



Research on Anti-Black Racism in Organizations: Insights, Ideas, and Considerations

Danielle D. King¹ · Alison V. Hall² · Lars Johnson³ · James Carter⁴ · Dominique Burrows¹ · Naomi Samuel²

Accepted: 2 March 2022

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2022

Abstract

In the wake of recent, highly publicized examples of anti-Black racism, scholars and practitioners are seeking ways to use their skills, resources, and platforms to better understand and address this phenomenon. Naming, examining, and countering anti-Black racism are critical steps toward fostering antiracist science and practice. To support those efforts, this paper details key insights from past research on anti-Black racism in organizations, draws from critical race perspectives to highlight specific topics that warrant consideration in future research, and offers considerations for how scholars should approach anti-Black racism research. Future research ideas include: specific manifestations of anti-Black racism within organizations, the double-bind of authenticity for Black employees, intersectionality among Black employees, and means of redressing anti-Black racism in organizations. Suggested research considerations include: understanding the history of anti-Black racism within research and integrating anti-Black racism research insights across organizational science. Research insights, ideas, and considerations are outlined to provide context for past and current experiences and guidance for future scholarship concerning anti-Black racism in organizations.

Keywords Anti-Black racism · antiracism · race · Black employees · Critical race theory

Anti-Black racism research is a necessary and legitimate endeavor. The caste system of the USA—"the granting or withholding of respect, status, honor, attention, privileges, resources, benefit of the doubt, and human kindness to someone on the basis of their perceived rank or standing in the hierarchy" ((Wilkerson, 2020), p. 70)—is based on racial groupings; making "caste, along with its faithful servant race, an x-factor in most any American equation" ((Wilkerson, 2020), p. 72). This system places White Americans in the assumed superior position and Black people, as their "polar opposite," at the bottom of the country's hierarchy. This hierarchy is thought to originate with the

social construction of US racial groups (e.g., "Black" and "White") during the times of chattel slavery, and to have been reinforced, intentionally and unintentionally, since then (see (Roediger & Esch, 2012; Wilkerson, 2020)). Because of race and racism's systemic entrenchment in societal systems, most people in the US either consciously or subconsciously hold anti-Black ideals (Banaji & Greenwald, 2016; Eberhardt, 2019). Further, despite knowing that racism—actions that mock, harm, attach stereotypes, or assume inferiority based on race (Wilkerson, 2020)—directly harms Black people's physical and psychological functioning (e.g., (Jones et al., 2020; Lewis & Van Dyke, 2018; Priest et al., 2020; Williams et al., 2019; Williams & Sternthal, 2010)), anti-Black racism persists.

Anti-Black racism is pervasive. Manifestations of anti-Black racism (e.g., Jim Crow, redlining, mass incarceration, organizational discrimination) are key contributors to current disparities in the health, education, and economic status of Black people in the USA (see (Bloome, 2014; Hammond et al., 2020; Hetey & Eberhardt, 2018)). In the healthcare and public health spheres, vast evidence demonstrates the lethal nature of the longstanding history and relentless persistence of anti-Black racism (Bailey et al., 2017; Feagin

✉ Danielle D. King
Danielle.D.King@rice.edu

¹ Department of Psychological Sciences, Rice University, 6100 Main Street, Houston, TX 77005, USA

² Department of Management, University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, TX, USA

³ Department of Psychology, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA

⁴ Department of Management, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

& Bennefield, 2014; Hoffman et al., 2016; Paradies et al., 2014). Ongoing disparities in interpersonal care (e.g., Cooper et al., 2012; (Penner et al., 2010)), medical treatment (e.g., (Goyal et al., 2015; Heins et al., 2006; Tait & Chibnall, 2014)), and mortality rates that are disproportionately high relative to disease incidence rates (e.g., (Richardson et al., 2016)) all substantiate anti-Blackness. This legacy endures in Black peoples' mistrust of healthcare practitioners (Bar-sevick et al., 2016; Ekezie et al., 2020; Gamble, 1993; Gamble, 1997). Black patients' increased exposure to anti-Black racism in healthcare is especially reprehensible because structural racism is associated with increased odds of severe health episodes that make healthcare more critical for Black people (Lukachko et al., 2014). Educationally and economically, anti-Black racism affords Black people fewer returns on their educational investments (e.g., (Gaddis, 2015)), and steers creditworthy Black homeowners into predatory, high-cost, high-risk mortgage loans (e.g., (Massey et al., 2016)).

Anti-Black racism also manifests at the intersection of personal and professional life. For example, in law enforcement organizations the nature of the work attracts and promotes individuals who are particularly likely to have contentious interactions with Black people (Hall et al., 2016). In large part due to stigmatization and implicit associations with sub-humanness (e.g., (Goff et al., 2008)), super-humanness (e.g., (Waytz et al., 2015)), and criminality (e.g., (Levinson et al., 2010)), both Black men and women are at higher risk of being killed by police than their White peers (Edwards et al., 2019). Evidence also shows that White, relative to Black, police officers are more likely to deny anti-Blackness in law enforcement (LeCount, 2017). This is unsurprising since Black officers personally experience anti-Black racism at work in the form of disproportionate formal discipline when accused of misconduct, despite no evidence to support racial differences in rates or severity of misconduct (Walter et al., 2020).

Anti-Black racism shapes lived experiences. In business and industry, race shapes our expectations of the people we work alongside (e.g., (Dumas et al., 2013; Phillips & Loyd, 2006; Phillips et al., 2006)), influences where people want to work (e.g., (McKay & Avery, 2006)), and, when leveraged appropriately, gives firms a competitive edge over their market rivals (e.g., (Richard et al., 2021; Richard, 2000)). Yet, racism continuously manifests within the workplace both as overt discrimination and, increasingly, as covert expressions and actions (e.g., (Avery et al., 2015; Hebl et al., 2020)). Anti-Black racism upholds human resources practices that have sustained unrelenting employment discrimination against Black people for the last twenty-five years (Quillian et al., 2017). Black people experience significantly more micro-aggressions—routine and ambiguous declarations or actions that target and denigrate a marginalized racial group member (Sue

et al., 2007)—than any other racial group (O'Keefe et al., 2015). Such common, subtle forms of racism can negatively affect individuals' emotions, cognitive functioning, and self-esteem as much as (if not more than) overt racism (Salvatore & Shelton, 2007; Solorzano et al., 2000).

The pervasive nature of anti-Black racism, at the intersection of personal and professional life, and the direct effect it exerts on lived experiences, all contribute to the necessity and legitimacy of anti-Black racism research. To support the advancement of this domain, this paper will highlight key insights from past research on anti-Black racism in organizations, draw from critical race perspectives to highlight specific topics that warrant additional consideration in future research, and offer considerations for how scholars should approach anti-Black racism research. We aim to facilitate antiracism in both the content and conduct of organizational scholarship.

A Critical Caveat: Countering Anti-Blackness in Organizational Science Approaches

Due to slavery's influence as the initial occurrence of mass, systematic organization, leadership (e.g., by overseers), and production in the USA (see (Cooke, 2003)), southern periodicals published by "intellectuals" in the twenty years prior to the Civil War, are said to have inaugurated management theory. In illustration, Roediger and Esch (Roediger & Esch, 2012) write: "The factory, so often seen as the site of management innovation, long coexisted with the plantation as the main site for the management of large groups of workers in the Americas. If anything, the latter ran ahead of the former in generating thought about management" (p. 23). Historian Robin Blackburn also explains that the word "factory" was first used for the West African staging areas where slaves were gathered for trade, and then for the production of the cotton that made the textile "factories" of England and New England possible (see (Blackburn, 1998)). Thus, early American managerial texts often focused on the "management of negroes." Their aim was to understand how best to extract labor, knowledge, and other resources from Black workers. For example, one author wrote of "best practices for managing negroes" as a "grave subject, and one that is not only always in order, but a subject that imperiously demands our instant and unremitted thoughts and our most devout consideration" (see (Roediger & Esch, 2012), p. 21). In direct contrast to such early perspectives, we write this paper with the intent of making clear the need and potential methods for turning the focus and efforts of organizational sciences toward understanding and countering the destructive forces of anti-Black racism imposed upon Black employees.

Research Insights into Anti-Black Racism in Organizations

Prior research on race in organizations provides a strong foundation for understanding the processes, experiences, and effects of anti-Black racism at work. Thirty years ago, a top organizational science journal published the first at-length discussion of Black professionals' experiences. Dr. Ella Bell edited that special issue to offer "... new knowledge and theoretical approaches to understanding race in an organizational context" (Bell, 1990a, p. 417). Drs. Cox Jr and Nkomo (Cox Jr & Nkomo, 1990) sounded alarms warning that we should not consider knowledge garnered via White male scholars' lenses focused squarely on White participants' experiences to be universally applicable. Echoing this sentiment's validity, that special issue illustrated the biculturalism inherent in Black professional life (Bell, 1990b) and illuminated how race and racism fundamentally inform Black people's psyches at work (Herbert, 1990). It revealed how race is integral in developmental relationships (Thomas, 1990) and how Black professionals rely on one another to assuage the stressors of working while Black (Denton, 1990). Two years later, Dr. Nkomo (Nkomo, 1992) used the allegory of "The Emperor Has No Clothes" to offer a critical analysis of how organizational scholarship (as an institution) and organizational scholars (as its upholders) had suppressed the meaningful examination of race in organizations. She highlighted an academic ignorance of race's ever-present role in our theorizing and methodology and exposed the peril of adhering to the assumption that organizations were race-neutral spaces. Since their publication, scholars have built upon these (and other) foundational works to add nuance to our understandings of the influence of race and racism in organizations.

Unfortunately, Black employees still battle racism within the workplace (e.g., (Nkomo et al., 2019)), across employment stages and organizational levels. The aversive racism framework explains that contemporary racism is expressed in indirect ways that do not threaten the aversive racist's non-prejudiced self-image (see (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986)). It is supported by longitudinal data showing the steady decrease in White individuals' self-reported prejudice across time coupled with the unchanged, relatively high level of discrimination against Black job candidates (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000). Anti-Black racism explains why applicants with names associated with Black culture (e.g., Lakisha and Jamal) receive fewer callbacks for job interviews across numerous occupations, industries, and "Equal Opportunity Employers," compared to applicants with names historically held by White individuals (e.g., Emily and Greg; see (Bertrand & Mullainathan,

2004)). It also explains why "whitewashing" (i.e., concealing or downplaying racial cues in job applications) resumes improves Black applicants' odds of labor market success (Kang et al., 2016). Anti-Black racism is evident in employers' hiring preferences for White applicants with criminal records over Black applicants with no criminal history (Pager, 2003; Pager et al., 2009). It is apparent in employers' increased hiring discrimination against Black applicants when they cannot inquire about criminal records (Agan & Starr, 2018); the assumption that Black people are criminals unless they prove otherwise is anti-Black racism in effect. Anti-Black racism makes White employees' referrals more valuable to job applicants than Black employees' referrals (Silva, 2018) and leads to the penalty of lower salaries for Black job seekers who choose to negotiate (Hernandez et al., 2019).

Further, among Black job applicants, anti-Black racism produces colorism (e.g., (Keith & Herring, 1991; Lavalley & Johnson, 2020)), as evidenced by a significant difference in hiring recommendations that favor Black applicants with lighter skin tones, compared to Black applicants with darker skin tones, regardless of qualifications (Harrison & Thomas, 2009). It also manifests uniquely against Black Americans (in a US context) producing a country-of-origin effect that gives native-born Black American applicants worse job and interpersonal ratings than both White applicants and foreign-born Black applicants (Howard & Borgella, 2019). Consistent with this evidence, Quillian et al. (Quillian et al., 2017) conducted a meta-analysis of hiring discrimination since 1989 and found that White applicants have received, on average, 36% more callbacks than Black applicants.

Anti-Black racism also affords Black people fewer opportunities and less leeway in leadership. For example, Rosette et al. (Rosette et al., 2008) empirically demonstrated an implicit cognitive connection between race and leader capabilities, such that participants assume that leaders are White and that White leaders are more effective than Black leaders (see also Gündemir et al., 2014). In addition to assumptions made about leadership potential and success, meta-analytic evidence shows that the glass cliff effect—the placement of certain people into risky or precarious leadership positions (see (Ryan & Haslam, 2005))—is stronger for Black individuals, compared to White individuals, signaling that either organizations are motivated to pursue demographic changes during crises or that anti-Black racism is a driver of the glass cliff effect (Morgenroth et al., 2020). Further, once in leadership roles, anti-Black racism manifests as internal attributions made for failures and external attributions for successes of Black leaders, while the opposite is observed for White leaders (Carton & Rosette, 2011). Anti-Black racism also undergirds the disproportionate sanctions for Black leaders (especially Black women leaders) who do experience failure (Rosette & Livingston, 2012).

Table 1 Glossary of terms relevant to anti-Black racism research

Term	Definition
Aversive racism	Covert manners of discrimination executed by individuals who view themselves as holding egalitarian values (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986)
Chattel slavery	A form of slavery in which slaves and their immediate descendants are legally rendered as property
Codeswitching	Adjusting one's self-expression (i.e., speech, dress) to improve social or goal-related outcomes (McCluney et al., 2021)
Colorblind approach	Lessening the importance of racial group membership to suggest that race does and should not matter (Plaut et al., 2018)
Glass Cliff effect	The placement of particular people in "risky or precarious" positions of leadership (Ryan & Haslam, 2005)
Imposter phenomenon	The internal experience of feeling intellectually phony, and underserving of recognition and current status (Clance, 1985)
Intersectional invisibility	Social invisibility stemming from a lack of other-perceived prototypicality in a single identity due to multiple, intersecting identities (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008)
Meritocracy myth	A challenge to the widely held American view that people get out of the system what they put into it, based on individual merit (McNamee, 2009)
Multicultural approach	Emphasizing the salience of group membership and the importance of its acknowledgement (Plaut et al., 2018)
Paternalism	Treating employees and if they are family, sometimes as children (Aycan, 2006)
Performative allyship	When well-meaning people with power and privilege show interest in becoming an ally but do not engage in the self-reflection, education actions, or changes inherent in true allyship (Erskine & Bilimria, 2019)
Selective incivility	Low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect (Andersson & Pearson, 1999)
Stereotypic caricature	Preferring that people of color behave in a stereotype-consistent manner (Gutiérrez & Unzueta, 2010)

Another key insight we have gained from past work on anti-Black racism concerns the role of organizational approaches to diversity in either fostering or reducing racism. Plaut et al. (Plaut et al., 2018) discuss whether diversity approaches that align with a colorblind (i.e., minimizing the use and significance of racial group membership to suggest that race does not and should not matter) versus multicultural (i.e., emphasizing that group membership does matter and should be acknowledged and valued) perspective are more apt to remedy racism. They describe benefits and pitfalls of each method, and the findings are nuanced. Specifically, although colorblindness may be more readily accepted by White employees, it fosters more negative outcomes for employees of color including diminished organizational sensitivity to racism and increased interpersonal discrimination. In contrast, while multiculturalism has been shown to elicit threat responses among White audiences and may lend itself to masked discrimination and caricatures of employees of color (preferring that people of color act in stereotype-consistent manners; see (Gutiérrez & Unzueta, 2010)), a multicultural approach to diversity can reduce implicit and explicit prejudice (Lai et al., 2014; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004). Further, field studies have shown that employees of color who work in departments in which White peers hold more multicultural attitudes perceive less risk of bias, which contributes to greater work engagement (Plaut et al., 2009), and that racial minorities who work with multiculturalism-endorsing leaders feel greater acceptance at work (Meeussen et al., 2014). Indeed, valuing traditionally excluded racial

identity groups is important, as is balancing this perspective so as not to *only* value employees for their social identity (Ely & Thomas, 2001).

The emperor is more exposed now than ever (Nkomo, 2020; Nkomo et al., 2019), and "covering" only superficial areas will not adequately address current issues of anti-Black racism. In a work context fraught with selective incivility (Cortina et al., 2013; Daniels & Thornton, 2019) and the spillover from mega-threats of witnessing race-based violence in surrounding communities and the media (Leigh & Melwani, 2019), scholars have an opportunity to elevate the science behind the unique organizational experiences of Black people, their Blackness, and the anti-Black racism with which they must contend daily. Thus, there is a great need for work that specifically examines and redresses anti-Black racism in organizations. To facilitate a productive research discussion, for both experts and newcomers in this area, Table 1 defines key terms that are relevant to anti-Black racism research mentioned throughout this paper.

Anti-Black Racism Research Ideas: A Critical Race Perspective

Organizational scholars pursuing research to understand issues related to anti-Black racism have primarily grounded their work in influential theories of social identity (e.g., (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986)), social

categorization (e.g., (Hogg, 2004; Tajfel et al., 1971; Turner, 2010)), stereotyping (e.g., (Fiske, 1993; Fiske, 1998)), and other micro-level frameworks that consider the production and reproduction of racism to be a primarily individual or interpersonal phenomenon. This focus has enabled many important insights. However, when we consider racism to be exclusive to individual actors and discrete social interactions, we limit our capacity to examine the dynamic manifestations, consequences, and nuances of anti-Black racism within the organizational sciences. Instead, we should challenge ourselves to consider the ways in which organizations, as institutions, and their policies, as structures, function to perpetuate anti-Black racism in concert with these individual and interpersonal acts.

Accordingly, in this section, we advance a critical line of psychological inquiry—critical race psychology (CRP: (Salter & Adams, 2013))—that more intentionally and explicitly provides an identity-conscious means of informing future scholarship on anti-Black racism. Grounded in critical race theory (CRT: (Bell, 1990a; Bell, 1992; Delgado & Stefancic, 2013; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017)), CRP suggests that rather than problematizing Blackness as a deviation from the (White) norm to be managed, we should instead recognize it as a fact of organizational life that has meaningful implications for a significant and valuable population of people. The challenge for organizational psychologists then becomes recognizing and investigating the patterns of organizational power, privilege, and practice that coincide with race and identifying structural, interpersonal, and intrapersonal means of fostering more equitable experiences and outcomes.

To understand anti-Black racism specifically, we start by centering Black people as focal actors who routinely navigate systems that are largely inconsiderate of their unique challenges and contributions. In the next sections, we identify a few critical race tenants as a basis for forging a path to understanding the persistent patterns of race-based inequities in organizations as well as possibilities for navigating them (see Table 1). Specifically, we highlight empirical claims about race and institutional racism that could inform specific research agendas that need further examination to advance our understanding of, and our ability to counteract, anti-Black racism in organizations. Integrating critical race perspectives (see Table 2), we promote the necessity of advancing knowledge within the following four research agendas: persistent manifestations of anti-Black racism within organizations, authenticity as a double-bind for Black employees, intersectionality and anti-Black racism, and means of redressing anti-Black racism in organizations¹. Then, we offer a “bottom-up” discussion for

future research that promotes agency among Black actors as they navigate the anti-Black structures around them.

Persistent Anti-Black Racism Within Organizations

First, the most central tenant of a critical race perspective is that racism is an ordinary, commonplace, general standard of practice for how life and work take shape for Black people each day (Bell, 1992; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Salter & Adams, 2013). It is deeply embedded in the organizational practices and policies that scholars take for granted as neutral but that actually center Whiteness as the norm and devalue non-Whites and their cultural expressions in the process (Ray & Purifoy, 2019). As organizations and scholars respond to heightened calls for antiracism resources (McCluney et al., 2020) and antiracism policies (Boykin et al., 2020; Kendi, 2019), a fine-grained understanding of the most enduring form of racism in Western civilization is imperative. Without recognizing anti-Black racism as the pervasive force that evidence suggests it is, organizational psychologists are ill-equipped to support organizations in their quests to act against it.

Like an enduring virus, racism persists by mutating and adapting its presentation (Nkomo, 2020); but it is still racism, and Black employees suffer as a result. Whether navigating a predominantly White employee lounge or considering a town’s racial climate as they evaluate job opportunities (see (McKay, 2020)), Black employees do not have the option to ignore issues of racism, and indifference toward Black experiences upholds racist organizational inertia (McCluney et al., 2020). Thus, scholars should actively acknowledge and counter the momentum of racism in organizations and organizational sciences.

Accordingly, organizational scholars should invest greater attention in numerous topics concerning the varying expressions, experiences, and implications of anti-Black racism. These topics include micro-aggressions, paternalism, differential promotion rates, anti-Black sentiments endorsed by organizational leaders (e.g., via social media or alliances with White supremacists), imposter phenomenon, invalidation of Black employees’ experiences, and performative allyship, among others (see Table 2). For instance, organizations would benefit from research that offers a more nuanced understanding of how group composition relates to individual behaviors, interpersonal experiences, and adoption and adaptation of policy. Similar to prior research showing a trend of negative salary inflection for all employees in work environments with large proportions of women (Ostroff & Atwater, 2003), recent research shows the negative point of inflection for pay in diverse groups is jointly dependent upon performance and the number of Black employees within the group. Hall and colleagues’ (Hall et al., 2019a) findings show how anti-Black racism may affect non-Black

¹ These four areas are offered as an initial starting point to integrating a critical race perspective in the organizational sciences. They are illustrative but far from exhaustive, as both CRP and CRT have several additional tenants.

Table 2 Anti-Black racism research ideas grounded in critical race perspective

Future research areas	Critical race tenet	Example topics for future research
<i>Persistent anti-Black racism within organizations</i>	Racism is an ordinary, commonplace, general standard of practice for how life and work take shape for Black people each day (e.g., Bell, 1992); (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017); (Ray & Puritoy, 2019)	Micro-aggressions; paternalism; differential promotion rates; anti-Black sentiments endorsed by leaders; imposter phenomenon; invalidation of Black employee experiences; performative allyship; dynamic anti-Black racism that manifests and morphs across time
<i>Double-bind of authenticity for Black employees</i>	The ideologies (e.g., meritocracy) and seemingly neutral standards (e.g., professionalism) to which we subscribe reflect and reproduce racial dominance. Observers evaluate Black people at least partially based on how they perform, express, and embody their Blackness, and as evaluators observe increasing levels of “Blackness,” their perceptions of Black people become less favorable (e.g., (Carbado & Rothmayr, 2014); Augoustinos & De Garris, 2012; (Thompson, 2009); (Lesane-Brown, 2006))	Unique barriers to authenticity faced by Black employees; how organizations can address the irreconcilable demand for Black people to assimilate while also being authentic; the inherently privileged and exclusionary nature of ambivalent authenticity conversations and practices; ways leaders can develop work places that are accepting of Black employees; the skills involved in Black employees successfully adapting to multiple cultural spheres
<i>Intersectionality among Black employees</i>	Race and its consequences are applied differently as it intersects with other meaningful social constructs like gender, class, sexual orientation, nationality, etc. (e.g., (Carbado et al., 2013); (Collins, 2019); (Crenshaw, 1990; Crenshaw, 1989))	Experiences of Black women (compared to men), Black Muslims (compared to Christians), Black LGBTQ+ people (compared to cisgender heterosexual people), and Black people from affluent backgrounds (compared to those of lower socioeconomic status) in the workplace; the role of power and privilege in shaping diverse Black employee experiences; the unique experience of Black immigrants in America
<i>Means of redressing anti-Black racism in organizations</i>	There is power in accepting that anti-Black racism is an inescapable facet of organizational life in the USA and still intentionally resisting its oppressive weight (e.g., (Bell, 1992); (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017))	The role and responsibility of those in positions of power to remove the “need for resilience” to anti-Black racism; how Black employees can and do cope with racism in the workplace; comparative utility of anti-Black racism coping choices; the comparative experience of Black employees who work in organizations that employ various antiracism interventions; how to proactively prevent anti-Black racism from occurring in organizations; barriers to organizational atonement for anti-Black historical and present wrongs; resistance, fragility, and denial in response to anti-Black racism

employees through stigma-by-association, with pay for all employees suffering as the number of Black employees within the group increases. This research illustrates how anti-Black ideology and stigmatization may introduce unique heterogeneity in previously understood relationships. As such, we encourage scholars to consider the unique effects of anti-Black racism on Black employees and how upward or downward changes in group composition may create contagion effects (e.g., stigma-by-association). To do so requires research that revisits and reimagines existing scholarship while moving this literature forward.

While further examination of each of these topics at the individual and interpersonal levels is most certainly necessary, organizational psychologists can also advance our scholarly understanding of the systems and governing ideologies that enable, and sometimes promote, these disparately racialized experiences and outcomes (e.g., organizations espousing meritocracy as a means of exacerbating and legitimizing group-based differences; (Castilla & Benard, 2010; van Dijk et al., 2020)). Theoretical and empirical work that directly centers anti-Black racism in organizations provides a necessary foundation for developing antiracism as a construct as well as the organizational-, team-, and individual-level means of eradicating it. A robust approach to anti-Black scholarship will include an evolving research agenda that supports top-down and bottom-up review and adaptation within organizations. That is, this work requires theoretical and empirical connections across organizational levels to ensure decision-making alignment and avoid decision siloing between levels that may undermine or dismantle efforts to counteract anti-Black racism. As workgroups and teams grapple with interpersonal issues, and human resources and decision-makers develop processes and policies, firm and industry leaders must also seek balance between systems and institutional artifacts beholden to meritocracy and higher-level decision-making that ensures diversity, inclusion, and justice are cogent, attainable, and systematized (Konrad et al., 2021). If organizations are to achieve this balance across levels, research that evaluates the efficacy and effects of decisions within and between levels of persistent imbalance is required.

As anti-Black racism persists *and* morphs (e.g., micro-aggressions; (Sue et al., 2007)), it is vital to better understand this dynamic process and the corresponding complex Black survival (and thriving) experience. To date, scholarship that directly addresses nuanced Black employee experiences remains stagnant, if not waning. The study of Black experiences, perceptions, needs, culture, and barriers are areas of inquiry that merit research consideration. Theoretically, advances in frameworks for understanding the dynamics of Black experiences at work would offer the organizational sciences essential insights from within this discipline, legitimizing the scholarship of organizational

researchers pursuing this work. Empirically, the practice of excluding Black groups (see (Roberts et al., 2020)) or using them simply as comparisons to White groups that serve as “controls” is inadequate. Such manifestations of “norming” Whiteness mute the nuance within the Black experience (see (Apfelbaum et al., 2014)). Thus, the direct study of Black experiences merits research investments.

Authenticity as a Double-bind for Black Employees

Second, one tenant of CRP asserts that many of the ideologies (e.g., meritocracy) and seemingly neutral standards (e.g., professionalism) to which we subscribe reflect and reproduce racial dominance (Salter & Haugen, 2017). Indeed, assumptions of race-neutrality in formal and informal organizational and institutional policies enable anti-Black racism by ignoring the fact that observers evaluate Black people at least partially based on how they perform, express, and embody their Blackness (e.g., Auguostinos & De Garis, 2012; (Carbado & Roithmayr, 2014; Lesane-Brown, 2006; Thompson, 2009)). Specifically, evaluators form assessments about Black people’s competence and professionalism with significant consideration of their accent, demeanor, dress, associational practices, and overall “racial orientation” (Carbado & Gulati, 2013). As evaluators observe increasing levels of “Blackness,” their perceptions of Black people become less favorable or more negative. Being aware of this presents a double-bind for Black people as they attempt to successfully navigate organizations (Hewlin & Broomes, 2019). They may feel pressured to moderate their Blackness to present themselves in more “palatable” fashions if they want to advance. So as organizations promote inclusion and increasingly ask employees to “bring your whole self to work” the costs of obliging that seemingly progressive request are inequitable. Recent research suggests that authenticity may only be welcomed from those with the power and privilege to “be themselves” in ways that are esteemed by society (e.g., (Bailey et al., 2022; Phillips et al., 2018; Wessel et al., 2020)).

Anti-Black racism casts Black culture, vernacular, hair, and experiences as misaligned with “professionalism.” For example, research that explores Black women’s hairstyles finds that people penalize women who opt for natural Black hairstyles, in part, because these hairstyles are perceived as lacking professionalism and being overly dominant (Koval & Rosette, 2020; Opie & Phillips, 2015). These perceptions align with laws and organizational policies that explicitly, implicitly, and unfairly deem Black culture incongruent with society and the workplace (e.g., Black hair and music; (Binder, 1993; Greene, 2016)). Consistent with empirical research, oral narratives and anecdotes have clarified that Black ways of being are scrutinized and devalued. Black people often feel compelled to “code switch,” or adjust

their styles of presentation and expression in ways that will optimize their outcomes (see (Koch et al., 2001; McCluney et al., 2019)). Unfortunately, code-switching and other intentional acts of demonstrating commonalities with dissimilar peers (e.g., (Hewlin, 2003)) reduce felt authenticity and contribute to employee burnout (Hewlin, 2009; Hewlin et al., 2016). Despite this evidence, organizations have failed to consider these factors in their pleas for authenticity.

Notably, scholarly interest in authenticity has spiked recently. In 2019, three different reviews on authenticity were published—two in management outlets and one in psychology (Cha et al., 2019; Lehman et al., 2019; Sedikides et al., 2019). These integrative reviews and other conceptual pieces ask us to think more broadly and critically about authenticity. Though most perspectives see organizations as race-neutral (see (Ray, 2019)), necessary theoretical and empirical advancements on authenticity in organizations must consider how normative expectations are indeed racialized. As researchers explore authenticity in the workplace, it is vital to acknowledge unique barriers and challenges faced by Black employees (See Table 2).

We can, for example, explore the seemingly irreconcilable demand for Black people to assimilate to White norms to be seen as legitimate, while their workplaces simultaneously ask them *not* to engage in those practices to be seen as authentic. It is imperative to interrogate the ways in which ambivalent conversations about authenticity in organizations are inherently privileged and exclusionary, placing additional cognitive, emotional, and physical burdens on Black employees.

Additionally, burgeoning work on social hierarchy and status demonstrates that status—being admired and respected by others—leads people to feel and act more authentically (Bailey et al., 2022). In this way, it is important that Black employees first feel admired and respected by their peers to be authentic. Future research could inform organizations on the specific concerns of Black employees and ways that leaders can develop accepting work environments.

It is also important that researchers develop theory and offer empirical assessments of the skills involved in Black employees' successfully adapting to multiple cultural spheres. While research has examined the benefits of being able to access and move between different cultural spheres and modes of communication (e.g., (Brannon et al., 2015); Anicich & Hirsh, 2017), further investigations are needed to ascertain the *unique* benefits of Black employees' "double consciousness" (Du Bois, 1903). Insights can be gleaned from critical race perspectives, along with other identity inclusive or Black-centric theoretical frames (e.g., (Sellers et al., 1998)), on how to best understand and advance Black employees' felt and perceived authenticity and the advantages thereof.

Intersectionality and Anti-Black Racism

Third, critical race perspectives maintain that race and its consequences are applied differently as it crosscuts with other meaningful social constructs like gender, class, sexual orientation, nationality, and beyond. While race may be some people's primary identity (e.g., (Sellers et al., 1998)), it is no one's single essence (e.g., (Carbado et al., 2013; Collins, 2019; Crenshaw, 1990; Crenshaw, 1989)). Though the monolithic classification of race has informed critical insights into race-based disparities (e.g., (Brondolo et al., 2009; Zahodne et al., 2017)), treating Black people as a homogenous group reduces our potential to uncover precise implications for all Black employees. Specifically, when we do so, we lose nuance and ignore the many ways in which multiple subgroup differences can lead to a variety of experiences *among* members of a racial group (Celious & Oyserman, 2001).

Multiple identities interactively create wholly unique subgroups that incur their own stereotypes (Hall et al., 2019b), and unique power and privilege dynamics undergird outcomes for people with multiple stigmatized identities (Crenshaw, 1990; Davis, 2008). More explicitly, Black people who are male, cisgender, heterosexual, affluent, able-bodied, fair-skinned, or Christian also have power and privilege intertwined in their Blackness. These intersecting identities alter their experiences, outcomes, and options for navigating organizations and broader society. When we explore anti-Black racism through an intersectional lens, we expose the incapacity of a one-size-fits-all approach that ignores the differing experiences of discrimination and the unique needs for support, allyship, and antiracism resources among Black people in organizations (see (Rosette et al., 2018)).

In illustration, Black women experience "intersectional invisibility," which means that because of their non-prototypicality to both their racial and their gender group, they experience differential outcomes compared to White women and Black men ((Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008); Carter & Ponde de Leon, 2022). Specifically, while Black women may be more physically visible in the organizational sphere due to their phenotypical distinctiveness, they are often also simultaneously overlooked and disregarded (Smith et al., 2019). Accordingly, Black women's contributions are less likely to be correctly attributed to them, in comparison with White men, White women, and Black men. Further, McCluney and Rabelo (McCluney & Rabelo, 2019) theorize that Black women experience "intersectional tension" (i.e., trying to feel seen and appreciated as a unique individual while also feeling as if they belong within their workgroup) and may not have complete autonomy in seeking such "optimal distinctiveness" (Brewer, 1991).

Finally, research shows that when specific racial and gendered stereotypes are aligned with a specific dimension of agency (e.g., competence vs. dominance), differential effects of the enactment of that agency emerge. Specifically, as Black women are perceived as dominant (though not competent), they are less likely targets of agentic penalties than White women or Black men for whom dominance is proscribed (Livingston et al., 2012; Rosette et al., 2016). As much research on the Black experience centers heterosexual men, and most examinations of the female experience are conducted on White women (Ghavami & Peplau, 2013), additional insights centering Black women employees' intersectional experiences could provide useful insights for how Black women leaders may wield their agency in advantageous ways.

Future research is needed to theoretically and empirically assess the specific roles of power and privilege in shaping and countering diverse Black experiences. This work may benefit by drawing from the knowledge base about power and status in organizations (e.g., (Krackhardt, 1990; Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Pfeffer & Pfeffer, 1981; Ragins & Sundstrom, 1989)). Doing so could support research on parallel and divergent processes among, for example, Black women (compared to men), Black Muslims (compared to Christians), Black LGBTQ+ people (compared to cisgender heterosexual people), and Black people from affluent backgrounds (compared to those of lower socioeconomic status).

Overall, an intersectional approach affords us access to a more complete understanding of lived experiences with anti-Black racism for all Black employees, and forges paths toward novel lines of inquiry (see Table 2). For example, future research could consider the dynamic experience of Black immigrants in America. Such work may illuminate experiences not considered when we assume all Black employees were born and socialized in the USA' context, or when we ignore the effect of xenophobia in shaping attitudes and acts of anti-Black racism. Immigration scholars have posited that the ability of ethnic minorities to be successful in the USA hinges upon their ability to engage in identity work (Pierre, 2004). Specifically, Black immigrants to the USA may experience benefits when they create distinctions between themselves and African Americans by emphasizing their national identity rather than their racial identity (e.g., Jamaican versus African American; (Habecker, 2012; Showers, 2015)). Thus, organizational scholars may uncover means of combatting such internalized, intersectional anti-Black racism via examining work socialization practices from a multicultural perspective. Examining the vast diversity within the Black labor force and means of fostering antiracism for *all* Black employees is a fruitful area for research and practice.

Means of Redressing Anti-Black Racism in Organizations

Finally, anti-Black racism is an inescapable facet of organizational life in the USA (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017), and while that may present as a bleak prognosis, another notable theme within critical race scholarship implies there is power in accepting that premise as true. Specifically, this perspective asserts that the courage and self-determination Black people enact to resist the oppressive weight of anti-Black racism fosters a sense of strength via struggle (Bell, 1992). The topic of redressing anti-Black racism, then, brings into view potentially competing perspectives.

On one hand, there is a need for efforts that foster resilience—the practice and process of overcoming adversity or difficulty (King et al., 2016)—among those who face anti-Black racism. Establishing practices and procedures that foster resilience to anti-Black racism could help Black employees to survive, cope, and even thrive, despite the strain placed on their psychological and physical health by racism. This is a worthy area of investigation, as it can help us to understand what options are most effective for addressing anti-Black racism.

However, on the other hand, it is equally (if not more) important to examine the role of contexts (e.g., organizations, perpetrators, allies, and leaders) in removing the “need for resilience” to anti-Black racism. It is imperative that anti-racist scholarship “insists on both justice and truth” ((Bell, 1992) p. 123). Here, we outline work that has begun to ask how to effectively cope with anti-Black racism (i.e., grapple with the truth), while simultaneously calling for future work that focuses on how to remove the adversity of anti-Black racism from organizations (i.e., demand justice).

The exhausting experience of continuously having to learn about and manage various, old and new, forms of anti-Black racism (see racial battle fatigue; (Smith et al., 2007a)) reinforces current disparities. For example, both McCluney et al. (McCluney et al., 2017) and Leigh and Melwani (Leigh & Melwani, 2019) theorize the effect of large-scale racially motivated, violent events on the vicarious trauma that Black employees endure. It spills over to affect their work experiences. To cope with such stressors, Black employees have adopted several strategies, including racial identity development, social support seeking, and anger suppression or expression (Brondolo et al., 2009).

Numerous studies conducted outside the organizational sciences have examined the role of coping methods in helping individuals to manage their experiences with racism. Studies have shown that problem-focused coping (attempts to address or change the stressor) can buffer the effect of racism on psychological health (i.e., depressive symptoms; (West et al., 2010)) and physical health (i.e., blood pressure; (Singleton et al., 2008)). Alternatively, avoidant coping

(cognitive and emotional strategies oriented away from the stress) exacerbates the negative effects of racism on health. However, in a review of various forms of coping as buffers between experienced racism and important life outcomes, Brondolo et al. (Brondolo et al., 2009) concluded that “no coping strategy has emerged as a clearly successful strategy for offsetting the mental and physical health impacts of racism. Instead, each approach has some demonstrated strengths, but also considerable side effects or limitations” (p. 16). Thus, research still needs to assess specifically how Black employees can and do cope with racism experienced in the workplace, and the comparative utility of these coping choices (e.g., effects on both Black employee experiential outcomes and peer and leader evaluation outcomes), while simultaneously calling upon systems, structures, and those with power and privilege to redress the anti-Black racism that requires coping effort (see Table 2).

Recent theory has advanced beyond individual-level approaches of coping with racism to include more collective factors (e.g., (French et al., 2020)). Practically, Roberson et al. (Roberson et al., 2020) recently reviewed four categories of interventions meant to improve employment outcomes for underrepresented communities: affirmative action practices, targeted human resource management, diversity training, and accountability and transparency practices. Their recommendations include urging identity-conscious (rather than identity-blind) practices, implementing integrated and systematic approaches (rather than standalone programs) for diversity training effectiveness, and having and transparently sharing explicit accountability practices that assign responsibility for reducing inequity (rather than relying only on managerial efforts to meet diversity and inclusion goals). Research that empirically assesses the experience of Black employees when working in organizations that employ these interventions would be informative. Further, Sue et al. (Sue et al., 2019) introduce a strategic framework for addressing micro-aggressions that includes actions that targets, allies, and bystanders can perform (i.e., micro-interventions). Specific behaviors align with four micro-intervention goals of: 1) making the invisible visible, 2) disarming the micro-aggression, 3) educating the perpetrator, and 4) external reinforcement or support. Because of the deleterious effects of racism on Black people, empirical work that directly tests the effectiveness of such interventions in the workplace and that demonstrates how to proactively prevent anti-Black racism from occurring in organizations is necessary.

There is also a pertinent need to investigate barriers to organizational atonement for historical and present anti-Black racism. At the micro-level, scholars could further examine the ways in which successful initiatives to decrease overt racism may be accompanied by an increase in covert racism (Lennartz et al., 2019). Indeed, race-conscious

initiatives (e.g., affirmative action; (Bell et al., 2000; Harrison et al., 2006)) can provoke rebellion (e.g., whitelash; (Kellner, 2017)), micro-invalidations (e.g., “people are people”; (Sue et al., 2008)), and racist misconceptions that advancing equity for Black employees compromises the integrity of organizational decision structures such as selection and promotion. Further, work that examines how people respond when confronted about their prejudiced actions or statements (see (Czopp, 2019)) offers a useful starting point to examine and address resistance, fragility, and denial in response to anti-Black racism in organizations.

At the macro-level, a useful starting point may be to examine whether and why corporate social engagement and advocacy may or may not follow corporate social responsibility statements in addressing anti-Black racism. Performative activism and allyship by organizations may parallel the detrimental effects of antiracism backlash by compounding the harms Black people face each day (Holmes, 2020). They also distract from real efforts to address the problem. Thus, future research is needed to understand, detect, and counter both resistance to antiracism and performative antiracism, as both may exacerbate Black employees’ experiences of racism in the organization.

Anti-Black Racism Future Research Considerations

The recent increase in mainstream attention to racism, inequality, and other constructs that disproportionately disadvantage Black people at work has afforded astute scholars who have advanced this work an opportunity to share their expertise with a larger, more open-minded audience. Some researchers, who have conducted diversity work more broadly, are entering the scholarly conversation about anti-Black racism. Others, who have not considered Black-centric research, may seek to seize this opportunity to contribute to the discourse. While we unequivocally support the advancement of organizational scholarship on race, racism, Blackness, anti-Blackness, anti-Black racism, and antiracism, we also advise scholars to engage in this work responsibly, keeping a few considerations top-of-mind.

Overall, we caution that anti-Black racism should not be regarded as an intellectual “hot topic” for casual pursuit. As such, we discourage scholars from considering race—especially Blackness—as merely a variable in a model. Blackness is a proxy for the lived experiences of people who, due to historical and current anti-Black racism, can be directly harmed by the (mal)practice and (mis)interpretations of researchers and research implications. Before scholars engage in this work, we encourage them to honestly consider their intentions, probe their biases, and contemplate the impact of their lines of inquiry. Research on anti-Black

racism in organizations done haphazardly risks furthering harm to Black employees.

Further, to advance current scholarship on anti-Black racism and the Black employee experience, we encourage scholars interested in furthering this work to absorb the existing relevant scholarship to ensure they are well-grounded and “speaking responsibly.” Responsible anti-Black racism scholarship requires expertise in this domain. Assuming it does not, implies that Black-centric scholarship is less deserving of effort, care, and critical consideration than other areas within which one would not automatically deem oneself proficient. With these concerns in mind, we detail specific considerations for future research procedures and perspectives in the next sections.

Understanding the History of Anti-Black Racism Within Research

We urge scholars and practitioners pursuing this work to: a) avoid inflicting further harms to people already burdened by racism, b) recognize the valid hesitation among the Black community to participate in research, and c) responsibly design, execute, and explain their research, in light of what we know about anti-Black racism. Research(er) mistrust among the Black community is multifaceted and creates a significant emotional burden for Black participants (see (Millet et al., 2010; Scharff et al., 2010)). Black individuals are more likely, compared to age-, education-, and gender-matched White participants, to believe that research findings will be used to reinforce negative stereotypes about their group (Thompson et al., 2003) and expose them to unnecessary risks ((Brandon et al., 2005); Corbie-Smith et al., 2004).

Mistrust of researchers among the Black community stems, in large part, from historical wrongs and is reinforced by discriminatory events that persist today (see (Briggs, 2000; Washington, 2006)). In illustration, many members of the Black community are aware of the US Public Health Services (USPHS) Syphilis Experiment at Tuskegee, in which Black male participants diagnosed with syphilis went untreated for years, despite available treatment options, as a deceptive research procedure to study the progression of this disease until their deaths (Raverby, 2012). Other examples of researchers’ abuse of Black people include the non-consensual procurement of live human cells (now used in most biology labs and commonly referred to as “HeLa” cells; (Skloot, 2017)) from a Black woman, Henrietta Lacks, and physician James Marion Sims’s years of physical experimentation on Black women’s bodies without anesthesia or consent (Kaupp-Roberts, 2020).

Unfortunately, egregious abuses of Black participants persist in recent years. In the 1990s, a group of scientists at a prestigious US university undertook a series of research

studies concerning the genetic etiology of aggression using a sample of African American male adolescents (Washington, 2006). This research involved an unaccompanied overnight stay, withdrawal of participants from all medications (including asthma and ADHD medication), withholding of water, hourly blood draws, and the administration of fenfluramine (a drug associated with aggression). Historical and recent racist abuses further the current chasm between the Black population and researchers. Thus, scholars interested in conducting research within the Black community should proactively ensure they are not perpetuating anti-Blackness via coercion, undue deception, or abuse of power.

Future research on anti-Black racism in organizations should take care to incorporate important lessons for facilitating safe and ethical experiences for Black participants. Critical practices include ensuring interpersonal justice (i.e., fairness in interactions) and offering direct benefits from research to the Black community. As mistrust for scientists is exacerbated by negative differential treatment ((Nelson, 2002); Smith et al., 2007a), researchers should demonstrate justice by treating Black people with interpersonal dignity and providing participants with complete and accurate information. Further, in light of the emotional and physical challenges that may arise when individuals are asked to recount and report experiences with anti-Black racism, researchers should take additional precautions to build trust, ensure participant psychological safety, and to avoid fostering the perception that participants do not have a choice, once enrolled in the study, in whether and when they respond to questions or prompts. Specifically, Teal and Street (Teal & Street, 2009) provide a framework for culturally competent communication that includes: knowledge about core cultural issues, communication repertoire, situational awareness, and adaptability. This framework may be useful for practicing antiracism in the study of Blackness and anti-Blackness.

Further, seeking only to “take” from Black populations (e.g., data, insights, samples) may further mistrust (Scharff et al., 2010). In past work, Black participants have reported concerns that findings associated with their participation will not benefit the Black community (e.g., Corbie-Smith et al., 2004). It is the researcher’s responsibility to make sure participants are not asked to invest their time and effort in research for the sole gain of the researcher and/or populations that do not include the Black community. In addition to offering adequate monetary payments in exchange for participation, researchers should also provide specific and clear communications of research findings and recommendations relevant to improving Black lives.

For scholars interested in conducting anti-Black racism research, a proactive understanding of the history of anti-Black racism within the research process would be helpful. They should also consult available reports (Alvarez et al., 2006; Campbell et al., 2007; UyBico et al., 2007; Williams

& Corbie-Smith, 2006) and frameworks (e.g., community based participatory research model; (Israel et al., 2017; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2003)) concerning ways to thoughtfully and responsibly gain the trust of community members. Researcher education in and awareness of the historical and current experiences of Black participants is one proactive tool that may help avoid anti-Black racism in the practice of organizational science.

Integrating Anti-Black Racism Research Insights Across Organizational Science

It is also valuable for scholars to remain aware of, and actively counter, anti-Black racism throughout organizational science—not only within the diversity and inclusion space. Specifically, widespread exclusion of Black-centric research and perspectives poses a threat to all scholarship, contributing to theoretical misspecification and methodological biases. Antiracism scholars are often currently left to draw from research based on WEIRD (western [White], educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic; (Rad et al., 2018)) perspectives and samples. And organizational science that focuses on effects from predominantly WEIRD samples assumes the observed effects are universal and run the risk of norming Whiteness in research and practice. WEIRD sampling also raises questions about the validity of findings given the inherent demographic constraints.

Thus, we encourage researchers to employ sampling strategies that do not implicitly assume participants exist in White-normed or neutralized racio-ethnic contexts. Otherwise, the interventions and institutionalized processes that we deem valid are limited and undermined by sample characteristics (Apfelbaum et al., 2014; Cox Jr & Nkomo, 1990; Ray, 2019). Whereas we agree that not all constructs or effects will vary by race, theory and empirics that examine variability due to racio-ethnic demography deserve consideration. Otherwise, we might continue to conduct and promote research with a reasonably high lack of awareness of potential unexplained model heterogeneity.

Recent research provides excellent examples of how reexamining existing frameworks and theories, across organizational science, with explicit consideration for anti-Black racism can expose unexpected or misunderstood heterogeneity (e.g., (Hernandez et al., 2019; Livingston et al., 2012)). For example, McCluney and Rabelo (McCluney & Rabelo, 2019) and Rabelo et al. (Rabelo et al., 2020) called attention to how inappropriately superimposing a lens of Whiteness on to the experiences and behaviors of Black women employees conditions their visibility, ultimately resulting in an erosion of opportunities or engagement in costly efforts to increase visibility. Thus, we suggest that organizational scientists, across their respective research topics of interest, begin to reexamine theory and empirical implications that

have ignored, or failed to explicitly incorporate a consideration of, Black experiences and/or anti-Black racism. This would involve revisiting scholarship across topic areas (e.g., training, performance, well-being, work-life balance, leadership, teams) to collectively address anti-Black racism's effects throughout and beyond organizations. When we ignore historical and current biases in our implicit leadership theories, occupational stress models, resilience frameworks, and other scholarship, we imply that Black lived experiences are inconsequential for organizational science. Accordingly, a way forward includes a coordinated research agenda that directly integrates anti-Black racism research across organizational science.

Conclusion

Anti-Black racism has neither ended nor has it recently resurfaced. As we write this paper and study this phenomenon, Black people continue to endure disparate treatment and undue trauma every day. Organizational scholars have an opportunity to advance the understanding of and offer insights for addressing anti-Black racism in organizations and beyond. While working to uncover and dismantle systemic racism and anti-Blackness, it is important that we do not inadvertently reinforce the burden of racism placed on Black people. Thus, the goals of this paper include encouraging a humanistic approach to studying Black lives in organizations and facilitating antiracist research content and contexts. We call for more research that directly names anti-Black racism, centers the experiences of Black people, and uncovers effective means of redressing racism. This article also serves as a model of the important practice of “turning the lens inward”—considering our own biases and acknowledging the need to improve organizational science and practice in the USA as we look to the future.

This paper is meant to highlight the advances and opportunities in the anti-Black racism domain, and to affirm the importance of these investigations for fostering effective organizations. Such work is not divisive in intent, but is focused on Blackness so as not to dilute a focal issue—anti-Black racism. It is our hope that this paper will offer guidance, spark expansion, and contribute to the eradication of anti-Black racism in organizations and societies.

References

- Agan, A., & Starr, S. (2018). Ban the box, criminal records, and racial discrimination: A field experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 133(1), 191–235. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjx028>
- Alvarez, R. A., Vasquez, E., Mayorga, C. C., Feaster, D. J., & Mitrani, V. B. (2006). Increasing minority research participation through community organization outreach. *Western Journal of Nursing*

- Research, 28(5), 541–560. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193945906287215>
- Apfelbaum, E. P., Phillips, K. W., & Richeson, J. A. (2014). Rethinking the baseline in diversity research: Should we be explaining the effects of homogeneity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9, 235–244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614527466>
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1). doi: 10.2307/2667087
- Avery, D. R., Volpone, S. D., & Holmes, O. (2015). Racial discrimination in organizations. In A. J. Colella & E. B. King (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Workplace Discrimination*.
- Bailey, E. R., Carter, J. T., Iyengar, S. S., & Galinsky, A. (2022). *The privilege to be yourself depends on what others think of you: Why status increases authenticity more than power. Unpublished manuscript.*
- Bailey, Z. D., Krieger, N., Agénor, M., Graves, J., Linos, N., & Bassett, M. T. (2017). Structural racism and health inequities in the USA: evidence and interventions. *The Lancet*, 389(10077), 1453–1463. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)30569-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30569-X)
- Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2016). *Blindspot: Hidden biases of good people*. Bantam.
- Barsevick, A. M., Leader, A., Bradley, P. K., Avery, T., Dean, L. T., DiCarlo, M., Hegarty, S. E. (2016). Post-treatment problems of African American breast cancer survivors. *Supportive Care in Cancer*, 24(12), 4979–4986. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-016-3359-z>
- Bell, E. L. (1990a). Introduction to special issue on the career and life experiences of black professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 417–418. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110603>
- Bell, E. L. (1990b). The bicultural life experience of career-oriented black women. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 11(6), 459–477. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110607>
- Bell, E. L. (1992). Myths, stereotypes, and realities of Black women: A personal reflection. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 28(3), 363–376. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886392283003>
- Bell, M. P., Harrison, D. A., & McLaughlin, M. E. (2000). Forming, changing, and acting on attitude toward affirmative action programs in employment: A theory-driven approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 784–798. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.784>
- Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review*, 94(4), 991–1013. <https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828042002561>
- Binder, A. (1993). Constructing racial rhetoric: Media depictions of harm in heavy metal and rap music. *American Sociological Review*, 753–767. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095949>
- Blackburn, R. (1998). *The Making of New World Slavery: From the Baroque to the Modern 1492-1800*. Verso.
- Bloome, D. (2014). Racial inequality trends and the intergenerational persistence of income and family structure. *American Sociological Review*, 79(6), 1196–1225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414554947>
- Boykin, C. M., Brown, N. D., Carter, J. T., Dukes, K., Green, D. J., Harrison, T., Hebl, M., McCleary-Gaddy, A., Membere, A., McJunkins, C. A., Simmons, C., Singletary Walker, S., Smith, A. N., & Williams, A. D. (2020). Anti-racist actions and accountability: Not more empty promises. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 39(7), 775–786. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-06-2020-0158>
- Brandon, D. T., Isaac, L. A., & LaVeist, T. A. (2005). The legacy of Tuskegee and trust in medical care: is Tuskegee responsible for race differences in mistrust of medical care? *J Natl Med Assoc.*, 97(7), 951–956.
- Brannon, T. N., Markus, H. R., & Taylor, V. J. (2015). “Two souls, two thoughts,” two self-schemas: Double consciousness can have positive academic consequences for African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108(4), 586–609. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038992>
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17(5), 475–482. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167291175001>
- Briggs, L. (2000). The race of hysteria: “Overcivilization” and the “savage” woman in late nineteenth-century obstetrics and gynecology. *American Quarterly*, 52(2), 246–273.
- Brondolo, E., Gallo, L. C., & Myers, H. F. (2009). Race, racism and health: Disparities, mechanisms, and interventions. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 32, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-008-9190-3>
- Campbell, L. C., Keefe, F. J., Scipio, C., McKee, D. C., Edwards, C. L., Herman, S. H., et al. (2007). Facilitating research participation and improving quality of life for African American prostate cancer survivors and their intimate partners: a pilot study of telephone-based coping skills training. *Cancer: Interdisciplinary International Journal of the American Cancer Society*, 109(S2), 414–424. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.22355>
- Carbado, D. W. (2013). Colorblind intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(4), 811–845. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669666>
- Carbado, D. W., Crenshaw, K. W., Mays, V. M., & Tomlinson, B. (2013). Intersectionality: Mapping the movements of a theory. *Du Bois Review Social Science Research on Race*, 10(2), 303–312. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000349>
- Carbado, D. W., & Gulati, M. (2013). The intersectional fifth Black woman. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 10(2), 527–540. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000301>
- Carbado, D. W., & Roithmayr, D. (2014). Critical race theory meets social science. *Annual Review of Lab and Social Science*, 10, 149–167. doi: 10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110413-030928
- Carter, J. T., & Ponce de Leon, R. (in press). Double Jeopardy or Intersectional Invisibility? Reconciling (Seemingly) Opposing Perspectives. In M. Hebl, E. King, & Q. Roberson Connally (Eds.), *The Future of Diversity & Inclusion*. Information Age Publishing.
- Carton, A. M., & Rosette, A. S. (2011). Explaining bias against black leaders: Integrating theory on information processing and goal-based stereotyping. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6), 1141–1158. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.0745>
- Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(4), 543–676. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2010.55.4.543>
- Celiou, A., & Oyserman, D. (2001). Race from the inside: An emerging heterogeneous race model. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 149–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00206>
- Cha, S. E., Hewlin, P. F., Roberts, L. M., Buckman, B. R., Leroy, H., Steckler, E. L., et al. (2019). Being your true self at work: Integrating the fragmented research on authenticity in organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(2), 633–671. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0108>
- Collins, P. H. (2019). *Intersectionality as critical social theory*. Duke University Press.
- Cooke, B. (2003). The denial of slavery in management studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(8), 1895–1918. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-6486.2003.00405.x>
- Corbie-Smith, G., Moody-Ayers, S., & Thrasher, A. D. (2004). Closing the circle between minority inclusion in research and health disparities. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 164(13), 1362–1364.
- Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in

- organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of management*, 39(6), 1579–1605. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311418835>
- Cox Jr., T., & Nkomo, S. M. (1990). Invisible men and women: A status report on race as a variable in organization behavior research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(6), 419–431. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110604>
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1990). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241–1299.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *U. Chi. Legal f.*, 139.
- Czopp, A. M. (2019). The consequences of confronting prejudice. In R. K. Mallett & M. J. Monteith (Eds.), *Confronting prejudice and discrimination: The science of changing minds and behaviors* (pp. 201–221). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-814715-3.00005-9>
- Daniels, S., & Thornton, L. M. (2019). Race and workplace discrimination: The mediating role of cyber incivility and interpersonal incivility. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 39(3), 319–335. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-06-2018-0105>
- Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. *Feminist theory*, 9(1), 67–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700108086364>
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2013). *Discerning critical moments. In Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 43–53). Routledge.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical Race Theory (Third Edition): An Introduction*. New York University Press. <https://doi.org/10.18574/9781479851393>
- Denton, T. C. (1990). Bonding and supportive relationships among black professional women: Rituals of restoration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(6), 447–457. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110606>
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999. *Psychological science*, 11(4), 315–319. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00262>
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of Black folk: Essays and sketches*. A. G.
- Dumas, T. L., Phillips, K. W., & Rothbard, N. P. (2013). Getting closer at the company party: Integration experiences, racial dissimilarity, and workplace relationships. *Organization Science*, 24(5), 1377–1401. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0808>
- Eberhardt, J. L. (2019). *Biased: Uncovering the hidden prejudice that shapes what we see, think, and do*. Penguin Random House.
- Edwards, F., Lee, H., & Esposito, M. (2019). Risk of being killed by police use of force in the United States by age, race–ethnicity, and sex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(34), 16793–16798. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1821204116>
- Ekezie, W., Czyznikowska, B. M., Rohit, S., Harrison, J., Miah, N., Campbell-Morris, P., & Khunti, K. (2020). The views of ethnic minority and vulnerable communities towards participation in COVID-19 vaccine trials. *Journal of Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdaa196>
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2667087>
- Feagin, J., & Bennefield, Z. (2014). Systemic racism and US health care. *Social Science & Medicine*, 103, 7–14. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.09.006>
- Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 48(6), 621–628. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.48.6.621>
- Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp. 357–411). McGraw-Hill.
- French, B. H., Lewis, J. A., Mosley, D. V., Adames, H. Y., Chavez-Dueñas, N. Y., Chen, G. A., & Neville, H. A. (2020). Toward a psychological framework of radical healing in communities of color. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 48(1), 14–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019843506>
- Gaddis, S. M. (2015). Discrimination in the credential society: An audit study of race and college selectivity in the labor market. *Social Forces*, 93(4), 1451–1479. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sou111>
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61–89). Academic Press.
- Gamble, V. N. (1993). A legacy of distrust: African Americans and medical research. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 9(6), 35–38. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797\(18\)30664-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(18)30664-0)
- Gamble, V. N. (1997). Under the shadow of Tuskegee: African Americans and health care. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87(11), 1773–1778. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.87.11.1773>
- Ghavamian, N., & Peplau, L. A. (2013). An intersectional analysis of gender and ethnic stereotypes: Testing three hypotheses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 37(1), 113–127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684312464203>
- Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human: implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(2), 292. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.292>
- Goyal, M. K., Kuppermann, N., Cleary, S. D., Teach, S. J., & Chamberlain, J. M. (2015). Racial disparities in pain management of children with appendicitis in emergency departments. *JAMA pediatrics*, 169(11), 996–1002. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.1915>
- Greene, D. W. (2016). Splitting hairs: The eleventh circuit's take on workplace bans against black women's natural hair in EEOC v. *Catastrophe Management Solutions. U. Miami L. Rev.*, 71, 987.
- Gutiérrez, A. S., & Unzueta, M. M. (2010). The effect of interethnic ideologies on the likability of stereotypic vs. counterstereotypic minority targets. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(5), 775–784. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2010.03.010
- Habecker, S. (2012). Not black, but Habasha: Ethiopian and Eritrean immigrants in American society. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35(7), 1200–1219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.598232>
- Hall, A., Hall, E., & Perry, J. (2016). Black and blue: Exploring racial bias and law enforcement in the killings of unarmed black male civilians. *American Psychologist*, 71, 175–186. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040109>
- Hall, E. V., Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., Blot, J. F., & Edwards, M. (2019a). Composition and compensation: The moderating effect of individual and team performance on the relationship between Black team member representation and salary. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(3), 448–463. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000378>
- Hall, E. V., Hall, A. V., Galinsky, A. D., & Phillips, K. W. (2019b). MOSAIC: A model of stereotyping through associated and intersectional categories. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(3), 643–672. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2017.0109>
- Hammond, J. H., Massey, A. K., & Garza, M. A. (2020). *African American Inequality in the United States*. Harvard Business School.

- Harrison, D. A., Kravitz, D. A., Mayer, D. M., Leslie, L. M., & Lev-Arey, D. (2006). Understanding attitudes toward affirmative action programs in employment: Summary and meta-analysis of 35 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 1013–1036. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1013>
- Harrison, M. S., & Thomas, K. M. (2009). The hidden prejudice in selection: A research investigation on skin color bias. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(1), 134–168. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00433.x
- Hetey, R. C., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2018). The numbers don't speak for themselves: Racial disparities and the persistence of inequality in the criminal justice system. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 27*(3), 183–187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418763931>
- Hebl, M., Cheng, S. K., & Ng, L. C. (2020). Modern discrimination in organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 7*, 257–282. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044948>
- Heins, J. K., Heins, A., Grammas, M., Costello, M., Huang, K., & Mishra, S. (2006). Disparities in analgesia and opioid prescribing practices for patients with musculoskeletal pain in the emergency department. *Journal of Emergency Nursing, 32*(3), 219–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jen.2006.01.010>
- Herbert, J. I. (1990). Integrating race and adult psychosocial development. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*(6), 433–446. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110605>
- Hernandez, M., Avery, D. R., Volpone, S. D., & Kaiser, C. R. (2019). Bargaining while Black: The role of race in salary negotiations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 104*(4), 581–592. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000363>
- Hewlin, P. F. (2003). And the award for best actor goes to...: Facades of conformity in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review, 28*(4), 633–642. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2003.10899442>
- Hewlin, P. F. (2009). Wearing the cloak: antecedents and consequences of creating facades of conformity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(3), 727. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015228>
- Hewlin, P., & Broomes, A. (2019). Authenticity in the workplace: An African American Perspective. In L. M. Roberts, A. J. Mayo, & D. A. Thomas (Eds.), *Race, Work, and Leadership: New Perspectives on the Black Experience* (pp. 135–149). Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation.
- Hewlin, P. F., Kim, S. S., & Song, Y. H. (2016). Creating facades of conformity in the face of job insecurity: A study of consequences and conditions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 89*(3), 539–567. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12140>
- Hoffman, K. M., Trawalter, S., Axt, J. R., & Oliver, M. N. (2016). Racial bias in pain assessment and treatment recommendations, and false beliefs about biological differences between blacks and whites. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113*(16), 4296–4301. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1516047113>
- Hogg, M. A. (2004). Social Categorization, Depersonalization, and Group Behavior. In M. B. Brewer & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Self and social identity* (pp. 203–231). Blackwell Publishing.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. Taylor & Francis/Routledge.
- Holmes, I. O. (2020). Police brutality and four other ways racism kills Black people. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 39*(7), 803–809. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-06-2020-0151>
- Howard, S., & Borgella, A. M. (2019). Are Adewale and Ngochi more employable than Jamal and Lakeisha? The influence of nationality and ethnicity cues on employment-related evaluations of Blacks in the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 160*(4), 509–519. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2019.1687415>
- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., Becker, A. B., Allen, A. J., Guzman, J. R., & Lichtenstein, R. (2017). Critical issues in developing and following CBPR principles. *Community-based participatory research for health: Advancing social and health equity, 3*, 32–35.
- Jones, S. C., Anderson, R. E., Gaskin-Wasson, A. L., Sawyer, B. A., Applewhite, K., & Metzger, I. W. (2020). From “crib to coffin”: Navigating coping from racism-related stress throughout the lifespan of Black Americans. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 90*(2), 267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000430>
- Kang, S. K., DeCelles, K. A., Tilcsik, A., & Jun, S. (2016). Whiteden résumé: Race and self-presentation in the labor market. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 61*(3), 469–502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839216639577>
- Kaupp-Roberts, S. (2020). Out of the shadows: The legacy of racism in obstetrics and gynecology. *BMJ. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m4675*
- Keith, V., & Herring, C. (1991). Skin tone and stratification in the Black community. *American Journal of Sociology, 97*, 760–778. <https://doi.org/10.1086/229819>
- Kellner, D. (2017). Brexit plus, whitelash, and the ascendancy of Donald J. Trump. *Cultural Politics, 13*(2), 135–149. <https://doi.org/10.1215/17432197-4129089>
- Kendi, I. X. (2019). *How to be an antiracist*. Random House Publishing Group.
- King, D. D., Newman, A., & Luthans, F. (2016). Not if, but when we need resilience in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*(5), 782–786. doi: 10.1002/job.2063
- Koch, L. M., Gross, A. M., & Kolts, R. (2001). Attitudes Toward Black English and Code Switching. *Journal of Black Psychology, 27*, 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798401027001002>
- Konrad, A. M., Richard, O. C., & Yang, Y. (2021). Both diversity and meritocracy: Managing the diversity-meritocracy paradox with organizational ambidexterity. *Journal of Management Studies, 58*(8), 2180–2206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12752>
- Koval, C. Z., & Rosette, A. S. (2020). The Natural Hair Bias in Job Recruitment. *Social Psychological and Personality Science. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620937937*
- Krackhardt, D. (1990). Assessing the political landscape: Structure, cognition, and power in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 34*(2), 342–369. doi: 10.2307/2393394
- Lai, C.K., Marini, M., Lehr, S.A., Cerruti, C., Shin, J.E., Joy-Gaba, J.A., Ho, A.K., Teachman, B.A., Wojcik, S.P., Koleva, S.P., Frazier, R.S., Heiphetz, L., Chen, E.E., Turner, R.N., Haidt, J., Kesebir, S., Hawkins, C.B., Schaefer, H.S., Rubichi, S., Sartori, G., Dial, C.M., Sriram, N., Banaji, M.R., & Nosek, B.A. (2014). Reducing implicit racial preferences: I. A comparative investigation. Of 17 interventions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 143*(4), 1765–1785. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036260>.
- Lavalley, R., & Johnson, K. R. (2020). Occupation, injustice, and anti-Black racism in the United States of America. *Journal of Occupational Science. https://doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2020.1810111*
- LeCount, R. J. (2017). More black than blue? Comparing the racial attitudes of police to citizens. *Sociological Forum., 1051-1072. https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12367*
- Lehman, D. W., O'Connor, K., Kovács, B., & Newman, G. E. (2019). Authenticity. *Academy of Management Annals, 13*(1), 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2017.0047>
- Leigh, A., & Melwani, S. (2019). #BlackEmployeesMatter: Mega-threats, identity fusion, and enacting positive deviance in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 44*(3), 564–591. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2017.0127>

- Lennartz, C., Proost, K., & Brebels, L. (2019). Decreasing overt discrimination increases covert discrimination: Adverse effects of equal opportunities policies. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 27(2), 129–138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijasa.12244>
- Lesane-Brown, C. L. (2006). A review of race socialization within Black families. *Developmental Review*, 26(4), 400–426. doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2006.02.001
- Levinson, J. D., Cai, H., & Young, D. (2010). Guilty by implicit racial bias: The guilty/not guilty Implicit Association Test. *Ohio St. J. Crim. L.*, 8, 187.
- Lewis, T. T., & Van Dyke, M. E. (2018). Discrimination and the health of African Americans: The potential importance of intersectionalities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(3), 176–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418770442>
- Livingston, R. W., Rosette, A. S., & Washington, E. F. (2012). Can an agentic Black woman get ahead? The impact of race and interpersonal dominance on perceptions of female leaders. *Psychological Science*, 23(4), 354–358. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611428079>
- Lukachko, A., Hatzenbuehler, M. L., & Keyes, K. M. (2014). Structural racism and myocardial infarction in the United States. *Social Science & Medicine*, 103, 42–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.07.021>
- Magee, J. C., Galinsky, A. D. (2008). 8 social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 351–398. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520802211628>
- Massey, D. S., Rugh, J. S., Steil, J. P., & Albright, L. (2016). Riding the stagecoach to hell: A qualitative analysis of racial discrimination in mortgage lending. *City & Community*, 15(2), 118–136. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/cico.12179>
- Minkler, M., Wallerstein, N. (2003). Part one: Introduction to community-based participatory research. *Community-based participatory research for health*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 5–24.
- McCluney, C. L., Bryant, C. M., King, D. D., Ali, A. A. (2017). Calling in Black: A dynamic model of racially traumatic events, resourcing, and safety. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 36(8), 767–786. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-01-2017-0012>
- McCluney, C. L., King, D. D., Bryant, C. M., Ali, A. A. (2020). From “calling in black” to “calling for antiracism resources”: The need for systemic resources to address systemic racism. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, ahead-of-print. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-07-2020-0180>
- McCluney, C. L., Rabelo, V. C. (2019). Conditions of visibility: An intersectional examination of Black women’s belongingness and distinctiveness at work. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 113, 143–152. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.09.008>
- McCluney, C., Robotham, K., Lee, S., Smith, R., & Durkee, M. (2019). The costs of code-switching. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from: <https://hbr.org/2019/11/the-costs-of-codeswitching>
- McKay, P. F. (2020). Winning and losing at the same time. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*.
- McKay, P. F., & Avery, D. R. (2006). What has race got to do with it? Unraveling the role of race/ethnicity in job seekers’ reactions to site visits. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(2), 395–429. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00079.x>
- Meeussen, L., Otten, S., & Phalet, K. (2014). Managing diversity: How leaders’ multiculturalism and colorblindness affect work group functioning. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 17(5), 629–644. doi: 10.1177/1368430214525809
- Millet, P. E., Close, S. K., & Arthur, C. G., (2010). Beyond Tuskegee: Why African Americans do not participate in research. In R. L. Hampton, T. P. Gullotta, & R. L. Crowel (Eds.), *Handbook of African American health* (p. 51–79). Guilford Press.
- Morgenroth, T., Kirby, T. A., Ryan, M. K., & Sudkämper, A. (2020). The who, when, and why of the glass cliff phenomenon: A meta-analysis of appointments to precarious leadership positions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(9), 797–829. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000234>
- Nelson, A. (2002). Unequal treatment: confronting racial and ethnic disparities in health care. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 94(8), 666–668.
- Nkomo, S. M. (1992). The emperor has no clothes: Rewriting “race in organizations”. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3), 487–513. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1992.4281987>
- Nkomo, S. M. (2020). Intersecting viruses: A clarion call for a new direction in diversity theorizing. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 39(7), 811–821. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-07-2020-0192>
- Nkomo, S. M., Bell, M. P., Roberts, L. M., Joshi, A., & Thatcher, S. M. B. (2019). Diversity at a critical juncture: New theories for a complex phenomenon. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(3), 498–517. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2019.0103>
- O’Keefe, V. M., Wingate, L. R., Cole, A. B., Hollingsworth, D. W., & Tucker, R. P. (2015). Seemingly harmless racial communications are not so harmless: Racial microaggressions lead to suicidal ideation by way of depression symptoms. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 45(5), 567–576. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12150>
- Opie, T. R., & Phillips, K. W. (2015). Hair penalties: The negative influence of Afrocentric hair on ratings of Black women’s dominance and professionalism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1311. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01311>
- Ostroff, C., & Atwater, L. E. (2003). Does whom you work with matter? Effects of referent group gender and age composition on managers’ compensation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 725–740. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.725>
- Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(5), 937–975. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1086/374403>
- Pager, D., Western, B., Sugie, N. (2009). Sequencing disadvantage: Barriers to employment facing young black and white men with criminal records. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 623(1), 195–213. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716208330793>
- Paradies, Y., Truong, M., Priest, N. (2014). A systematic review of the extent and measurement of healthcare provider racism. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 29, 364–387. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-013-2583-1>
- Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., West, T. V., Gaertner, S. L., Albrecht, T. L., Dailey, R. K., & Markova, T. (2010). Aversive racism and medical interactions with Black patients: A field study. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(2), 436–440. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.11.004>
- Pfeffer, J., Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in organizations*. Pitman.
- Phillips, K. W., Dumas, T. L., & Rothbard, N. P. (2018). Diversity and authenticity. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(2), 132–136.
- Pierre, J. (2004). Black immigrants in the United States and the “cultural narratives” of ethnicity. *Identities: Global studies in culture and power*, 11(2), 141–170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10702890490451929>
- Phillips, K. W., & Loyd, D. L. (2006). When surface and deep-level diversity collide: The effects on dissenting group members. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99(2), 143–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.12.001>
- Phillips, K. W., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (2006). Surface-level diversity and decision-making in groups: When does deep-level similarity help? *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 9(4), 467–482. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430206067557>

- Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities? *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 444–446. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02318.x
- Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., Hurd, K., & Romano, C. A. (2018). Do color blindness and multiculturalism remedy or foster discrimination and racism?. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(3), 200–206. doi: 10.1177/0963721418766068
- Priest, N., Truong, M., Chong, S., Paradies, Y., King, T. L., Kavanagh, A., et al. (2020). Experiences of racial discrimination and cardiometabolic risk among Australian children. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*, 87, 660–665. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.02.012>
- Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles*, 59(5–6), 377–391. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4>
- Quillian, L., Pager, D., Hexel, O., & Midtbøen, A. H. (2017). Meta-analysis of field experiments shows no change in racial discrimination in hiring over time. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(41), 10870–10875. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1706255114>
- Rabelo, V. C., Robotham, K. J., & McCluney, C. L. (2020). “Against a sharp white background”: How Black women experience the white gaze at work. *Gender, Work & Organization*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12564>
- Rad, M. S., Martingano, A. J., & Ginges, J. (2018). Toward a psychology of homo sapiens: Making psychological science more representative of the human population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115, 11401–11405.
- Ragins, B. R., & Sundstrom, E. (1989). Gender and power in organizations: A longitudinal perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 105(1), 51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.105.1.51>
- Raverby, S. M. (2012). *Tuskegee’s Truths: Rethinking the Tuskegee Syphilis study*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Ray, V. (2019). A theory of racialized organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 84(1), 26–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418822335>
- Ray, V., & Purifoy, D. (2019). The colorblind organization. In *Race, organizations, and the organizing process*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Richard, O. C., Triana, M. D. C., & Li, M. (2021). The effects of racial diversity congruence between upper management and lower management on firm productivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(5), 1355–1382. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2019.0468>
- Richard, O. C. (2000). Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 164–177. <https://doi.org/10.5465/1556374>
- Richardson, L. C., Henley, S. J., Miller, J. W., Massetti, G., & Thomas, C. C. (2016). Patterns and trends in age-specific black-white differences in breast cancer incidence and mortality—United States, 1999–2014. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 65(40), 1093–1098.
- Richeson, J. A., & Nussbaum, R. J. (2004). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 40(3), 417–423. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2003.09.002
- Roediger, D. R., & Esch, E. D. (2012). *The production of difference: Race and the management of labor in US history*. Oxford University Press.
- Roberson, Q., King, E., & Hebl, M. (2020). Designing more effective practices for reducing workplace inequality. *Behavioral Science & Policy*, 6(1), 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.1353/bsp.2020.0003>
- Roberts, S. O., Bareket-Shavit, C., Dollins, F. A., Goldie, P. D., & Mortenson, E. (2020). Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(6), 1295–1309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620927709>
- Rosette, A. S., Koval, C. Z., Ma, A. (2016). Race matters for women leaders: Intersectional effects on agentic deficiencies and penalties. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 429–445. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.01.008>
- Rosette, A. S., Leonardelli, G. J., & Phillips, K. W. (2008). The White standard: racial bias in leader categorization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(4), 758. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.758>
- 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(5), 1162–1167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.05.002>
- Rosette, A. S., Ponce de Leon, R. P., Koval, C. Z., & Harrison, D. A. (2018). Intersectionality: Connecting experiences of gender with race at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 38, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2018.12.002>
- Ryan, M. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2005). The glass cliff: Evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. *British Journal of Management*, 16(2), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2005.00433.x>
- Salter, P., & Adams, G. (2013). Toward a critical race psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7(11), 781–793. doi: 10.1111/spc3.12068
- Salvatore, J., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). Cognitive costs of exposure to racial prejudice. *Psychological Science*, 18(9), 810–815. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01984.x>
- Scharff, D. P., Mathews, K. J., Jackson, P., Hoffsuemmer, J., Martin, E., & Edwards, D. (2010). More than Tuskegee: understanding mistrust about research participation. *Journal of health care for the poor and underserved*, 21(3), 879. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.0.0323>
- Sedikides, C., Lenton, A. P., Slabu, L., & Thomaes, S. (2019). Sketching the contours of state authenticity. *Review of General Psychology*, 23(1), 73–88. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000156>
- Sellers, R. M., Smith Bynum, M. A., Shelton, J. N., & Rowley, S. J. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2(1), 18–39. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0201_2
- Silva, F. (2018). The strength of Whites’ ties: How employers reward the referrals of Black and White jobseekers. *Social Forces*, 97(2), 741–768. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soy051>
- Singleton, G. J., Robertson, J., Robinson, J. C., Austin, C., & Edochie, V. (2008). Perceived racism and coping: Joint predictors of blood pressure in Black Americans. *Negro Educational Review*, 59(1–2), 93–113.
- Showers, F. (2015). Being black, foreign and woman: African immigrant identities in the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(10), 1815–1830. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2015.1036763>
- Skloot, R. (2017). *The immortal life of Henrietta Lacks*. Broadway Paperbacks.
- Smith, A., Allen, W., & Danley, L. (2007a). ‘Assume the position... You fit the description’: Psychological experiences and racial battle fatigue among African American male college students. *American Behavioral Scientists*, 51, 551–578. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764207307742>
- Smith, A. N., Watkins, M. B., Ladge, J. J., & Carlton, P. (2019). Making the invisible visible: Paradoxical effects of intersectional invisibility on the career experiences of executive Black women. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(6). <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2017.1513>

- Smith, Y. R., Johnson, A. M., Newman, L. A., Greene, A., Johnson, T. R., & Rogers, J. L. (2007b). Perceptions of clinical research participation among African American women. *Journal of Women's Health, 16*(3), 423–428. <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2006.0124>
- Solorzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education, 60*–73. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2696265>
- Sue, D. W., Alsaidi, S., Awad, M. N., Glaeser, E., Calle, C. Z., & Narolyn, M. (2019). Disarming racial microaggressions: Microintervention strategies for targets, white allies, and bystanders. *American Psychologist, 74*(1), 128–142. doi: 10.1037/amp0000296
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., & Holder, A. M. (2008). Racial microaggressions in the life experience of Black Americans. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39*(3), 329–336. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.39.3.329>
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American psychologist, 62*(4), 271. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271>
- Tait, R. C., & Chibnall, J. T. (2014). Racial/ethnic disparities in the assessment and treatment of pain: Psychosocial perspectives. *American Psychologist, 69*(2), 131. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035204>
- Tajfel, H. E. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cup Archive.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relation* (pp. 7–24). Hall Publishers.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 1*(2), 149–178. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420010202>
- Teal, C. R., & Street, R. L. (2009). Critical elements of culturally competent communication in the medical encounter: a review and model. *Social Science & Medicine, 68*(3), 533–543. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.10.015>
- Thomas, D. A. (1990). The impact of race on managers' experiences of developmental relationships (mentoring and sponsorship): An intra-organizational study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*(6), 479–492. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110608>
- Thompson, C. (2009). Black women, beauty, and hair as a matter of being. *Women's Studies, 38*(8), 831–856. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00497870903238463>
- Thompson, H. S., Valdimarsdottir, H. B., Jandorf, L., & Redd, W. (2003). Perceived disadvantages and concerns about abuses of genetic testing for cancer risk: differences across African American, Latina and Caucasian women. *Patient Education and Counseling, 51*(3), 217–227. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-3991\(02\)00219-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-3991(02)00219-7)
- Turner, J. C. (2010). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In T. Postmes & N. R. Branscombe (Eds.), *Rediscovering social identity* (pp. 243–272). Psychology Press.
- UyBico, S. J., Pavel, S., & Gross, C. P. (2007). Recruiting vulnerable populations into research: a systematic review of recruitment interventions. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 22*(6), 852–863. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-007-0126-3>
- van Dijk, H., Kooij, D., Karanika-Murray, M., De Vos, A., & Meyer, B. (2020). Meritocracy a myth? A multilevel perspective of how social inequality accumulates through work. *Organizational Psychology Review, 10*(3-4), 240–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386620930063>
- Walter, S. L., Gonzalez-Mulé, E., Guarana, C. L., O'Boyle Jr., E. H., Berry, C. M., & Baldwin, T. T. (2020). The race discipline gap: A cautionary note on archival measures of behavioral misconduct. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.03.010*
- Washington, H. A. (2006). *Medical apartheid: The dark history of medical experimentation on Black Americans from colonial times to the present*. Doubleday Books.
- Waytz, A., Hoffman, K. M., & Trawalter, S. (2015). A superhumanization bias in Whites' perceptions of Blacks. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 6*(3), 352–359. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550614553642>
- Wessel, J. L., Barth, S. E., & Bryant, C. M. (2020). *Authentically different: Authenticity as a diversity management issue*. Information Age Publishing.
- West, L. M., Donovan, R. A., Roemer, L. (2010). Coping with racism: What works and what doesn't work for Black women? *Journal of Black Psychology, 36*(3), 331–349. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798409353755>
- Wilkerson, I. (2020). *Caste: The Origins of Our Discontents*. Penguin Random House. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.12394>
- Williams, I. C., & Corbie-Smith, G. (2006). Investigator beliefs and reported success in recruiting minority participants. *Contemporary Clinical Trials, 27*(6), 580–586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cct.2006.05.006>
- Williams, D. R., Lawrence, J. A., Davis, B. A., & Vu, C. (2019). Understanding how discrimination can affect health. *Health Services Research, 54*, 1374–1388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.13222>
- Williams, D. R., & Sternthal, M. (2010). Understanding racial-ethnic disparities in health: sociological contributions. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 51*(1_suppl), S15–S27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146510383838>
- Zahodne, L. B., Manly, J. J., Smith, J., Seeman, T., & Lachman, M. E. (2017). Socioeconomic, health, and psychosocial mediators of racial disparities in cognition in early, middle, and late adulthood. *Psychology and Aging, 32*(2), 118–130. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000154>

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.