notable attention from scholars, consultants, practitioners, and research foundations. Unfortunately, few of these sponsored studies have investigated the distinct prejudiced treatment experienced by faculty women of color working in STEM field careers.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) developed the ADVANCE-Institutional Transformation (IT) grants to encourage evidence-based research to broaden the participation of women faculty in the STEM fields (see http://nsf.gov/ADVANCE). Increasing and leveraging diversity in STEM is one of the United States' most pressing economic imperatives. The United States will face an estimated one million worker deficit in STEM jobs over the next decade (PCAST 2012); thus, employers must seek talent from a more diverse pool. Moreover, diversity in collaborative teams positively predicts group intelligence (Bear and Woolley 2011) alongside the quality and reach of STEM research (Campbell et al. 2013; Freeman and Huang 2014). Yet, in STEM research jobs, women and minorities are confronted by marked social exclusion, stigma, and self-doubt as they navigate their careers. These experiences impair academic and professional performance and ultimately limit diverse contributions to the STEM enterprise. Psychology scholars have much to offer in this societal mission, by means of methodological and theoretical tools to measure, test, analyze, and interpret the impact of cultural transformation on the recruitment and retention of women faculty, as well as the benefits of enhancing faculty diversity. Empirical research confirms that bias along with campus climate strongly influences well-being and retention of women and minority faculty (e.g., Jayakumar et al. 2009; Settles et al. 2006). Next, we explore different

scenarios that demonstrate how hidden biases affect the well-being of women of color in the workplace, especially those employed in university faculty positions.

Scenario 1: Intersectional Identities Among Academically Successful Black Women

Due to educational and professional obstacles, as well as the psychological tolls associated with racism and sexism, Black women may feel pressured to present a self to the world that is acceptable to others (Cocchiara et al. 2006). This pressure involves conforming to professional standards and dominant cultural values found in work organizations, while also managing expectations, values, and roles in relation to the Black community (Bell 1990).

The experiences of Black women in the workplace are different from their women of color counterparts, in part due to the unique history of Black people in the United States (Catalyst 2006). Black women often report that their White counterparts question their credibility and authority. Black women also report that many negative stereotypes exist in the workplace about women of their same racial/ethnic make-up, and as a result they consistently encounter race/gender/class based stereotypes in the workplace (Catalyst 2006).

How race, gender, and class differences play out in the workforce for women of color (e.g., Bell 1990; Reynolds-Dobbs et al. 2008) is a topic of growing interest. For example, Rosette and Livingston (2012) found that individuals with dual-subordinate identities (i.e., Black women) faced 'double jeopardy' or more penalties, compared to White women or Black men, for making competence-related mistakes on the job. Additionally, Dickens (2014) explored how Black women workers negotiated dual identities in order to prevail as leaders on the job. Findings from this research provide insight into factors that may influence Black women's participation in the negotiation of their race and gender identities, and the unique experiences of early career Black women in the United States.

Scenario 2: How Representation and Coworker Support Affect Negative Outcomes

Workplace ostracism – being ignored and excluded by others in an organizational setting – has gained attention as a pervasive job stressor that has detrimental effects on its targets, including greater psychological distress, decreased job satisfaction, and higher turnover intentions (Ferris et al. 2008). Nearly two-thirds of employees reported being ostracized at work (e.g., Fox and Stallworth 2005; O'Reilly et al. 2014). This experience can take a variety of forms, including being uninformed of information mutually known by others, known as being out-of-the-loop (Jones et al. 2009), being excluded when others are speaking in a language not understood by all

who are present, known as linguistic ostracism, (Hitlan et al. 2006b), and/or being given the silent treatment by others (Fox and Stallworth 2005).

Though research has established the effects of workplace ostracism (e.g., Ferris et al. 2008; Hitlan et al. 2006a; Zhao et al. 2013 – conducted in China), little is known about its antecedents. Research from Milam et al. (2009) found that individuals who report experiencing frequent incidents of incivility are also identified by coworkers as provocative or deserving victims. Likewise, there may be characteristics that predispose certain people to being ostracized in the workplace. Social exchange theory provides a framework for understanding these characteristics.

Marek et al. (2015) identified minority status (i.e., being female in a male-dominated work domain) in the workplace as a fertile setting where the negative effects of perceived social exclusion are likely to occur. Results showed that regardless of the ratio of female to male workers; in the workplace, women were more likely to perceive being ignored and excluded by others compared to men. Additionally, female workers reported a greater number of ostracism occurrences. Although perceived coworker support moderated the impact of workplace ostracism on targets' reported states of psychological distress and turnover intentions, the pattern of the interaction indicated that perceived support was only beneficial when ostracism experiences were infrequent.

Scenario 3: Confronting Workplace Discrimination and Bullying: Inspiring or Imprudent?

Prejudices can take many forms and discrimination occurs regularly for members of stigmatized groups. Although the strain of being devalued is burdensome, targets of discrimination rarely report directly confronting the perpetrators of their mistreatments. This norm of silence is further reinforced by bystanders who, regardless of whether they belong to privileged or disadvantaged groups, often passively observe incidents of discrimination without taking any actions, thereby contributing to the justifications of prejudices.

Social scientists have encouraged interpersonal confrontation as a means of reducing discrimination, bullying, and other forms of incivility at work (Ashburn-Nardo et al. 2008). However, most of our understanding of confrontation comes from student samples and lab studies. Little is known about whether confrontation happens at work and, if so, how it's received.

Ashburn-Nardo et al. (2014) asked a sample of working adults to describe their experiences witnessing the confrontation of discrimination and bullying in the workplace. Participants reported sometimes witnessing confrontation throughout their careers and described a variety of incidents based on race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, body size, and other personal characteristics. Overall, participants viewed

confronters more favorably (courageous, likable) than unfavorably (rude, hypersensitive) and saw confrontation as more positive than negative. They perceived confrontation as an appropriate response from both targets and non-target bystanders and indicated that it is important for non-target bystanders to confront in very assertive, direct ways. Interestingly, the greater the perceived hostility of their recalled confrontation incident, the more effective and beneficial it was perceived in the short- and long-term and the more influential it was on their own intentions to confront similar incidents (Ashburn-Nardo et al. 2014). In sum, workplace confrontations appear to be more inspiring than imprudent.

In total, these workplace scenarios may guide research that will inform policies to have greater success in uncovering hidden biases, managing multiple identities, and confronting incidents of discrimination as either a target or a bystander. As suggested by Remedios and Snyder (2015), sustaining diversity in STEM fields is a complex issue. Research on intersectional stigma in the workplace can inform educators and policymakers of social barriers that disproportionately disadvantage women of color and other multiply-stigmatized targets of prejudice. Identifying structural obstacles to the full social, political and economic participation by women of color does contribute to the development of policies to address those impediments. Research shows that campus climate strongly influences well-being and retention of faculty women and people of color, making climate especially important for those at the intersection of these identities (Jayakumar et al. 2009; Settles et al. 2006). These approaches taken together can engage, motivate, and sustain participation of women of color in the STEM fields and in other a male-dominated work domains.

Conclusion

Remedios and Snyder (2015) proficiently argue that White women and women of color experience stigmatization in fundamentally different ways due to the vulnerability of women of color to racism, as well as sexism. This commentary supports the supposition offered by the authors, but then pursues an alternative path for research development and future studies. First, we suggest implementing an asset-based orientation versus the pervasive deficit focused expectations when encountering barriers to including women of color in data collection. Second, we provide measurement tools that can assess stigma experiences unique to women of color participants. Third, we offer different workplace scenarios to demonstrate how hidden biases affect the well-being of women of color on the job, especially those employed in university faculty positions.

Together, these comprehensive observations into how prejudice is perceived and mitigated, from the target's point of view offer validated measures to assess individual differences

as well as evidence-based, institutional level, solutions. In closing, these ideas and suggestions are intended to encourage stigma researchers to examine the subtleties in how targets perceive prejudice and integrate these factors into revised process models of stigmatization configured to accommodate different ways of detecting and coping with multiple forms of prejudice.

References

Abrams, J. A., Maxwell, M. L., Pope, M., & Belgrave, F. Z. (2014). Carrying the world with the grace of a lady and the grit of a warrior: Deepening our understanding of the "strong Black woman" schema. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 38*, 503–514. doi:10.1177/0361684314541418.

Apfelbaum, E. P., Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Seeing race and seeming racist? Evaluating strategic colorblindness in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 918–932. doi:10.1037/a0011990.

Ashburn-Nardo, L., Hebl, M. R., Martinez, L. R., & Moss, A. (2014, June). The power of confronting discrimination: How allies can strategically intervene. In A. Newheiser and M. Barreto (Chairs), *Strategies for promoting positive cross-group interactions*. Symposium conducted at the 17th General Meeting of the European Association of Social Psychology, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Ashburn-Nardo, L., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2008). The confronting prejudiced responses (CPR) model: Applying CPR in organizations. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7*, 332–342. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2008.34251671.

Babbitt, L. G. (2011). An intersectional approach to Black/White interracial interactions: The roles of gender and sexual orientation. *Sex Roles, 68*, 791–802. doi:10.1007/s11199-0110104-4.

Bear, J. B., & Woolley, A. W. (2011). The role of gender in team collaboration and performance. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, 36*, 146–153. doi:10.1179/030801811X13013181961473.

Belgrave, F. Z., Abrams, J. A., Hood, K. B., Moore, M. P., & Nguyen, A. B. (2015). Development and validation of a preliminary measure of African American women's gender role beliefs. *The Journal of Black Psychology*. doi:10.1177/0095798415576614.

Bell, E. L. (1990). The bicultural life experience of career-oriented black women. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 459–477. doi:10.1002/job.4030110607.

Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Leffert, N., & Roehlkepartain, E. C. (1999). *A fragile foundation: The state of developmental assets among American youth*. Minneapolis: Search Institute.

Bowleg, L. (2008). When Black+Lesbian+Woman≠Black Lesbian Woman: The methodological challenges of qualitative and quantitative intersectionality research. *Sex Roles, 59*, 312–325. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9400-z.

Campbell, L. G., Mehtani, S., Dozier, M. E., & Rinehart, J. (2013). Gender-heterogeneous working groups produce higher quality science. *PLoS ONE, 8*, e79147. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0079147.

Carter-Sowell, A. R. (2010). Salting a wound, building a callous, or throwing in the towel? The measurement and effects of chronic ostracism experiences. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Catalyst (2006). Connections that count: The informal networks of women of color in the United States. Retrieved from http://www.catalyst.

org/publication/52/connections-that-count-the-informalnetworks-of-women-of-color-in-the-united-states.

Chandler, K., & Lucas, P. (2015, March 8). Bloody Sunday anniversary: Selma recalls Voting Rights Act. *Associated Press.* Retrieved from http://www.montgomeryadvertiser.com/story/news/local/selma50/2015/03/08/bloody-sunday-anniversary-selma-recalls-voting-rights-act/24612321/.

Choo, H. Y., & Ferree, M. M. (2010). Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory, 28*, 129–149. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9558.2010.01370.x.

Cocchiara, F., Bell, M., & Berry, D. P. (2006). Latinas and black women: Key factors for a growing proportion of the US workforce. *Equal Opportunities International, 25*, 272–284. doi:10.1108/02610150610706258.

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *The American Psychologist, 64*, 170–180. doi:10.1037/a0014564.

Crisp, R. J., Turner, R. N., & Hewstone, M. (2010). Common ingroups and complex identities: Routes to reducing bias in multiple category contexts. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 14*, 32–46. doi:10.1037/a0017303.

Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Competence and warmth as universal trait dimensions of interpersonal and intergroup perception: The Stereotype Content Model and the BIAS Map. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 61–149). New York: Academic.

Cuddy, A. C., Fiske, S. T., Kwan, V. Y., Glick, P., Demoulin, S., Leyens, J., … Palacios, M. (2009). Stereotype content model across cultures: Towards universal similarities and some differences. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *48*, 1–33. doi:10.1348/014466608X314935

Dickens, D. D. (2014). Double consciousness: The negotiation of the intersectionality of identities among academically successful Black women. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Eckes, T. (2002). Paternalistic and envious gender stereotypes: Testing predictions from the stereotype content model. *Sex Roles, 47*, 99–114. doi:10.1023/A:1021020920715.

Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., Berry, J. W., & Lian, H. (2008). The development and validation of the Workplace Ostracism Scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 1348–1366. doi:10.1037/a0012743.

Fisher, C. B., Jackson, J. J., & Villarruel, F. A. (1997). The study of ethnic minority children and youth in the United States. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 1145–1207). New York: Wiley.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 878–902. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878.

Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2005). Racial/ethnic bullying: Exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 438–456. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2004.01.002.

Freeman, R. B., & Huang, W. (2014). Collaboration: Strength in diversity. *Nature, 513*, 305. doi:10.1038/513305a.

Friedan, B. (1963/1997/2013). *The feminine mystique.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Gilman, R., Carter-Sowell, A. R., DeWall, C. N., Adams, R. E., & Carboni, I. (2013). Validation of the ostracism experience scale for adolescents. *Psychological Assessment, 25*, 319–330. doi:10.1037/a0030913.

Ghavami, N., & Peplau, L. A. (2013). An intersectional analysis of gender and ethnic stereotypes testing three hypotheses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37*, 113–127. doi:10.1177/0361684312464203.

Goodwin, S. A., Williams, K. D., & Carter-Sowell, A. R. (2010). The psychological sting of stigma: The costs of attributing ostracism to

racism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 612–618. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.02.002.

Gosling, S. D., & Johnson, J. A. (2010). *Advanced methods for conducting online behavioral research.* Washington: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/12076-000.

Hitlan, R. T., Cliffton, R. J., & DeSoto, M. C. (2006a). Perceived exclusion in the workplace: The moderating effects of gender on work-related attitudes and psychological health. *North American Journal of Psychology, 8*, 217–235.

Hitlan, R. T., Kelly, K. M., Schepman, S., Schneider, K. T., & Zárate, M. A. (2006b). Language exclusion and the consequences of perceived ostracism in the workplace. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 10*, 56–70. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.10.1.56.

Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education, 80*, 538–563. doi:10.1353/jhe.0.0063.

Jones, E. E., Carter-Sowell, A., Kelly, J. R., & Williams, K. D. (2009). 'I'm out of the loop': Ostracism through information exclusion. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 12*, 157–174. doi:10.1177/1368430208101054.

Khanna, N., & Johnson, C. (2010, August). *Passing and performance in the 21st century: Black-White biracial Americans and passing as Black.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA.

Lubinski, D., & Benbow, C. P. (2006). Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth after 35 years: Uncovering antecedents for the development of math-science expertise. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*, 316–345. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00019.x.

Mack, K. M., McDermott, P., & Rankins, C. (2015). Truth: STEM Women of Color Conclave Report of National Findings.

Maranto, C. L., & Griffin, A. E. C. (2011). The antecedents of a 'chilly climate' for women faculty in higher education. *Human Relations, 64*, 139–159. doi:10.1177/0018726710377932.

Marek, J. G., Constance, H. M., Zimmerman, C.A., & Carter-Sowell, A.R. (2015). *Owning your identity: Group identification blocks ostracism's effect on collective self-esteem.* Poster presentation presented at Texas A&M University Student Research Week, College Station, TX.

McCoy, S. K., & Major, B. (2003). Group identification moderates emotional responses to perceived prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 1005–1017. doi:10.1177/0146167203253466.

Mengesha, S. K., Meshelemiah, J. C. A., & Chuffa, K. A. (2015). Asset-based community development practice in Awramba, Northwest Ethiopia. *Community Development, 46*, 164–179. doi:10.1080/15575330.2015.1009923.

Milam, A., Spitzmüller, C., & Penney, L. (2009). Investigating individual differences among targets of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14*, 58–69. doi:10.1037/a0012683.

National Center for Education Statistics [NCES] (2010). Digest of education statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010013_0.pdf.

National Center for Education Statistics [NCES] (2014). Table 306.10.Total fall enrollment in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by level of enrollment, sex, attendance status, and race/ethnicity of student: Selected years, 1976 through 2013. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_306.10.asp

O'Reilly, J., Robinson, S. L., Berdahl, J. L., & Banki, S. (2014). Is negative attention better than no attention? The comparative effects of ostracism and harassment at work. *Organizational Science, 26*, 774–793. doi:10.1287/orsc.2014.0900

Ponjuan, L. (2013). Awareness into action: helping Latino students succeed in Texas Higher Education. *The Journal for the Texas Association of College & University Student Personnel Administrators, 1.* Retrieved from http://tacuspa.squarespace.com/current/researchinbrief.

Powell, L. R., John, M., Dickens, D. D., & Butler, T, (2015, May). *Always on my mind: Double consciousness and health outcomes in women of color.* Presented at the 2015 National Conference on Race & Ethnicity in American Higher Education in Washington, DC.

President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) (2012). *Engage to excel: Producing one million additional college graduates with degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.* Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/pcast

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles, 59,* 377–391. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4.

Remedios, J. D., & Snyder, S. H. (2015). How women of color detect and respond to multiple forms of prejudice. *Sex Roles,* this issue. doi:10.1007/s11199-015-0453-5

Reynolds-Dobbs, W., Thomas, K., & Harrison, M. (2008). From mammy to superwoman: Images that hinder black women's career development. *Journal of Career Development, 35,* 129–150. doi:10.1177/0894845308325645.

Riva, P., Wesselmann, E. D., Wirth, J. H., Carter-Sowell, A. R., & Williams, K. D. (2014). When pain does not heal: The common antecedents and consequences of chronic social and physical pain. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 36,* 329–346. doi:10.1080/01973533.2014.917975.

Rodriguez, M. C., & Morrobel, D. (2004). A review of Latino youth development research and a call for an asset orientation. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 26,* 107–127.

Rosette, A. S., & Livingston, R. W. (2012). Failure is not an option for Black women: Effects of organizational performance on leaders with single versus dual-subordinate identities. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48,* 1162–1167. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.05.002

Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30,* 47–58. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00261.x.

Shelton, J. N. (2000). A reconceptualiztion of how we study issues of racial prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4,* 374–390. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0404.

Turner, C. S. V. (2002). Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73,* 74–93. doi:10.1353/jhe.2002.0013.

Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wong, K. (2011). Faculty women of color: The critical nexus of race and gender. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 4,* 199–211. doi:10.1037/a0024630.

U.S. Census Bureau (2013). Table B24010B. Sex by occupation for the civilian employed population 16 years and over (Black or African American alone). Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_13_1YR_B24010B&prodType=table

Williams, K. D., & Carter-Sowell, A. R. (2009). Marginalization through social ostracism: Effects of being ignored and excluded. In F. Butera & J. Levine (Eds.), *Coping with minority status: Responses to exclusion and inclusion* (pp. 104–124). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, L. N., & Fiske, S. T. (2006). Applying the stereotype content model to intra-racial subgroups: Black people's perceptions about Black people. Unpublished manuscript.

Yeneabat, M., & Butterfield, A. K. (2012). "We can't eat a road" Asset-based community development and the Gedam sefer community partnership in Ethiopia. *Journal of Community Practice, 20,* 134–153. doi:10.1080/10705422.2012.650121.

Zhao, H., Peng, Z., & Sheard, G. (2013). Workplace ostracism and hospitality employees' counterproductive work behaviors: The joint moderating effects of proactive personality and political skill. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 33,* 219–227. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.08.006.