Kim Burke   **University of California, Berkeley**
kcburke@berkeley.edu

Kimberly C. Burke is a graduate student and Chancellor's Fellow at the University of California at Berkeley Department of Sociology. Broadly, her research examines the institutional, organizational, and individual mechanisms underlying racial inequality and social hierarchies, with a specialization in policing. More specifically, she investigates: 1. how ingroup/outgroup dynamics impact DEI reform efforts within policing; 2. the organizational barriers to racial equity goals within policing; 3.the spillover effects of policing on interpersonal relationships outside of police interactions. Before her doctoral program, she collaborated with police trainers to develop and implement officer training aimed at disrupting bias. She translated these pedagogical insights into a book chapter on best practices for bias-intervention training. This work earned her an invitation to speak at the United Nations Human Rights Council in Geneva, Switzerland. She and her research have been featured in media outlets, including Politico, National Public Radio's Morning Edition, New York Times, and theSkimm. She has a B.A. from Duke University and an M.A. in Women's Studies from San Diego State, where she was a Carstens-Wertz Sisterhood Scholar.

Abstract:

The Impact of Policing on Social Identity and Intergroup Interactions in Black-White Interracial Relationships.

Racial formation theory describes racial hierarchies as organized and inhabited through the mutually constitutive relationship between the macro-level state institutions and the micro-level of everyday experiences (Omi & Winant, 1994). Over time, hierarchy-enhancing institutions act back upon individuals, shaping reasoning and determining conduct in ways that solidify racial stratification. This study bridges the sociological theory of racial formation with insights from psychology's social dominance theory (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) to examine how hierarchy-enhancing institutions, such as policing, shape the everyday boundaries of racial hierarchy in interracial interactions. I examine hierarchy-enhancing and -attenuating dynamics in a context in which intergroup interactions are most prevalent and more easily observed: Black and White interracial couples.

Evidence suggests that racism increases White people's affective capital— those resources a "person gains from being positively evaluated and [the] positive emotions generated from affirming social interactions [which] can generate…greater creativity, resilience, and emotional well-being" (Hordge-Freeman 2015 p.5.) Additionally, I introduce the concept of physical capital to explain how racism produced by policing increases White people's freedom of movement,

bodily safety, and conditions that facilitate an individual's or group's ability to engage in society fully. In this way, I extend Magee and Galinksy's (2008) conception of power as control over valued resources to include affective and physical capital, where racial stratification describes the unequal distribution of these resources. In a relational ethnography that draws on 32 in-depth interviews with 16 Black-White interracial, I ask how policing shapes the racialized distribution of physical and affective capital in Black/White relationships.

I find that distributions of physical and affective capital are associated with two main factors: participants' conceptions of White agency and communality. Agency refers to an individual's self-protection and independence, while communality focuses on interdependence and mutual support. Based on these concepts, I developed two typologies, White agency, and White communality, to categorize the divergent behavioral expectations and emotional responses observed among the couples when the partner perceived themselves or was perceived as agentic or communal. White agency correlates to behavioral expectations that reproduce unequal distributions of physical and affective capital (i.e., power) along racial lines. When White partners' agency was centered, couples did not express any behavioral expectations of the White partner. They described ways the Black partner should try to prevent police interactions, like making sure their tags were up to date, attending neighborhood meetings to make themselves known to White neighbors, and avoiding public behaviors that could be viewed as 'dangerous.' Consequently, White agency maintains White participants' access to safety from undue police violence and freedom to navigate public spaces without fear of police aggression or surveillance. As such, individuals focused on White agency inadvertently enhance racial stratification.

In contrast, White communality correlates to behavioral expectations that aim to challenge the unequal power dynamics caused by biased policing. They expect White partners to become more mindful of their everyday actions (while shopping, driving, or walking in the neighborhood) to avoid police interactions that may harm their Black partners. In some cases, couples expressed the expectation that the White partner should physically intervene in police action. In line with these findings, sentiment analysis reveals that White communality is associated with a higher frequency of positive emotion words in Black partners than White agency. In summary, this study shows that policing, a hierarchy-enhancing institution that disproportionately targets and enforces actions against Black individuals (Eberhardt et al., 2004; Goff et al., 2008; Brunson & Miller, 2006), reproduces hierarchy-enhancing behaviors at the interpersonal level through the perceived agency of, and among, White people.

With few exceptions, studies of agency and communality in workplace settings have focused singularly on gender, with little attention paid to racial dynamics. This research motivates future examinations of agency and communality in interracial interactions. The findings of this study suggest that White communality will increase equity in teamwork, mitigate workplace harassment, and increase wellbeing among Black employees. Field surveys should be used to test these hypotheses among Black-White colleagues.

Grace Flores-Robles　　　　　　　　　　　　　**CUNY Graduate Center**

gfloresrobles@gradcenter.cuny.edu

Grace Flores-Robles is a doctoral candidate in psychology at the CUNY Graduate Center. Her research investigates the role of morality in organizations, including how people allocate blame for corporate wrongdoing and why people oppose labor unions. Grace is currently a Junior Scholar at the Stone Center on Socio-Economic Inequality and a Quantitative Reasoning Fellow at the CUNY School of Labor and Urban Studies.

Abstract:

Seeing and Sanctioning Structural Unfairness
Authors: Grace Flores-Robles, CUNY Graduate Center and Ana Gantman, Brooklyn College

When a wrongdoing occurs, people can think about blame in two ways: as the result of "bad actors" (i.e., individuals who are responsible for the bad outcome) or "bad systems" (i.e., structural factors that are ultimately responsible for the outcome). In five studies (four U.S. online convenience, one U.S. representative sample), we examined how people ascribed responsibility, and subsequently punished, unfairness in an economic game. In Pilot 1A (N = 40), people interpreted unfair offers in an economic game as the result of a bad actor (vs. unfair rules), unless incentivized (Pilot 1B, N = 40), which, in Study 1 (N = 370), predicted costly punishment of individuals (vs. changing unfair rules). In Studies 2 (N = 500) and 3, (N = 470, representative of age, gender, and ethnicity in the U.S), we found that people paid to change the rules for the final round of the game (vs. punished individuals), when they were randomly assigned a bad system (vs. bad actor) explanation for prior identical unfair offers. This research suggests that how people understand, and ultimately explain, unfairness influences how they sanction the systems that perpetuate it.

Roman Angel Gallardo   **University of Chicago**
roman.gallardo@chicagobooth.edu   **Booth school of Business**

Roman Angel Gallardo is a doctoral student in the Behavioral Science program at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business and a recipient of the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship. In 2019, he received his BA in Psychology from Sonoma State University as a Ronald E. McNair Scholar. After graduation, Roman spent three years in the Peace and Conflict Neuroscience Lab at the University of Pennsylvania researching the psychological roots of intergroup conflict. Roman is broadly interested in intergroup relations, with a focus on stigmatized groups. More specifically, Roman has three lines of interests: the predictors of prejudice and discrimination, why and how group disparities persist, and the psychological factors underlying intergroup conflict.

Abstract:

Competitive climates increase material and symbolic zero-sum thinking

When people believe one person's gain comes from another person's loss, they are said to have zero-sum beliefs (ZSBs). In 5 studies, we investigate (1) whether a competitive workplace climate leads people to believe that resources are more zero-sum, (2) whether a competitive climate increases ZSBs for both material and symbolic resources, and (3) whether highlighting an abundance of resources can decrease ZSBs, even within a competitive workplace climate.

Many scholars have linked competition and zero-sum beliefs conceptually. Moreover, empirical research suggests that zero-sum beliefs arise in situations of threat and resource scarcity (Wilkins et al., 2022; Kuchynka et al., 2018; Sirola & Pitesa, 2017; Ongis & Davidai, 2022). However, as far as we know, there has not been any research directly testing whether a competitive climate causes more zero-sum beliefs. Our studies provide such a test. In addition, we develop a ZSB scale with two sub-scales to separately test whether a competitive climate affects material resources that are inherently limited (e.g., money) and symbolic resources that need not be limited (e.g., respect). Finally, we identify consequences of zero-sum thinking within the workplace and develop an intervention to short-circuit zero-sum thinking.

In two online studies (Studies 1 and 2; Ns = 1,311), we test whether zero-sum beliefs vary depending on workplace climate by having participants read about a fictional company with either a competitive, collaborative, or neutral work climate and report their level of agreement with items that measure material ZSBs and separately, symbolic ZSBs. Participants who read about a competitive workplace climate more strongly endorsed both material and symbolic zero-sum beliefs (Study 1 both material and symbolic ZSBs: $F(2, 464) = 25.31$, $p < 0.001$; Study 2 material ZSBs: $F(2, 421) = 38.16$, $p < 0.001$, symbolic ZSBs: $F(2, 417) = 16.54$, $p < 0.001$).

In Study 3, we examine the relationship between climate perceptions and ZSBs for members of a real (rather than fictional) organization. We find that MBA students (N = 325) who perceive their program climate as more competitive report stronger endorsement of both material and symbolic ZSBs (material ZSBs: $B = 0.18$, $t = 3.38$, $p < 0.001$; symbolic ZSBs: $B = 0.10$, $z = 1.96$,

p = 0.05). Furthermore, higher ZSBs was associated with less willingness to help colleagues (B = -0.26, z = -2.42, p = 0.02) and less willingness to donate to the MBA program (B = -4.79, z = -2.68, p = 0.01), highlighting the importance of mitigating zero-sum thinking within competitive professional environments.

Finally, in two intervention studies (Studies 4 and 5; Ns = 2,171), we test whether signaling resource abundance mitigates ZSBs and its associated consequences. In Study 4, we describe a workplace as either competitive or collaborative and orthogonally manipulate whether resources are described as plentiful (or are not mentioned). In Study 5, we used an experiential budget task to signal either resource abundance or scarcity. Results indicate that signaling resource abundance with text and with an experiential task leads participants to report less material and symbolic ZSBs in competitive workplace climates (Study 4 $F(1, 1078) = 12.11$, $p < 0.001$; Study 5 $F(1, 1087) = 54.96$, $p < 0.001$).

Collectively, the current work advances our understanding of ZSBs formation and its associated consequences, and offers an intervention that can mitigate ZSBs within a competitive environment.

Sandra Portocarrero   **Columbia Business School**
svp2118@columbia.edu

As an organizational sociologist, I study how workplace structures and social categories of people — like race and ethnicity, social class, and immigration status — jointly shape processes of inclusion and exclusion that can perpetuate or alleviate inequality. With my work, I strive to provide empirical, theoretical and applied insights into consequential diversity, equity, and inclusion related phenomena.

Abstract:

How Expertise Becomes Racialized in Everyday Work Interactions

How does workers' expertise become racialized? And what are the consequences of racializing the expertise of workers? Despite the important work of expertise and occupational scholars, how a worker's race and ethnicity shape perceptions and presentations of expertise and the consequences of such attributions on everyday work life is still unclear. In this study of diversity, equity, and inclusion (hereafter, DEI) workers at a large U.S. R1 university that I refer to as Atlantic, I find that the race and ethnicity of workers play a significant role in perceptions and presentations of DEI expertise. Understanding the racialization of expertise is critical because the processes of attribution, recognition, and utilization of expertise can impact how work is structured (Di Benigno and Kellogg, 2014; Liang, Moreland, and Argote, 1995; Larson et al., 1996). For example, in their study of TSA agents, Chan and Anteby (2016) showed that because of managers' assumption that female workers can perform specific tasks better than male workers in the same job, women were allocated more (and more intense) tasks than men, negatively affecting female TSA workers.

This paper addresses how expertise becomes racialized and the consequences of such a process in task allocation. I examine how people at Atlantic perceive the expertise of DEI workers, how DEI workers present their expertise, and how coworkers and managers allocate tasks to DEI workers. In my study, workers at Atlantic perceive that minority DEI workers carry a type of expertise grounded in experiential and cultural knowledge gained through the experiences of being a racial minority in the United States. Similarly, when discussing the experiences that have prepared them to fulfill the tasks associated with their DEI role, minority DEI workers referenced the knowledge gained through lived experiences and their competence to understand other minority group members rather than their educational background or knowledge of the organization's bureaucracy. I call the expertise that people attribute and self-attribute to minority workers based on the belief that a worker can carry out specialized tasks because of experiential and cultural knowledge gained through a workers' positionality in society, *racialized expertise.*

The differences in perceptions and presentations of DEI expertise dictated what tasks were allocated to whom, ultimately leading to task segregation. Task segregation happens when a group of workers is disproportionately allocated, relative to other groups, to spend more time on specific tasks in a given job (Chan & Anteby, 2016). Because supervisors and colleagues attributed racialized expertise to minority DEI workers, they allocated tasks that required them to

perform emotional labor and racial tasks – tasks that require workers of color to display cultural practices, behaviors, and attitudes in response to race-related situations (Wingfield and Alskton, 2014: 285) *in addition to* tasks recognized as core in their job description (i.e., core tasks). In contrast, supervisors and colleagues mainly attributed *administrative expertise* to White DEI workers and allocated mostly core tasks to these workers. Thus, the segregation of tasks created unequal work burdens among DEI workers and disparities in task quantity and task content, that is, the complexity of a given work task (Wilmers, 2020). I develop a theoretical model of how expertise becomes racialized, identifying the conditions under which these attributions happen and specifying the consequences of attributions and self-attributions of racialized expertise in everyday task allocation. As more organizations are hiring DEI workers, hoping they have the competence to interact with minority constituents (Maurer, 2020; Goldstein, Grewel, Imose & Williams, 2022), understanding perceptions and presentations of racialized expertise and the consequences of racialized processes is increasingly consequential for scholars and practitioners interested in organizational life.