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CHAPTER 1

Introduction
The central question in this dissertation is whether the diversity of the workforce in terms of ethnicity and gender affects ethnic and gender ingroup preferences. Group threat and group contact theory (see Section 1.1 and Chapter 2) are used to explain the potential effects of workforce diversity. The use of these theories within the work context is discussed in Section 1.2 and Chapter 2. Finally, the preference towards the ingroup is studied via two specific phenomena, namely dismissals and the support for preferential treatment (see Section 1.3).

1.1 Competition and cooperation in the workplace

Work plays a central role in people’s lives (Fassinger, 2008) and is a main aspect of their social status (Heizmann, 2014). In combination with the increasingly diverse workforce in terms of gender and ethnicity, this makes the workplace an ideal context where researchers can test competing theories on how the composition of the workforce regarding majority and minority groups affects workers from those groups (Reskin et al., 1999).

Modern organisations require political behaviour from their employees. On the one hand, employees have to work with one another, which requires cooperation; on the other hand, resources such as career openings are limited in availability, creating a certain degree of competition (Kvande and Rasmussen, 1994). Does the diversity of the workforce in terms of ethnicity and gender, via the mechanisms of competition and cooperation, affect ethnic and gender ingroup preferences? Whereas one author (e.g. Estlund, 2005) may see the individual workplace as a place where employees can overcome prejudices against the outgroup by cooperating, communicating and commiserating with colleagues from another ethnic background (who they probably would not have met otherwise), others (e.g. Heizmann, 2014) point out that fear of increased labour market competition due to immigration is a relevant cause for anti-immigrant attitudes. At the micro-level, the first idea forms the foundation of contact theory, which assumes that people who have more interaction with...
members of other groups will, under the right conditions, form more positive attitudes towards those groups (Sections 2.4 and 2.5). The latter idea, at a macro-level, is rooted in threat theory: heightened competition for jobs between ethnic minorities and native Dutch individuals can lead to fear and negative attitudes. Both threat theory and contact theory can connect ethnic composition to prejudices. In this dissertation, they are also used to explain gender prejudices. Prejudice is often described as an attitude consisting of negative feelings, beliefs and behavioural intentions towards the outgroup (Strabac and Listhaug, 2008). This dissertation focuses on the preference for the ingroup over the outgroup. In particular, it uses workforce diversity (among other things) to explain two work-related phenomena in which ingroup preferences are expected to play a role: dismissals and the support for preferential treatment in recruiting personnel.

The effect of workforce diversity in terms of demographic characteristics has long been a subject of management studies. It is also relevant for psychological and sociological research (DiTomaso et al., 2007). In the latter sciences, prejudices are an important field of study, though when they are studied in an empirical setting, it is usually not the workplace (Dixon and Rosenbaum, 2004). This dissertation bridges these two fields of study by applying sociological and socio-psychological theories (threat theory and contact theory) to the workplace. Although neither theory is necessarily restricted to a specific context, the focus is often on the composition of groups of people in neighbourhoods or a city. The workplace, however, appears to receive less attention (Dixon and Rosenbaum, 2004). By disregarding the workplace when investigating ingroup preferences, an important aspect of individuals' social circles is overlooked. Adults spend a large portion of their waking hours working, which in many cases gives them more opportunity to interact with others than is the case in their free time. Moreover, a workplace is more likely to be diverse than other settings in which people interact (Reskin et al., 1999). The younger generations in the Netherlands are more ethnically diverse than the older generations. For example, in January 2017, 29% of people in the age group 20–30 years were born outside the Netherlands or had a parent who was. In the age group 50–60 years, this percentage was 19% (CBS, 2017a). Hence, the work context increases the chances of older Dutch people being in contact with younger people other than their kin (Uhlenberg and Gierveld, 2004), and also, given the increased ethnic diversity in the younger age group, of being in contact with people from an ethnic minority background. As Estlund (2005) suggests, the workplace is where people are compelled to work with one another, not where they choose to do so. In this dissertation it is assumed that this makes selection effects less likely, which makes the workplace an ideal context in which to study the effects of contact and competition between groups.

---

3In some studies (e.g. Bobo and Zubrinsky, 1996), it is possible to distinguish between ingroup preferences and outgroup prejudices. The former are defined as the preference for one's own group – a preference that is similar across all groups independent of their societal position. Outgroup prejudices also take into account that some outgroups receive 'extra' hostility based on their status. With the chosen outcome measures and the limited possibilities to compare preferences across different groups, however, it is not possible to distinguish between both phenomena in this study.

4Some authors refer to this as workforce diversity, but it all comes down to the composition of work units (on different levels, ranging from teams to total organisations) in terms of demographic or cultural characteristics. In this dissertation, workforce diversity is studied at the branch level of organisations, and concerns employees' gender and ethnicity.
As mentioned, the ethnic composition of the workforce in the Netherlands is changing. In 1996, 15% of the potential labour market (i.e. people aged 15–65 years old) had parents who were born outside the Netherlands and/or were born outside the Netherlands themselves. By 2014, this percentage had risen to 22% (CBS, 2015), and it will continue to increase in the coming decades (CBS, 2014). Moreover, the percentage of this group in the workforce (i.e. people with a job for more than 12 hours a week) also rose in this period, from 13% to 19% (CBS, 2015). The percentage of women in the workforce also increased in this period, from 37% to 45% (CBS, statline 2015). Thus, the composition of the working environment within many organisations has changed. Nevertheless, both vertical and horizontal segregation persist (Dolado et al., 2003). The aforementioned changes have made it increasingly probable that a workplace will contain a more balanced mixture of men and women, and of native Dutch individuals and people from an immigrant background. This makes it all the more relevant to know whether the degree of workforce diversity, via the mechanisms of cooperation and competition, changes ingroup preferences.

1.2 Ethnic and gender composition of the workforce

Contact theory and threat theory were originally developed to explain ethnic preferences. It could be argued that they also explain gender preferences (Reskin et al., 1999). In contexts such as neighbourhoods (often taken as a context to explain the influence of ethnic composition on ethnic attitudes), it is not useful to apply threat theory to explain gender attitudes, since the distribution of men and women will probably be almost equal, and because men and women who are living together do not have to compete for scarce goods such as housing. In labour issues, however, these differences are more subtle. In these cases, men and women compete for scarce goods such as high-quality jobs. According to threat theory, competition may lead to more negative attitudes towards the minority group.

Some authors argue that threat theory could indeed be applied to the gender composition in the labour market and even in the workplace (Reskin et al., 1999). For contact theory, despite the everyday basis on which men and women interact, it is possible that contact with women in the working environment affects the stereotype content and in turn the ingroup preferences in that context.

Thus, this dissertation takes both gender and ethnic workforce diversity into account, something that is rarely done (Reskin et al., 1999). Its contribution is that it determines whether threat theory and contact theory remain valid in a different context and for another ingroup-outgroup construction.

The central independent variable in this study is workforce diversity in terms of gender and ethnicity. The gender and ethnic composition is an important characteristic of an organisation’s social structure (Reskin et al., 1999). Since the 1980s, this composition of the workforce has received more attention, especially to understand the link between the

---

5 In this dissertation the term ethnic minorities is used for groups with an ethnic background other than Dutch, suggesting that there is a Dutch ethnic majority. Whereas this is true on a national level, in some areas of life such as specific neighborhoods (and in this dissertation the workforce of a branch), this is not necessarily the case. Although there is no strict majority group anymore in those examples, as Duyvendak (2017) argues, people are still aware which groups have most access to goods and power in general.
micro-level of the workplace and inequality at the macro-level, as well as to understand workgroup dimensions (Reskin et al., 1999). In addition, more recent research has taken workforce composition into account as an important variable, with outcomes focusing on explaining business results, health and discrimination, and the effect of workforce diversity on psychological distress, life dissatisfaction, job dissatisfaction (Maddox, 2013) and experienced discrimination (Stainback and Irvin, 2012). Such research has also investigated the effect of gender composition on mortality (Barclay, 2013), experienced discrimination (Bobbitt-Zeher, 2011), psychological distress (Elwér et al., 2014) and sick leave (Laaksonen et al., 2012).

The central question in this dissertation – Does workforce diversity in terms of gender and ethnicity affect ingroup preferences regarding employment-related issues (not specifically tied to people's own working environment)? – has remained largely unanswered. This relation could likely provide insight into whether people's preferences regarding labour market issues are formed, or partly formed, by their personal experiences in the workplace. As the workforce is growing increasingly diverse in terms of gender and ethnicity, this question is becoming all the more relevant. Moreover, the question whether workforce diversity is related to ingroup preferences is not only of theoretical importance: it also serves a policy goal, since ingroup preferences are related to behaviour, whereby stronger preferences can lead to discriminative behaviour in the recruitment process. Although this does not always have to be the case (Derous et al., 2009), discrimination is an integral part of understanding how inequality arises (Hirsh and Lyons, 2010). Therefore, to better manage diversity within the workforce, it is crucial to know how this increasing diversity is connected to ingroup preferences, and what other factors play a role. At a time when many organisations aim to be increasingly diverse and inclusive, it is of crucial importance to be aware of potential effects on group relations.

1.3 Dismissals and support for preferential treatment
In this dissertation the following subjects are investigated because of their expected reflection of ingroup preferences in different phases of the employment cycle:
• ethnic and gender preferences regarding dismissals;
• support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities and women in the recruitment process.

Both subjects have a group competition element. Preferential treatment is intended to increase the chances of members of minority groups. In the case of dismissals, this study investigates whether people have a preference for their ingroup, which would weaken the position of the outgroup. Discussing different phases within the employment circle of hiring and firing, enables the discussion of the degree to which generalisation to the full employment circle can be made.

Employers who strive to achieve these goals could sign the 'Diversity Charter.' The Netherlands is the 16th country in Europe to have such a charter. So far (October 2017), 92 employers in the public and private sectors (e.g. various government ministries as well as such companies as Coca-Cola and Microsoft) have signed this declaration of intent and formulated at least one concrete goal ('Diversiteit in bedrijf', n.d.).

Preferential treatment is a specific form of affirmative action. Only tiebreak preferential treatment in recruitment is allowed in the Netherlands, and only under strict conditions (equal treatment act: article 2 (3)). It is called tiebreak preferential treatment (e.g. Verbeek and Groeneveld, 2012) because preference can only be given to an ethnic minority candidate/female candidate if the candidate is just as qualified as the best qualified native Dutch/male candidate.
Although the preferential treatment measure has received much public and scholarly attention (as will be described in Chapters 5 and Chapter 7, which explain the support for preferential treatment), the empirical importance of this measure should not be overestimated. Verbeek and Groeneveld (2012) conclude, based on the reports from 8,283 organisations filed in 2001/02 under the obligation of the SAMEN act\(^8\), that the ethnic diversity within organisations that implemented preferential treatment did not increase compared to organisations that did not implement this measure. The authors also refer to older studies (such as Callender, 1989) that show that in the Netherlands, organisations that indicate in their vacancy listings that they apply preferential treatment of ethnic minorities, rarely end up hiring such individuals. Schaafsma (2006) carried out 219 in-depth interviews with employees, managers and HR professionals within 15 Dutch ethnically diverse organisations, and concludes that the resistance to implementing such measures in these organisations was substantial (between 78% and 91% of the respondents within an organization did not support such measures).

Preferential treatment is included in this study despite the measure seeming to have little empirical importance and support, mainly because preferential treatment and dismissal preferences are expected to reflect ingroup preferences related to the workplace. The two subjects are not analysed with the aim of fully revealing all factors underlying them. Instead, they are chosen because of their relation to the labour market. Moreover, both subjects can be investigated in a manner that minimises the risk of obtaining socially desirable answers. A vignette study is used to investigate dismissals, so that people’s choices do not directly reveal their ingroup preferences (see Section 3.1). In the case of support for preferential treatment, people’s opinions can be explained by more than ingroup preferences (e.g. people can have meritocratic objections), which is also expected to reduce socially desirable answering (see Section 3.2).

Several methods can be used to study ingroup preferences in labour market issues. Among them, a reliable approach to study the role of ethnic and gender preferences in the hiring process is through field experiments. In a field experiment, fictitious equally qualified job applicants from different ethnic backgrounds apply for the same job (researchers use real job openings for field experiments\(^9\)). Results have shown that preferences towards hiring someone from one’s own ethnic group indeed play a role: applicants from a different ethnic background have a smaller chance of being hired (Pager and Western, 2012). This effect has also been found in the Dutch context (van den Berg et al., 2017; Blommaert, 2013; Andriessen et al., 2012). Moreover, this type of study has also been conducted with women to measure gender preferences, with more mixed results (women do not have a disadvantage when applying for some types of job) (Azmat and Petrongolo, 2014). Field experiments

---

\(^8\) In the Netherlands between 1998 and 2003, the ‘wet SAMEN’ (the Dutch act for the stimulation of labour participation of minorities, which was in force from) obliged organisations that employed 35 or more people to file an annual report, in which they had to report the number of ethnic minorities employed at the different occupational levels and the measures taken to increase this number (Guiraudon et al., 2005).

\(^9\) In these experiments the gender and the ethnicity of the recruiter or manager making the selection of applicants is often unknown. The results therefore do not necessarily indicate ingroup preferences, but could suggest ethnicity and gender preferences. Without knowing those demographic characteristics of the decision makers, it is not possible to distinguish whether the results indicate ethnic ingroup preferences and/or ethnic preferences in general.
have the advantage that all other possible explanatory factors besides ethnicity/ gender preferences can be excluded (because such factors are randomly addressed). On the other hand, one of the weaknesses of many field experiments is that they include little or no information about the participants, since they are usually people in companies who are responsible for the selection of employees and are not aware of their participation in the experiment. This makes it difficult to explain differences in preferences among the participants, since no personal information is available. An exception can be found in a study by Rooth (2010), but the approach used led to many missing data with regard to background information. Because the primary interest in this dissertation is in the effect of workforce diversity on ingroup preferences, it is necessary to rely on other methods. In addition, the use of field experiments is restricted to the first phase of the recruitment process, and is therefore not suitable for studying dismissals (Pager and Shepherd, 2008) or other work-related group preferences. As stated, it is desirable to investigate distinct measures, and not only those relating to the first phase of the hiring process. To this end, in this dissertation a survey will be used to measure the two chosen subjects related to group preferences in labour market issues. To avoid the risk of social desirability bias, two different methods were employed. In both methods, people did not need to directly reveal their possible group preferences. In the case of dismissals, the use of vignettes ensured that ingroup preferences were not directly revealed. In the case of preferential treatment, direct questioning was used, but the subject itself only indirectly revealed ingroup preferences.

Two of the empirical chapters are about dismissals and two are about the support for preferential treatment. Each phenomenon is explained for women and for ethnic minorities (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject/outgroup of interest:</th>
<th>Ethnic minorities</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dismissals</td>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>Chapter 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2 - Contact theory and threat theory

The conditions under which social groups cooperate or are in conflict and the effect this may have on prejudices and ingroup preferences have long been a subject of both study and public interest. In this chapter the relevant conditions in the workplace will be discussed for threat theory and for contact theory.

2.1 Introduction

Women and ethnic minorities hold, on average, less favourable positions in the Dutch labour market compared to men and native Dutch people, in terms of the percentage of people who actively participate in the average level of an occupation. However, the level of jobs of migrants increased more than that of native Dutch people between 2001 and 2012 (Huijnk et al., 2014). The level of occupation for women also increased at a slightly faster pace than that for men (measured by the percentage of women and men who hold a job for which higher education is the appropriate level to exercise the job) (CBS, 2017b). Both ethnic minorities and women form a larger part of the labour market than was the case 20 years ago (CBS, 2015). As such, it is possible that men and people from a native Dutch background could experience more job competition.

The assumption underlying the two issues is that it matters how the workforce in an organisation is composed in terms of ethnicity and gender. It is expected to matter for ingroup preferences because it is a place where people can get to know each other and presumptions about groups can be overcome. On the other hand, the workplace can also be seen as a place where people have to compete for positions and tasks, affecting people’s perception of labour market competition between minority and majority groups and ingroup preferences in general. The increased presence of a minority group may lead to perceived competition between groups, in turn leading to stronger ingroup preferences, greater prejudices and support for discrimination. The first mechanism is the focus of contact theory, the second of threat theory. By investigating two different labour-related group preferences, the effect of contact and threat in the workplace can be tested in a more robust manner.

Whereas threat theory and contact theory have been tested against each other many times before, the novel aspect of the current study is that it tests these theories in the workplace, whereas prior studies applied both theories to neighbourhoods, cities or entire countries (Dixon and Rosenbaum, 2004). By not taking into account the workplace, an important aspect of people’s social environments in which they interact with others from different ethnic backgrounds is overlooked. Furthermore, contact with minorities is often operationalised as personal contact or as a percentage of ethnic minorities in the living area. Investigating contact with colleagues makes the design less vulnerable to selection processes. This study aims to determine whether contact theory and threat theory remain valid in a different context where some of the selection effects are reduced as inter-ethnic contact at work is not driven solely by choice.

The indicators of ethnic and gender preferences used in this study (dismissal of employees and support for preferential treatment in the hiring process) are contrary to most studies directly related to the context in which threat theory and contact theory are operationalised (the workplace). Because it is a relatively novel idea that contact theory and threat theory may be useful at a workplace level in explaining group preferences in labour issues, using
two distinguishable dependent variables to measure labour-related group preferences decreases the chance that undue conclusions are drawn about the applicability of these theories in this context. If only one dependent variable or multiple closely related variables that measure group preferences in the labour market were used, a lack of relation between the variable(s) and the composition of the workforce could either suggest that threat theory does not hold in the work context or that the variables do not capture group preferences properly. With two distinct phenomena, this is less likely.

Threat theory and contact theory are expected to be relevant to explain both gender and ethnic ingroup preferences in relation to dismissals and support for preferential treatment. Theories that could be relevant for only one of the phenomena or types of ingroup preferences will be addressed in the four empirical chapters. In the following sections, the possible impacts of threat (2.2 and 2.3) and contact (2.4 and 2.5) on the two labour market issues will be discussed.

2.2 Threat theory

There are various theories that connect competition between groups with increased ingroup preferences. Realistic group conflict theory was one of the first to state that conflicting goals and competition for scarce goods create conflict, which leads to stereotypes. When the goals of different groups are complementary, however, this leads to positive intergroup relations (Sherif and Sherif, 1969). The best known investigation into the conditions in which conflict occurs is the Robbers Cave experiment. In this experiment, Sherif manipulated the conditions under which two groups of 11- and 12-year-olds from similar backgrounds were in contact with each other during their holiday camp at Robbers Cave. Soon after the conflicting goals (such as games in which the victory of one team meant the loss of things for the other) and scarce goods were introduced, conflict arose (Sherif and Sherif, 1969). In the end, this resulted in hostile relations between the two teams, which were resolved after introducing common goals.

Since then, threat theories have been adjusted and refined. For example, people do not have to be personally threatened; their group’s values or self-esteem can be threatened. Threat theory has been used to explain many conflicts, including the civil war in Rwanda, where both realistic and symbolic threats were found to increase negative attitudes towards a Rwandan

---

10 The experiment still appeals to the imagination today. For example, a reality show has recently been launched on Dutch public television that captures some of the elements of Sherif’s original Robbers Cave experiment. In April 2017, a television show ‘dat wordt oorlog’ (a possible translation might be, ‘there will be war’) was aired by BNN, one of the public broadcasting companies that aims predominate-ly at a young audience.

11 What is interesting is that two earlier experiments that Sherif set up seemed to have failed because interventions that were supposed to create competition and conflict did not have the expected effect (the groups of children had friendly relations). In 2013 an Australian journalist aired a radio episode based on audio material from Sherif’s two original experiments, which revealed the reasons behind the failure of the earlier experiments. No official scientific source is available but the episode was retrieved in May 2017 from http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/hindsight/inside-robbers-cave/4515060. The shutdown of the two earlier experiments was reported by Sherif, but the exact reasoning behind it was not.
minority group (Stephan et al., 2005). There are several books and articles that provide an overview of the development and different elements of threat theories (e.g. Sniderman and Hagendoorn, 2007; Stephan and Stephan, 2000; Riek et al., 2006).

In this dissertation, the focus is on an objective element of threat that some authors take into account and that is comparable between different organisations, namely the share of women and ethnic minorities in the workforce. Besides the comparability, this element is less likely to be altered by people’s pre-existing ingroup preferences. Although perceived realistic threat (e.g. people indicate that ethnic minorities threaten their job security) and symbolic threat (e.g. people indicate that a minority group threatens their values) will be discussed, both are expected to be more vulnerable to social desirability than the relative group size. In other words, people may indicate that ethnic minorities are a threat to employment because of their ingroup preferences.

Blalock’s (1967) threat theory was the first theory to explain racial prejudices by taking into account the relative group size. The size or increasing size of minority groups creates a threat (later often described as ‘realistic’ threat), which in turn affects prejudices, ingroup preferences and discrimination. Blalock acknowledges that different forms of threat exist and that the link between prejudice and the share of the minority goes via the perceived threat, but still shows that simplified models in which only the relative size is taken into account, explain the degree of prejudices reasonably well. For example, income differences between African-Americans and whites12 and voting behaviour on ‘Dixiecrat’ candidates13 are explained by the percentage of African-Americans in states and cities (Blalock, 1967).

There are two intermediate steps between relative group size and ingroup preferences. The first is that a dominant group fears that the existing social structure from which they benefit is challenged by minority groups. The size of the minority population is an indicator of the threat experienced by a majority group in a society. Minority and majority groups ostensibly compete for goods such as employment, housing and welfare (which leads to economic threats). The relative size of a group of ethnic minorities could be seen as a political threat, as they can be mobilised to vote or demonstrate. The second step according to Blalock, is that these economic and political threats cause an ethnic majority to create exclusionary barriers to protect its social interests. Such barriers can exist in the form of institutionalised measures but also as prejudices against minorities or discrimination at a micro-level. Threat increases as ethnic minority groups become larger and goods become scarcer, for example in an economic recession (Blalock, 1967; Markert, 2010; Wheelock et al., 2011).

---

12 The terminology that is used to describe race and ethnicity is, as a rule, taken from the referenced studies. In the case of Blalock and some other older studies, certain terminology is outdated. In those cases more recent terms are used, for example African Americans instead of negroes (as in Blalock).

13 The Dixiecrats (formally known as the States’ Rights Democratic Party) were a faction that separated from the democratic party in 1948. They pleaded for the states’ right to keep racial segregation laws in place and against the involvement of the federal government in this (or to take control of the federal government) (Lemmon, 1951).
Blalock (1967) often looked at the relative growth of ethnic minority groups, as well as at the differences in the percentage of ethnic minorities at a certain time between different areas. Lacking an opportunity to investigate how specific workplaces have changed over time, the current study takes the latter approach and focusses on differences in the relative size of minority groups between workplaces. Not being able to compare multiple changes over time unfortunately also means that the impact of economic changes cannot be considered.

Respondents make poor estimates of the relative size of minorities at a national level (Glaser, 2003). People are better at estimating the number of minorities in their neighbourhood than, for example, at a national level (Alba et al., 2005). It is expected that the share of minorities in a workplace is even more visible than in a neighbourhood. This makes it more plausible to ascribe possible effects of the relative number of minorities to actual differences in the population. Alba et al. (2005) note that poor estimates of the number of minorities also holds valuable information about perceived threat. They found that whereas estimates at a national level are distorted by the ethnic composition of communities, there is an independent effect from erroneous estimates at a national level on ethnic attitudes. The degree of misperception is largely correlated with the number of years of education. Education itself has arisen in many studies as a predictor of ethnic attitudes (e.g. Gaasholt and Togeby, 1995; Hello et al., 2002). This entanglement makes it difficult to separate the impact of minority populations from other attitude-related factors, such as education. Therefore, in this dissertation a context is investigated that is relatively easy to oversee. Moreover, it is expected that labour-related ethnic attitudes are more influenced by the ethnic composition of people in a workplace than ethnic composition in other contexts.

Blalock’s threat theory was originally applied in the USA to explain the racial attitudes of white Americans towards African-Americans (although according to Blalock this was merely pragmatic because for those groups the most trustworthy data were available). Since then, it has been applied to explain prejudices against other ethnic groups, such as Hispanics in the USA (Toussaint, 2013) and in European countries. Studies done in a European context often do not look at specific ethnic minority groups but at ethnic minorities in general (e.g. Quillian, 1995; Coenders et al., 2009). In the current study, we look at both specific minority groups (in the case of dismissals) and ethnic minorities in general (in the case of preferential treatment). Looking at the total percentage of ethnic minorities as well as the relative size of specific ethnic minorities provides more insight into the mechanism behind threat theory. Is it merely an ingroup-outgroup construction, in which everybody from another ethnic minority poses the same threat irrespective of differences within the outgroup with regard to values and economic position? Or do people experience specific threats from specific groups? Most research into the effect of relative group size has been done in the

---

14 A lot of the discussed theory that is developed is based on the American society, in which the discourse makes use of the terminology race and racism. In the Dutch and European context the terms ethnic minorities and discrimination are more commonly used. Siebers (2017) explains this by the fact that in the race discourse biological differences play a role, whereas in the political debate in the Netherlands arguments are based on assumed cultural superiority (when superiority of one ethnic group over the other is claimed). Moreover he explains that he terms allochthones and ethnic minorities became in use to avoid racialization. In this dissertation the Dutch terminology of ethnic minorities is used.
USA to study relations between African-Americans and whites (Strabac and Listhaug, 2008). This study supplements this by studying ethnic relations that have a very different history in another country.

2.2.1 Relative group size in workforce

It is expected that in a workforce that has a relatively large share of minorities, a majority group will more often show prejudice towards the ethnic minorities. A larger share of minorities is an indication of stronger ‘Competition for political power and jobs’ in the workplace. Prejudices against minority groups are expected to translate into preferences for the ingroup. A preference for the majority group relative to the preference for individuals from migrant backgrounds is expected to be reflected in the two labour-related issues. In all issues, a conflict concerning the interests of group members is at stake.

2.2.2 Personal threat

According to threat theory, individuals’ personal valuable goods do not have to be under threat for them to perceive a threat from a minority group. The perception that the position of one’s group is under threat is sufficient to evoke prejudices and discrimination against an ethnic minority group (Bobo and Hutchings, 1996; Blumer, 1958). According to Quillian (1995), such individuals are as likely to have prejudices as those who are directly threatened. Others argue that personal threat matters, even when controlled for the group threat. McLaren (2003) found that people who experience a low risk of losing their jobs, show less prejudice compared to people who do not have jobs. This is also referred to as the job threat hypothesis, which is formulated by Citrin et al. (1997, p. 861) as ‘a vulnerable labor market situation, as indexed by such factors as occupation, unemployment, or anxiety about one’s job security, is the crucial source of opposition to immigration’. In the current study, personal threat will be included using job certainty/uncertainty.

2.2.3 Expected effects in this study of perceived threat

Whereas Blalock assumes that feelings of threat are caused by actual minority sizes, Blumer (1958) focusses on the effect of feelings concerning the collective threat of minorities to the interests of a majority group, unconnected to an actual threat. Besides real or perceived conflicts over actual goods (such as jobs) or power, the feeling that values are at risk because the values of ethnic minorities are expected to conflict with those the ethnic majority can affect prejudices (Bobo, 1983; McLaren, 2003). Such forms of cultural competition have received less attention due to a focus on relative group size (Tolsma et al., 2008). In this study, both cultural and economic perceived threats are taken into account. It can be expected that perceived economic threat will be a better predictor of the outcome measures (labour market-related) than perceived cultural threats. Focussing on more types of threats generates greater insight into the relative importance of perceived threats versus the minority group size. Again, the assumption is that prejudices against minority groups translate into higher preferences for the ingroup for both issues.

Rosenstein (2008) found that perceived individual and perceived collective threat from ethnic minorities matter for prejudices. Sniderman and Hagendoorn (2007) however, point out that operationalising perceived threat from ethnic minorities has its complications. When people are asked about the threat that minority groups pose, their answers could
indicate more than fear. Answering the question can also be seen as an opportunity for respondents to express negative attitudes about ethnic minorities, irrespective of whether they actually experience fear.

In this study, we look at perceived cultural and economic threat in relation to the two labour market issues. By combining perceived threats with more objective indicators derived from threat theory, such as job insecurity and the percentage of minorities, it is possible to shed more light on how realistic threat relates to perceived threat.

2.3 Applying threat theory to gender

In contexts such as neighbourhoods (which are often taken as a context to explain the influence of ethnic composition on ethnic attitudes), applying threat theory is not useful to explain gender attitudes. Indeed, there is generally an equal number of men and women in a neighbourhood and men and women do not need to compete for scarce goods such as housing. In labour issues, these differences are more nuanced. In such cases, men and women compete for scarce goods such as high-quality jobs. This is a mechanism that, according to threat theory, may lead to more negative attitudes. Some authors argue that this mechanism could indeed be applied to the gender composition in the labour market and even in the workforce (Reskin et al., 1999). Other evidence suggests that the perception that the collective interests of men in the labour market are threatened can lead to decreasing support for affirmative action\textsuperscript{15} for women (Tougas et al., 1995). This can be interpreted as the application of threat theory to gender, although not via relative group sizes. Other studies have applied threat theory to gender roles (Ryon, 2013), but to the best of the author’s knowledge, not to explain gender preferences in group competition concerning labour market issues. For both issues, the question that is investigated in this dissertation is whether the composition of the workforce in terms of gender has an effect. The direction of the effect is expected to be similar to that of ethnic minorities. The results form a building block in broader discussions of the explanatory value of threat theory for groups other than ethnic groups. If this indeed shows a broader applicability, studying the effect of threat posed by women and ethnic minorities simultaneously for the first time could provide insight into their relative importance.

2.4 Contact theory

An ethnically diverse workforce suggests that individuals from different ethnic groups can successfully interact with each other (Reskin et al., 1999). The theoretical foundation of the relation between interactions with minority groups and the reduction of negative stereotypes about these groups originates in contact theory (Allport, 1954/1979). Although Allport’s book The Nature of Prejudice is viewed as the foundation of contact theory, related theories had already been formulated (e.g. Williams, 1947). Meeting people from a minority group

\textsuperscript{15}In this dissertation, the term affirmative action rather than diversity management is used, although the latter term has become increasingly popular in recent decades. This is done because the measure of interest, namely the preferential treatment in the recruitment process of women and ethnic minorities, fits better in the affirmative action frame than in the diversity management frame. As Kelly and Dobbin (2001) describe in ‘Color lines: Affirmative action, immigration and civil rights options for America’, affirmative action defines concrete effects (namely more women and ethnic minorities in better positions), whereas in diversity management the effects are less concretely defined.
can provide insight into their experiences, beliefs and values. Such first-hand information can lead not only to more positive views of the encountered individual, but also to more positive stereotypes about the entire minority group.

In the original formulation of contact theory (also known as the contact hypothesis), specific conditions under which this positive relationship holds were formulated. Contact should be between people with a similar status and must be of a substantive rather than a superficial nature (having a common goal, cooperating and some form of institutionalisation). Superficial contact would only reinforce stereotypes (Allport, 1954/1979). In his work Allport explains in detail why contact on its own is not enough to disconfirm stereotypes. It is very comfortable to stick to prejudices, especially when people are in an environment that thinks similarly about those groups and when prejudices justify people’s own privileged situation.\textsuperscript{16} Disconfirming information can be set aside as an individual experience in which people use such phrases as ‘Some of my best friends are Jews, but...’ Allport calls this ‘re-fencing’. However, later research suggests that even superficial daily contact can lead to a more positive attitude towards other groups (Schlueter and Scheepers, 2010; Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006), although when certain conditions are met, this may well lead to an increased reduction of ingroup preferences in a majority group. Therefore, Pettigrew considers the conditions merely facilitating rather than necessary.

Pettigrew (2009) theorised and found that the positive effect of contact with an outgroup does not only affect the attitudes concerning that particular outgroup. This effect also leads to a more positive picture of other outgroups - although this effect was found to be smaller than for the primary outgroup and the strongest for secondary outgroups that are most similar to the primary outgroup. The spread of the effect to other outgroups is called the secondary transfer effect of contact. Recently, more attention has been paid to investigating the impact of negative contact. It shows that the content is indeed important and that negative contact can lead to increased prejudice. Some even found that negative contact was a stronger predictor of prejudices than positive contact (e.g. Barlow et al., 2012).

\subsection*{2.4.1 Mechanisms: salience of group membership}

In previous research on contact theory, it was assumed that contact with outgroups generates disconfirming information about an outgroup and leads to fewer prejudices. Nonetheless, mechanisms other than information related to the correlation between contact and prejudice reduction have been introduced. Also, cognitive empathy and emotional empathy were shown to play a role. Cognitive empathy is about taking the perspective of an outgroup member, whereas emotional empathy refers to the response. Increased empathy is believed to decrease fear of the outgroup (Stephan and Finlay, 1999).

\textsuperscript{16} In his work, Allport describes this mechanism using the following example: ‘Somewhat similar is the case of the lady who said “Of course I have no prejudice. I had a dear old colored mammy for a nurse. Having grown up in the South and having lived here all my life I understand the problem. The Negroes are much happier if they are just allowed to stay in their place. Northern troublemakers just don’t understand the Negro.’ This lady in her little speech was (psychologically speaking) defending her own privileges, her position, and her cozy way of life...’ (Allport, 1954/1979, p. 26 ).
These additions to the original model were in part aimed at explaining why and under what conditions contact with an outgroup member can lead to a changed picture of the entire outgroup rather than of only an individual member of that outgroup. Empirical findings suggest that such a generalisation to an entire outgroup is more likely when a person with whom somebody has contact is seen as typical of the entire group. Moreover, more salient group membership leads to contact having stronger effects (Brown and Hewstone, 2005). Interventions that are used to increase the salience of group membership in experiments include explicitly mentioning that the contact person belongs to the outgroup. In most studies, the salience of group membership is measured by looking at the characteristics of the specific situation, such as whether people are aware of group membership during the contact (Brown and Hewstone, 2005).

In this study it is investigated whether the effect of contact is also mediated by differences in salience of the group membership at the personal level, rather than the salience at the situational level. In the current study, the degree to which a person identifies with the ingroup in general is a condition that is taken as a relevant mediator between contact and labour market preferences. By doing so, a piece of social identity theory is incorporated into contact theory. This will show whether people who identify with their ingroup to a different degree will react differently to having contact with the outgroup. In other words, is the effect of contact with the outgroup on ingroup favouritism mediated by the degree to which people identify with their ingroup? This, potentially, bridges two very important theories in the field of prejudices.

Social identity theory asserts that belonging to a social group leads to the construction of an ingroup and an outgroup, and that people tend to favour the ingroup at the expense of the outgroup (Luhtanen and Crocker, 1992). Tajfel and Turner (1979) laid the foundations of the theory and show that ingroup favouritism also occurs in experimental situations in which group membership is created ad hoc. Tajfel and Turner identify three conditions under which ingroup favouritism is stronger: The first is the extent to which individuals identify with their ingroup. The second is the context: does the context provide ground for comparison? The third is whether the outgroup is seen as a relevant group to make a comparison at all. Focussing on the first condition, we expect that people who identify more strongly with their ethnicity or gender will show more ingroup preference. At the same time, people who identify more strongly probably better fulfil the condition of salience of the group membership in contact theory, and hence it is expected that contact will lead to a larger reduction of the ingroup favouritism effect.

2.4.2 Contact in the workplace

The four conditions under which contact improves intergroup relations, as formulated by Allport, have largely withstood the empirical tests of the last decades (Brown and Hewstone, 2005). Also contacts in the workplace have the potential to fulfil those original conditions: most often, (1) there are colleagues with equal status, (2) people have common goals and (3) are working with one another and often cooperating, and (4) the institutionalised context of work often ensures long-term contact. However, Allport himself is not clear on this. On the one hand, he states that when interethnic contact takes place only in the workplace and not in the private sphere, this will seldom meet all those criteria. Also, and here Allport
takes a step towards threat theory, fear of competition in the workplace could stand in the way of good relations. On the other hand, Allport also provides examples of the positive effects of integrated workplaces, following the executive order to ensure fair employment, which enforced contact between groups\(^{17}\) (Allport 1954/1979 pp. 18 and 56).

In their meta-analysis of 515 studies, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) looked at the effect of the setting in which contact took place. They concluded that recreational contact and contact in an experimental setting had the biggest effect on prejudices. However, studies that investigated workplace contacts were taken together with all other studies within an organisational setting. For example, Weller and Grunes (1988) looked at the effects of contact between patients and caregivers. In such cases, equal status is less likely. Therefore, it is not possible to compare the effect of contact between colleagues with other types of contact. A more recent study (Mancini et al., 2015) compares workplace contacts with contacts in other settings, and finds that contact in the workplace, compared to intergroup contact in other settings, such as friends and one's living area, has the most decreasing effect on general racial stereotypes that people hold. Contact was operationalised as whether or not people conversed with others from another ethnic background. The present study focuses on the possibility of contact (rather than having already established contact) to make the design less prone to selection effects.

### 2.4.3 Selection effects

In prior studies, correlations were found between contact with an outgroup and a more positive attitude towards this group. However, this correlation was not sufficient to support a causal relation between contact and attitudes. This result could also have arisen due to a selection effect: people who have positive attitudes towards minorities are more likely to make contact with members of these groups. Studies with longitudinal data that analyse the evolution of both contacts and stereotypes over time have found that this selection effect does indeed occur, but does not explain everything. Nonetheless, contact also reduces negative stereotyping (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006). Other studies, in which people could not select themselves in a situation (because of random assignment), also support contact theory (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006). Still, in the workplace, compared to other spheres of everyday life, the opportunity to select colleagues is limited. Therefore, the selection effect in this dissertation is expected to be small but nonetheless present. People could still choose to avoid working at a place because of the size of the minority group. A longitudinal study in a big American retail firm (Giuliano et al., 2011) with more than 100,000 employees found that whites who were hired under a non-white manager less often quit their job than whites who were hired under a white manager but then got a non-white manager. This suggests that whites who do not want to work under a non-white manager sometimes select themselves out of the situation. The same pattern may occur when whites want to avoid working with ethnic minority colleagues. It is still expected that selection effects in choosing a job will be less severe than in several other contexts. Indeed, there are several factors involved in deciding whether or not to apply for a job, including factors that have nothing to do with

\(^{17}\) The aim of executive order 8802 from 1941 (signed by President Roosevelt) was to promote equality and to prohibit racial discrimination in the defence industry.
the interaction with colleagues (such as wage, tasks, status). This makes the effect of ethnic preferences relatively smaller than in, for example, interactions in social settings.

It is expected that the opportunity to meet individuals from particular ethnic backgrounds in a workplace has more to do with the number rather than the percentage of people from a certain background, because a workplace is relatively easy to survey\textsuperscript{18} and especially because it is expected that even superficial contact can reduce stereotypes. Therefore, in this dissertation the effect of the absolute number of people from an ethnic background in a workplace is investigated. By taking the potential for interaction rather than the actual interactions with minorities, the operationalisation of contact is less vulnerable to selection effects. People with more positive views of ethnic minorities will be more inclined to make contact with them. The expectation is that more people from a different ethnic background in an absolute sense in a workforce will lead to a smaller ingroup preference.

As indicated, when the conditions of contact theory are met, contact is expected to have stronger effects. One of those beneficiary conditions is that the relation should have a substantial nature. The expectation is that colleagues who often work with one another have a more substantial relation because they are, more than other colleagues, expected to have a common goal and they are cooperating. Therefore, working closely with a colleague from an immigrant background is expected to have an additional (besides the number of ethnic minorities) decreasing effect on ingroup preferences.

2.5 Contact theory/stereotype content applied to gender

In Allport's original work, prejudices against religious and ethnic groups take a central place. However, also other ingroup–outgroup constructions are described (e.g. lower and higher social class) (Allport 1954/1979). The positive relation between contact with groups and less prejudice against those groups has been demonstrated many times, not only for contact with ethnic minorities but also for other groups such as people with a disability (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2008). However, the effects differed between outgroups; for example, they were stronger for homosexuals and weaker for the mentally ill.

\textsuperscript{18}Most people included in the database used in this dissertation work in a branch of an organisation where fewer than one hundred people work.
Using contact theory for contact with women may seem a bit farfetched. Allport devotes a paragraph to discussing whether people define their gender as an ingroup. He concludes that although children go through a phase in which they do not want to play with the opposite gender, adults who still have qualms about the opposite gender are misogynist exceptions. For most people the rejection of the gender outgroup is unreal and therefore gender is not a ground for prejudices (Allport, 1954/1979 page 33). Unfortunately, this turned out to be a bit too optimistic. Glick and Fiske (2001) show in their literature review that both hostile and benevolent sexism are still prevalent in many cultures (including that of the Netherlands).

Almost all men interact regularly with women, but not everybody has contact with working women in a professional context, or at least the degree of contact varies. In the Netherlands, the female labour market participation rate has increased considerably in recent decades. The percentage of women who had or were looking for a paid job for at least 12 hours a week increased from 34% in 1985 (Kösters et al., 2009) to 65% in 2014 (CBS, 2015). As such, the composition of the working environment in terms of the share of women within many organisations has changed. Nevertheless, both vertical and horizontal segregation persist (Dolado et al., 2003), meaning that not every employee is in contact with working women to the same degree. Solely regarding contact theory would suggest that men who are in greater contact with female colleagues support preferential treatment in the labour market more often and, in a fictitious vignette study, show less preference for firing a female colleague over a male colleague.

Contact theory describes the mechanism behind interactions on the one hand, and prejudices and stereotypes on the other. It does not describe the content of those stereotypes. According to the so-called stereotype content model, it is possible to distinguish two fundamental

19 Allport provides a quote from Lord Chesterfield as an exception to his idea that gender is no ground for prejudice. Lord Chesterfield (1694–1773), a British statesman and writer, wrote in letters to his son, among other even more demeaning ideas about women: ‘Women are much more like each other than men; they have in truth but two passions, vanity and love: these are their universal characteristics.’ Chesterfield describes how he perceives the outgroup as more homogeneous than his ingroup. Perceiving the outgroup as more homogeneous than the ingroup (the out group homogeneity effect) shows to be no exception and occurs also between gender groups. In their meta-analyses, Boldry et al. (2007) show this effect and the intermediating factors that play a role (such as status differences). Perceiving the outgroup as more homogeneous compared to the ingroup facilitates generalisation and stereotyping (Nelson, 2009).

20 The definition of both types of sexism (hostile and benevolent) and their interdependence is given by Glick and Fiske (2001, p. 109): ‘Hostile sexism is an adversarial view of gender relations in which women are perceived as seeking to control men, whether through sexuality or feminist ideology. Although benevolent sexism may sound oxymoronic, this term recognises that some forms of sexism are, for the perpetrator, subjectively benevolent, characterising women as pure creatures who ought to be protected, supported, and adored and whose love is necessary to make a man complete. This idealisation of women simultaneously implies that they are weak and best suited to conventional gender roles; being put on a pedestal is confining, yet the man who places a woman there is likely to interpret this as cherishing rather than restricting her (and many women may agree). Despite the greater social acceptability of benevolent sexism, our research suggests that it serves as a crucial complement to hostile sexism that helps to pacify women’s resistance to societal gender inequality’.
dimensions within all stereotypes, namely warmth and competence. The intentions of the outgroup (warmth) and the ability to achieve those intentions or goals (competence) predict the content of the stereotypes the ingroup attaches to the outgroup. This leads to, for example, the stereotype of the career woman as cold but competent and that of the housewife as warm but incompetent (Fiske et al., 2002). These mixed contents of positively and negatively perceived traits are called the paternalistic stereotype (in cases of high warmth and low competence) for outgroups that are neither capable of nor have the intention to harm, and the envious stereotype (in cases of low perceived warmth and high competence). For the relationship between contact with ethnic minorities in general and prejudices and stereotypes, the distinction is less relevant. They score relatively low on both dimensions compared to the ethnic ingroup (Fiske, 2012). Contact can only improve the general picture. Because of the mixed content of stereotypes of women and because contact with women has been less researched, studies of the effect of contact with women in the workplace in this study are therefore of a more exploratory nature.

When people are asked about women, a paternalistic stereotype generally emerges, even though subtypes of women, such as career women, are categorised in the envied stereotype (Eckes, 2002; Fiske et al., 2002). The expectation is that working closely with women will lead to stereotypes that are more competence based because career women in general are seen as competent but colder (the envied). The question is whether contact with working women also leads to less warmth. Two arguments point in the opposite direction. First, it is unclear whether women in the workplace are considered career women, or whether perceptions of career women only involve women in high powered positions. Second, Brambilla et al. (2012) found that imagined contact with other groups of mixed stereotypes, envied groups (in their case, Chinese immigrants in Italy) and paternalised groups (in their case, Peruvian immigrants in Italy), increased both warmth and competence. If real contact with women works the same way, this would lead to an improved overall picture. If so, the same effect of contact with women on the two labour-related issues is expected as for the effect of contact with ethnic minorities.

Contact is not necessarily expected to have the same effect on labour market issues related to women as is predicted for ethnic minorities. It could be that the two different labour-related issues have distinct effects.

2.6 Relation between contact theory and threat theory
Many studies that explain attitudes towards ethnic minorities on the basis of contact theory and threat theory use the percentage of the population that are members of a minority group in a certain area as an indicator of both threat and contact. These studies rightfully assume that a larger presence of people from a certain minority increases the likelihood of meeting them (Schneider, 2008). Threat theory and contact theory have been tested at different levels: neighbourhoods, cities and nationwide (e.g. Coenders et al., 2008; Tolsma et al., 2008; Dixon and Rosenbaum, 2004; Hjerm, 2009). The workplace is a more comprehensible context, one that makes it possible to investigate both the absolute number of employees who have an immigrant background (to test contact theory more directly) and the percentage of employees who have an immigrant background (as one of the indicators of threat theory). By operationalising threat theory and contact theory as such (instead of...
both as a percentage), hypotheses drawn from both theories are considered not as conflicting but as complementary.

In Figure 1 below, a dot represents a feasible workforce composition from the perspective of an ingroup member. The horizontal coordinate of the dot is the percentage of people from an outgroup in the workforce, whereas the vertical coordinate is the absolute number of people from that outgroup. In this dissertation ingroup members whose workforce composition lies more to the right in this diagram are hypothesized to experience more threat and demonstrate a higher ingroup preference than those whose work floor lies to the left on the same horizontal line. Respondents whose work floor lies high in the diagram are expected to experience more contact and demonstrate a lower ingroup preference than those whose workforce composition is situated lower on the same vertical line.

Figure 1  Expected effects of absolute and relative outgroup size on ingroup preferences
That implies that for the effect of contact it does not matter whether the potential contact is with a colleague who is the only person among 50 employees or among 100 employees who has an ethnic minority background. This key assumption is made because the number of employees at a particular branch of an organisation is rather comprehensible and employees probably know each other at some level (if only by sight). Although of course with a larger number of colleagues, the chance to have more intense contact with a particular colleague is reduced, evidence suggest that this type of contact still has a relevant effect. The results of a meta-analysis done by Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) into the necessary/beneficiary conditions for contact to decrease prejudices, showed that (unlike what Allport expected) intergroup contact in a more superficial setting still reduced prejudices. This creates the possibility to actually operationalise the two different mechanisms behind threat and contact theory in a different way and thus to find out whether both mechanisms possibly work simultaneously. To verify whether there are additional effects arising from close contact with colleagues, it will also be taken into account whether the people with whom an employee has to work with are most often outgroup members. The results will indicate whether this approach to contact is fruitful for the context of the workplace.
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Method and data
3.1 Vignettes
Many studies have set out to explain the degree of respondents’ ethnic ingroup preferences, but most of them operationalised preferences in a direct manner – for example, by asking which person they would choose if a native Dutch individual and an individual with an immigrant background were competing for a job or another scarce good (Coenders et al., 2008). Pager and Shepherd’s (2008) literature review provides an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of the discussed methods to measure ingroup preferences. Going beyond field experiments and the method of direct questioning, this study investigates preferences for the ethnic ingroup using vignettes. Vignettes are fictitious scenarios in which several conditions vary at the same time (Alexander and Becker, 1978). By taking all vignettes together, their relative importance for the investigated outcome can be revealed.

There are three main advantages to using vignettes. First, they yield more insight into the relative importance of ethnicity compared to the other characteristics presented in them, such as gender. Little is known about the relative importance of ethnicity, since ingroup preferences based on gender and ethnicity, for example, are mostly investigated separately in the literature (Kane and Whipkey, 2009). Second, vignettes reduce the risk of obtaining socially desirable responses. There are a number of reasons for this. “For example, instead of expressing personal viewpoints, a respondent takes the role of a vignette character, and hence they need not feel directly accountable for expressed feelings and opinions (Hughes and Huby, 2002), and multiple conditions in the vignette can vary simultaneously, so that respondents do not reveal their opinion about a particular characteristic by choosing between two vignettes. The third advantage is that by using vignettes, it is possible to obtain data on all comparisons made by the respondents, which is not possible in field experiments, where the comparison under the control of the researcher is limited to the experimental pair only (Heckman, 1998).”

3.2 Direct questioning
Direct questions about race- and gender-related opinions are prone to socially desirable answering. Nevertheless, direct questioning was used in this study to measure the support for preferential treatment. Support for preferential treatment is not only related to liking or disliking the benefiting group. For example, support can also be affected by the objection that preferential treatment prevents hiring based on merit. However, by exploring factors that are expected to affect ingroup preferences (e.g. workforce diversity) but not principal objections, the risk of explaining something other than ingroup preferences is reduced. To further check whether the explored factors explain ingroup preferences, additional analyses are conducted using the same factors, but then to explain support for equal treatment in the labour market, for which it is difficult to find principal objections that are not related to group preferences. In the USA, it has been found that the majority of white people support equal treatment, but of that group only a minority support preferential treatment (Kravitz and Platania, 1993). If comparable underlying patterns are found in this dissertation, this will confirm that support for preferential treatment reflects ingroup preferences. Different
patterns could indicate a larger social desirability effect for equal treatment\textsuperscript{22} and/or show that other objections against preferential treatment also interfere with factors that were thought to affect ingroup preferences.

3.3 Data
The dataset underlying this dissertation stems from a survey conducted for this purpose in 2012. The survey respondents form a specific subset of a GfK (an international market research company) internet panel that has 110,000 members. This internet panel, being an access panel, is used for multiple projects and clients over a longer period of time, during which some members leave and new members join. Due to their participation in previous surveys, a lot of background data on every member is available. The panel is ISO 26362 certified - a standard that includes norms for customer care and for the quality criteria of the panel itself; for example, members are actively checked for double applications.

The panel was formed as follows: 44% of its members joined after they had participated in a study in which random households were approached. Other groups were explicitly targeted via specific platforms or via snowball methods because they are more difficult to reach. For the target group in this research (i.e. the working population), there are no specific arguments to expect that methods other than random selection were more suitable for achieving a representative sample. However, because workforce diversity plays a central role in this dissertation, it was necessary to ensure that survey respondents had been employed at the same branch of their organisation for at least half a year. There are two reasons for this. First, the probability of such employees not being able to give accurate information about the ethnic and gender workforce diversity is larger. Second, it is possible that it takes time before workforce diversity affects people's preferences. The advantage of using this panel approach is that respondents could be pre-selected based on previous information, which made it much more efficient to reach the relevant target group. As no additional requirements were imposed, a wide variety of branches of organisations (both large and small) and sectors were included in the resulting survey.

In view of the above, a subset of the initial randomly selected 44% of the GfK access panel members was selected for the purpose of this dissertation. These members were then sent a pre-survey, with as an added selection question whether they had been working at the same branch of their organisation for at least half a year. From the members who answered this question positively, a random sample was drawn of 1430 members, of whom 1115 answered the whole survey. Thus, the online questionnaire achieved a response rate of 78%. Note that in 2012, 99% of the people who were active in the labour market in the Netherlands had access to the internet (CBS, 2016). This makes an online panel a suitable method to approach the working population.

As mentioned, the dataset comprises 1,115 completed questionnaires. However, this disser-

\textsuperscript{22}If there are no arguments not to support equal treatment besides a preference for the ethnic ingroup, the pressure to give a socially desirable answer could be greater. This is expected for the support for equal treatment and not so much for preferential treatment, where other arguments are possible.
Even though it would be interesting to test whether expected mechanisms differ between ethnic minorities and the ethnic majority, there were not enough participants from an ethnic minority background to test this in a reliable manner. The disadvantage of using a panel is that although its members were initially randomly selected, it is unknown whether the randomness was later influenced by members leaving and new members joining. Therefore, important characteristics needed to be verified to determine whether the composition of the respondents reflects the general working population.

To verify whether the data are representative of the Dutch labour force, a comparison was made with data retrieved from the EBB (Enquete Beroeps Bevolking), a labour force survey that has been held since 1987 by the Central Bureau of Statistics. The EBB is well known for its reliability. Data from the 2012 EBB were used in this comparison, and the same selection criteria were applied: participants had to be native Dutch employees working a minimum of 12 hours a week, and they had to have been working at the same company for a minimum of half a year.

More than half of the respondents in the present study’s sample were male (54%; 544 persons); 46% were female (463 persons). In the EBB sample, the share of men and women was 53% and 47%, respectively. The average age of the employees in the sample was 42 years, with a standard deviation of 11. This was also the case for the EBB sample. They worked 34 hours per week on average, with a standard deviation of 14; in the EBB data, this average was 33. The respondents’ median gross household income category was between €36,500 and €61,000. According to the Central Bureau of Statistics, the mean gross household income in which the main income came from a native Dutch resident was €59,700 in 2012 (CBS, 2017c). The EBB data do not include income information. Furthermore, in that same year, 17% of the employees who worked 12 hours or more in the Netherlands had a temporary contract (CBS, 2017d). In contrast, in this study’s sample, only 11% of the respondents had a temporary contract. This difference in the data is mostly caused by the imposed restriction of working for the same company for more than six months, and also by the focus on native Dutch respondents. When those two conditions were applied to the EBB sample, 12% were found to have a temporary contract.

23Here the Statistics Netherlands (CBS) definition of ‘native Dutch’ was used: both parents of the respondent were born in the Netherlands. Using this definition has disadvantages: people who were born in the Netherlands and feel Dutch can be defined as immigrants, and vice versa. An analysis was also conducted using self-definition of ethnicity, which led to essentially the same results but fewer respondents. This was partly because some respondents did not define themselves as Dutch because they identified as citizens of the world (which they described in the comment section). Neither definition is optimal; therefore, the option leaving the most respondents was chosen. Another reason for this choice is that it makes comparison with other data easier, because they often use the same definition.

24A detailed description of the methods can be retrieved via https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/onze-diensten/methoden/onderzoeksomschrijvingen/korte-onderzoeksbeschrijvingen/enquete-beroepsbevolking--ebb--

25This CBS statistic is also based on the EBB data.
For more characteristics regarding the workplace and the employees, see the appendix (Tables 21–25), which gives the number of branches per organisation, the number of people at the branch of the respondent, gender and ethnic workforce diversity, and the required educational level for the job. The EBB data also include the number of people at the branch of the respondent. To conclude, none of the variables from the EBB data that could be matched with the data used in this dissertation differed by more than one percentage point per category, indicating that the dataset used in this dissertation is representative of the Dutch labour market.
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CHAPTER 4

A vignette study of ethnic preferences regarding dismissals
In this chapter, eight hypotheses will be tested. These hypotheses are all concerned with how the ingroup preference of a native Dutch employee is affected by contact with Moroccan and/or Polish colleagues. The hypotheses will be tested by a vignette study, which will be described in more detail in Section 4.4.

4.1 Introduction

In the Netherlands, there are substantial differences between the labour market positions of native Dutch and those with an immigrant background, in terms of both participation and average wages (Bevelander and Veenman, 2004). For example, in 2012 the unemployment rate among native Dutch people was 5%, whereas it was 11% for people with an immigrant background (CBS, 2017e). Several factors could explain labour market inequality. One of them is Dutch employers’ unconscious or conscious ingroup preference for native Dutch employees (Andriessen et al., 2012). Field experiments performed in the Netherlands, such as the one by Andriessen et al. (2012), have shown that preferences for Dutch employees reduce the chance of ethnic minorities getting hired. In this chapter, the degree of ethnic ingroup preference in dismissals is explained using threat theory and contact theory. It is unknown whether ethnic ingroup preferences play a role in dismissals in the Netherlands. Empirical studies in other countries such as the USA provide some evidence, however. A case study of an American retail company (700 stores; sample comprised 1500 managers and over 100,000 employees) showed that in promotion and dismissal situations, the chance of being promoted was higher and the chance of being fired was lower in employee-manager dyads of the same race (Giuliano et al., 2011). However, white employees sometimes benefited from having a manager from another race. A less recent study, by Zwerling and Silver (1992), found that African-American federal government employees were twice as likely to be fired than white employees, even when controlled for variables such as absenteeism, job level, tenure and disciplinary actions. Comparable results were found in a later study by Wilson (2005), who found that African-Americans were fired more often than whites in the early phases of their careers, especially if they had working-class occupations. These studies support the hypothesis that ethnic preferences are relevant for dismissal decisions. However, the determinants of those ethnic preferences remain unknown. The aim of this chapter is to develop a better understanding of ethnic ingroup preferences using the case of dismissals by, among others, differences in workforce diversity.

In prior research, ethnic ingroup preferences were often compared with attitudes towards ethnic minorities in general (Strabac and Listhaug, 2008). For this chapter, two specific ethnic minority groups are used to investigate preferences based on ethnicity: namely Polish and Moroccan groups.25 There are three reasons for including these specific ethnic groups rather than investigating preferences for native Dutch compared to ethnic minorities in general. First, some of the expected effects are contingent upon the specific characteristics of the minority group. This leads to different hypotheses for the various groups, and therefore enables us to test the theories in more detail. For instance, Moroccans and Poles in the Netherlands differ with respect to the main period in which they migrated. This is relevant for understanding the impact of different contexts on ingroup preferences.

---

25 Respondents were presented with Moroccan, Polish or Dutch employees in the vignettes. It was not specified whether these employees had, for example, Dutch nationality or not. They were presented as having a Dutch, Moroccan or Polish background, leaving this to the interpretation of the respondents.
when testing whether it matters if stereotypes have had time to become ingrained (Dixon and Rosenbaum, 2004). They also differ in their religious background, which is relevant to threat theory. Second, both are sufficiently large minority groups in the Netherlands to be generally known and for people to have a good chance of having a Polish or Moroccan colleague. In 2012, out of a total population of 16.7 million, the Netherlands had 100,775 Poles and 362,954 Moroccans (CBS, 2017f). Third, using the term ‘ethnic minorities’ in general may wrongly suggest homogeneity between ethnic groups. Studies of attitudes towards ethnic minorities that distinguish between different ethnic groups show that it matters whether respondents are asked about a specific group or about ethnic minorities in general (Watt et al., 2007; Ford, 2011; Hjerm, 2009). Although the Polish and Moroccan ethnic minority groups are not homogeneous, investigating specific ethnic minority groups nevertheless provides more detailed insight into the factors explaining preferences.

4.2 Four hypotheses based on threat theory

It can be expected that in workplaces with a relatively large minority group, the majority group will more often show a preference for its own ethnic ingroup, because of competition for power and jobs in and outside the workplace (see Section 2.2 for more on threat theory). Some studies distinguished between different minority groups, with mixed results. Dixon and Rausenbaum (2004) found that the percentage of African-Americans in an area explained negative stereotypes about African-Americans better than the percentage of Hispanic people explained stereotypes about people from a Hispanic background. Although it is not clear why this relation is different for these two groups, these findings do show that the size of a certain minority is related to the strength of the prejudices about that minority group. This relation will probably exist in the workplace as well.

This leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 1A:** Native Dutch employees who work with a larger percentage of Moroccan and/or Polish colleagues have a higher degree of ingroup preference.

Besides conflicts over actual goods (such as jobs) or power, the feeling that values are at risk because ethnic minorities’ values are expected to conflict with those of the ethnic majority can also affect ingroup preferences (Bobo, 1983). It can be expected that the fear of conflicting values is greater when the ethnic group differs more from the majority group with respect to race, religion and language (Ford, 2011). In the Netherlands, the role of race seems to be less important than in the American context. However, closeness in terms of religion, language and connection with the country of origin does indeed seem to matter (Huijnk et al., 2010). That study describes a consistent hierarchy of preferences in which one’s own ethnic group is preferred most, followed by migrants from western countries. Migrants from the former Dutch colonies, such as Suriname and the Netherlands Antilles are third in this hierarchy. The last group consists of ethnic minorities from countries that are predominately Islamic, in which Moroccans are mostly found at the bottom of the hierarchy. Little research has compared preferences for different immigrant groups that

---

26 These numbers also include second-generation immigrants.
include Poles, because Polish immigration (and immigration from other eastern European countries) to the Netherlands on a large scale is a relatively recent phenomenon. A study in the United Kingdom that included opposition to immigration from eastern Europe showed that immigrants from eastern Europe were less preferred compared to immigrants from Australia or western European countries, but more preferred than immigrants from Hong Kong, Africa, the West Indies and India (Ford, 2011).

Based on these studies, one would expect that concerns over values are more strongly related to immigration from Morocco than from Poland. However, in recent years the public debate about immigration has also included the labour migration from Poland (and other central and eastern European countries). For example, in 2010 Geert Wilders’ Party for Freedom (Partij voor de Vrijheid; PVV), advocated in its political manifesto that the Dutch labour market should no longer be open to Poles (among others) (Rosenthal, 2011). The PVV won 15 of the 150 seats in parliament in the 2012 elections. In addition, in February 2012 they launched a central and eastern European contact point (also known as the ‘Poles contact point’), where people could report perceived problems caused by labour migration from central and eastern Europe. It turned out that of the 40,000 complaints, most were about nuisance (noise complaints, public intoxication, etc.); second were complaints about these immigrants taking houses and jobs (Volkskrant, 2012). Other political parties from the middle of the political spectrum warned about the effects of immigration from eastern Europe.

In an open letter to the Volkskrant (a Dutch daily newspaper) in August 2013, Lodewijk Asscher from the Dutch Labour Party (Partij van de Arbeid; PvdA), who at the time was minister of Social Affairs and Employment, warned that the effects of the free movement of workers in Europe merited a ‘code orange’ (the warning that is issued in the Netherlands for a moderate severe weather event), and that Dutch employees have to compete with eastern Europeans, who are used to lower wages. A survey held in 2013 by the Netherlands Institute for Social Research showed that two thirds of Dutch people thought that too many immigrants from eastern Europe were coming to the Netherlands. Because of this, respondents perceived the replacement of Dutch labour and unfair competition in the labour market as the biggest problems (Dagevos and Gijsberts, 2013). Because the worries and the debate seem to focus more on the economic consequences of immigration than on Poles’ values, however, this debate does not directly indicate that Poles are perceived as having values that differ from those of native Dutch.

Hypothesis 1B: Native Dutch employees who are concerned that ethnic minorities are a threat to norms and values in the Netherlands have a higher degree of ingroup preference.

The debate regarding Polish immigration displacement in the labour market, gives rise to the next hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1C: Native Dutch employees who are concerned that ethnic minorities are a threat to employment in the Netherlands have a higher degree of ingroup preference.
As discussed in Section 2.1.2, some studies found that personal threat matters, even when controlled for group threat. Individuals who have an uncertain labour market position are expected to experience more threat and will show a higher ingroup preference.

**Hypothesis 1D:** Native Dutch employees who have an uncertain position in the labour market have a higher degree of ingroup preference.

**4.3 Four hypothesis based on the contact theory**

Contact theory, as outlined in Section 2.4, suggests that having more colleagues with an immigrant background creates the possibility of contact and therefore leads to a lower ingroup preference. This expected negative effect is not in contradiction with the threat hypotheses: as argued in Section 2.6; the effect of contact is expected to be independent of the size of the total group of employees at a branch. In this dissertation, lower ingroup preferences related to the labour market are operationalised as a lower preference for firing an employee with an immigrant background than a native Dutch employee in the vignette study. In this chapter, the focus is not on ethnic minorities in general but on Moroccan and Polish employees. From the assumption that contact with ethnic minorities in general leads to smaller ingroup preference, it cannot be derived that contact with a specific ethnic minority will lead to smaller ingroup preferences relative to this specific outgroup. For example as mentioned earlier, Dixon and Rosenbaum (2004) found in the USA that whereas contact with black colleagues reduced negative stereotypes about this group, contact with Hispanic colleagues did not have the same effect (contact at school or college, however; reduced negative stereotypes about both groups). The authors explain these differences by discrepancies in status: white and black colleagues at work were probably more often of equal status compared to whites and Hispanics. Nevertheless, this example does show that specific contact can lead to a reduction in stereotypes specific to a group. For instance, a study conducted in the Netherlands found that contact with colleagues from ethnic minority groups reduced negative attitudes towards Muslims (Savelkoul et al., 2011).

In general, it has been shown that contact theory holds for many different ingroup–outgroup dyads, not only for the ethnic minority and majority groups in general, but also for contact with specific ethnic outgroups (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006). Pettigrew and Tropp also found in their meta-study that not all the original conditions of contact theory have to be met to observe a reduction in prejudice. Based on these findings, the expectation is that contact with Moroccans and Polish colleagues leads to reduced prejudices towards these groups. However, as mentioned, Dixon and Rosenbaum’s study shows that contact with specific ethnic minorities at work will not always lead to reduced stereotypes. As there are no indications that contact theory will not hold for the two specific minority groups in this study, the following hypothesis is formulated.

**Hypothesis 2A:** Native Dutch employees who have a larger absolute number of Moroccan and/or Polish colleagues have a lower degree of ingroup preference.
Based on the beneficiary condition in contact theory (see Section 2.4), concerning the intensity of the contact, also the following hypothesis is formulated.

**Hypothesis 2B:** Native Dutch employees who work closely with a Moroccan or Polish colleague have an even lower degree of ingroup preference than in hypothesis 2A.

On average, the beneficiary condition is the salience of the group membership when having contact, as described in Section 2.4.1. In this dissertation, it is investigated whether people who identify more with their ethnicity and therefore attach more salience to their group membership, benefit more from contact with the other group. Of course, the results are controlled for the expected negative effect that identifying more with one’s own ethnic background has on the preference for the outgroup. In this concrete situation, the following is expected.

**Hypothesis 2C:** Native Dutch employees who work closely with a Moroccan or Polish colleague have a lower degree of ingroup preference. The more strongly the native Dutch employees identify with their ethnic background, the lower the degree of ingroup preference.

The beneficiary conditions formulated in contact theory can on average be present less or more often in contact between native Dutch and one ethnic minority group or another. This potentially explains why contact does not have the same effect for every ethnic minority group. Dixon and Rosenbaum (2004) also offer another explanation for why the effect of contact with ethnic minorities can differ between groups. According to them, some historical and cultural stereotypes are so deeply rooted that contact with the relevant minority has little influence. This applies to minorities who had a weaker societal position in the past than today, such as African-Americans in the USA: their old images stick. Both groups in the present study came to the Netherlands as guest workers, but in a different era and under different circumstances. Moroccan immigration started at the beginning of the 1960s, when Dutch industry started to recruit immigrant labour on a large scale (Coenders et al., 2008). They mostly took low-skilled jobs. The bulk of Polish migration only started after 2004, when Poland joined the European Union. The Poles are the largest group of recently arrived immigrants (Polek et al., 2008; CBS, 2017e). As previously stated, there is also opposition to immigration from central and eastern Europe, but because Poles are a relatively new group it is expected that stereotypes about Moroccans are more ingrained than those about Poles. Consequently, contacts with Moroccans in the workplace will influence preferences to a lesser degree than contacts with Poles.

**Hypothesis 2D:** The absolute number of Polish colleagues has a smaller effect on the ingroup preference of native Dutch than the absolute number of Moroccan colleagues.
4.4 Method

4.4.1 Choice situation vignette

The vignettes presented to the respondents are used for two different purposes. First, they allow us to investigate whether certain employee characteristics affect the likelihood of being dismissed. In this way, it is possible to compare the influence of ethnicity with other characteristics of the presented employee. Second, the use of vignettes allows to investigate whether (and, if so, why) respondents more often choose to fire employees who have a certain ethnic background. Choosing to dismiss an outgroup member rather than an ingroup member is expected to reflect ingroup preferences.

Respondents read the following description of the situation. The characteristics of Employees A and B varied. Every respondent rated seven choice situations.

_The CEO of a company with 15 employees has to lay off an employee because the company is on the edge of a financial abyss. He has to choose between two employees. Both have been in service for approximately the same length of time and both function equally well._

_Employee A [for example]: Female, two children, works full time, works in financial administration, Moroccan background._

_Employee B [for example]: Male, no children living at home, works full time, works in the laboratory, Dutch background._

_If you were the CEO and had to choose, which employee would you fire - Employee A or Employee B?_

_Characteristics of the employees – vignette_

The vignette was set up as follows. Each of the 1007 respondents was confronted with seven consecutive pairs (called A and B) of employee profiles. Each profile contained the following information concerning sex, children, job, and ethnicity:

1) sex (male or female)
2) children (either none, or two)
3) job (either financial administration, or working in the laboratory)
4) ethnicity (Dutch, or Moroccan, or Polish)

Additionally, for each employee it was explicitly stated that he/she worked full-time for the company.

A forced-choice design was used, meaning that the respondents had to choose between the two employees, who were presented in the form of two business cards. Although using a forced-choice design has its advantages with regard to missing data (no question remains unanswered), people may feel that they are obliged to make choices that they would not make in real-life situations. The characteristics gender, ethnicity, having children and type of job on the cards varied randomly. Gender, having children and type of job were chosen because none of them are legal motivations to fire one person rather than another (unlike, for example, the seniority of an employee). Legal reasons for firing were expected to be the obvious and thus dominant characteristic in motivating the respondents’ choice. Dominant alternatives were left out in this forced-choice design because they do not provide any additional information about the relative importance of characteristics and are therefore not
truly informative (Crabbe and Vandebroek, 2012). Working full time was added as a fixed characteristic, so that respondents would not automatically assume that, for example, the woman worked part time. By adding this as a fixed variable, uncontrolled variation was prevented. Two extra conditions were added: the two employees presented in a pair of vignettes had to vary in at least two characteristics, and the same employee could appear only once in all seven pairs of vignettes (they were randomly assigned without replacement). Every variable was dichotomous (as shown in the example), with the exception of ethnic descent. Here, Dutch descent, Moroccan descent and Polish descent were the three different values.

Ranging over all combinations of the four characteristics, a total of $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 3 = 24$ different employee profiles can be formed. Now, suppose that profile A has been selected arbitrarily. Then six out of the 24 choices for profile B differ from A in at most one of the four characteristics: one differs in no characteristic, one differs only in sex, one differs only in children, one differs only in job, and two differ only in ethnicity. The 18 remaining profiles thus differ in at least two of the four characteristics. As a result, there exist $24 \times 18/2 = 216$ pairs of employees A and B that differ in at least two characteristics. Each of the seven pairs A and B that was handed out to a respondent was randomly selected from this set of 216 pairs, without replacement. This set-up avoided that:

a) a specific pair turned up more than once amongst the seven;
b) profiles A and B were the same;
c) A and B differed only with respect to their ethnicity, or only in sex.

From the 216 pairs that figured in the vignette study:
- 168 differed in ethnicity, each of the three possible combinations of two distinct ethnicities occurring 56 times. For the remaining 48 pairs, both the ethnicities were the same, each of the three combinations occurring 16 times (see Table 2).
- 132 differed in gender, whereas 42 were male-male and 42 female-female (see Table 3).
Because the characteristics of children and work, like gender, have two outcomes, the numbers in Table 3 are also valid for those two characteristics. 4.4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette A: Vignette B:</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Moroccan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Vignette A x B ethnic background
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Table 3 Vignette A x B gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Dependent variables

Table 4 Descriptive statistics of the dependent variables, number of relevant vignette choices and the outcome of choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The choice for vignette A (used in Table 5)</th>
<th>The choice to fire Polish or Moroccan rather than Dutch employees (Table 6)</th>
<th>The choice to fire Moroccan rather than Dutch employees (Table 7)</th>
<th>The choice to fire Polish rather than Dutch employees (Table 7)</th>
<th>The choice to fire Moroccan rather than Polish employees (Table 30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of choices per respondent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand dev. number of choices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean choice over all the respondents</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand dev.</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% confidence interval</td>
<td>.49-51</td>
<td>.57-60</td>
<td>.53-58</td>
<td>59-64</td>
<td>.48-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vignettes</td>
<td>7049</td>
<td>3629</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>1784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4 - A vignette study of ethnic preferences regarding dismissals

The choice for vignette A.
Table 4 shows the descriptive results. Whether a respondent chose to fire the employee presented in vignette A or B is not informative in itself. This dependent variable is merely used to analyse which vignette characteristics influence the choice for vignette A rather than vignette B. The variable is defined as the number of times a respondent chose vignette A as a proportion of the total number of choices. This ranges from 0 to 1: a 0 indicates that the respondent always chose vignette B, a 1 that the respondent always chose vignette A. The next four dependent variables are indicators of ethnic preference. If respondents chose to fire Polish/Moroccan employees rather than Dutch employees, for example, this is interpreted as a preference for one’s own ethnic ingroup.

Choosing to fire a Polish or Moroccan employee rather than a Dutch employee. Ethnicity was one of the four characteristics presented in the vignette. Each vignette depicted either a Dutch, a Moroccan or a Polish employee. Every time the respondent did not have to choose between a Moroccan/Polish employee and a Dutch employee, a missing score was given for that pair of vignettes. This occurred when both vignette A and vignette B represented Moroccan/Polish employees, or when they were both Dutch. This left 3,629 vignettes to analyse. Respondents who never had to choose between Polish/Moroccan and Dutch employees were excluded (5 out of 1,007 respondents). As shown in Table 4, on average the respondents had 3.61 choices between Moroccan/Polish employees and Dutch employees. A score of 1 was given when the respondent chose to fire the Moroccan/Polish employee, and a score of 0 was given when the Dutch employee was fired.

Choosing between two ethnicities.
Firing a Moroccan rather than a Polish employee. Each time the respondent did not have to choose between a Moroccan and a Polish employee, a missing value was given for that vignette. This occurred when vignettes A and B were similar regarding ethnicity, or when one or both of the vignettes represented a Dutch employee. When vignettes A and B were Moroccan and Polish, respectively, a value of 1 was given when the respondent chose to fire the Moroccan employee, and a score of 0 was given when the Polish employee was chosen. The scores of all pairs of vignettes were calculated in a similar way as the former variable (the variable is represented in Table 1). People who never had a choice between a Moroccan and a Polish employee were given a missing score (103 out of 1,007 employees). On average, people had a lower number of choices when only the choices between two ethnicities were included (see Table 4). There were around 2 choices compared to 3.6 choices when choosing between Moroccan and Polish employees versus choosing between a Moroccan/Polish employee and a Dutch employee.

Firing a Moroccan rather than a Dutch employee. This variable was calculated in a similar manner as the choice to fire a Moroccan employee rather than a Polish employee (see Table 4).

Firing a Polish rather than a Dutch employee. This variable was calculated in a similar manner as the choice to fire a Moroccan employee rather than a Polish employee (see Table 4).
4.4.3 Independent variables: characteristics in the vignettes

**Vignette variables.** The independent vignette conditions were calculated in the following manner. These variables were only used to explain why vignette A was chosen rather than vignette B (used in the analysis shown in table 2 to explain the choice of vignette A); they were not used for the analyses that explain the preference for a certain ethnicity.

**Woman.** For every pair of vignettes: -1 = vignette A is a man, vignette B is a woman; 0 = both employees are male or both are female; and 1 = vignette A is a woman; vignette B is a man. The scores were added.

**Laboratory** (as opposed to financial administration) was calculated in a similar manner as the variable woman.

**Children** (two children as opposed to no children) was calculated in a similar manner as the variable woman.

**Dutch.** For every pair of vignettes: -1 = vignette A is Moroccan or Polish, vignette B is Dutch; 0 = both employees are Dutch or both are not Dutch; and 1 = vignette A is Dutch, vignette B is Moroccan or Polish. The scores were added and divided by the number of times that there was a choice between Dutch and Moroccan/Polish employees. This variable was used as a control variable for the variables Moroccan and Polish.

**Moroccan.** The variable Moroccan was calculated in a similar manner as the variable Dutch (Dutch vs Moroccan and Polish was now replaced by Moroccan vs Dutch and Polish).

**Polish.** The variable Polish was calculated in a similar manner as the variable Dutch (Dutch vs Moroccan and Polish was now replaced by Polish vs Dutch/Moroccan).

4.4.4 Other independent variables

The following independent variables were used to explain the extent to which a respondent chose a vignette from a particular ethnic background.

**Percentage of colleagues who have a Polish/Moroccan background.** People were asked how many of their colleagues had a Moroccan background. The same question was asked about Polish colleagues. This was divided by the total number of employees who work in the establishment. People were not asked directly to estimate a share. As Alba et al. (2005) show, people have difficulties estimating percentages of the smallest minority groups. It was, however, expected that they can count the number of people from a specific ethnic background and know how many people work in the same workplace.

**Perceived value threat from ethnic minorities.** Sniderman and Hagendoorn (2007) indicate that operationalising perceived threat from ethnic minorities has its complications. When people are asked about the threat that minority groups pose to their values (or goods and power), their answers could indicate more than fear. Answering the question can also be seen as an opportunity for respondents to express negative attitudes about ethnic minorities, irrespective of whether they in fact experience fear. This problem can be partly solved by
taking into account the fear that people have in general that their values are under threat (without connecting this to ethnic minorities). In this dissertation, people were asked to indicate on a five-point scale whether they agreed or disagreed with the proposition ‘I am worried about the norms and values in the Netherlands’. This question was included at the beginning of the questionnaire. No questions about ethnic minorities had been asked at this point. Almost at the end of the survey, the following proposition was given: ‘The norms and values of ethnic minorities are a threat to the norms and values in the Netherlands’. If people scored higher on the second proposition than on the first (this was the case for 13% of the respondents), they were less worried about the norms and values in general than they were about the threat that ethnic minorities pose to these values. We controlled for this effect by using three dummy variables: people who were more concerned about the threat that ethnic minorities pose to values than about values in general; people who were equally concerned; and people who were less concerned about the threat that ethnic minorities pose than they were worried about values in general. The dummy variables were used as controls for the proposition ‘The norms and values of ethnic minorities are a threat to the norms and values in the Netherlands’.

**Perceived employment threat from ethnic minorities.** Measuring the perceived economic threat posed by ethnic minorities involves the same difficulties as measuring perceived value threat does. To control for the fact that people might use the question about the threat posed by ethnic minorities to express negative opinions without truly being worried about employment in the Netherlands, the same solution was chosen as for measuring perceived value threat. Both ‘The employment in the Netherlands is in a bad state’ and ‘The number of ethnic minorities in the Netherlands is a threat to employment’ were included. The second proposition was also used as the primary measurement, and the combination of the two was used to create three dummy variables as control.

**Personal labour market uncertainty.** Personal labour market uncertainty was based on two variables: whether people had a permanent (value 1) or a temporary contract (value 2), and the time that respondents estimated it would take them to find a job that offered similar wages and benefits (ranging from 1, ‘Less than two months’, to 6, ‘Not sure if I will find that job at all’). These scores were multiplied, indicating that feeling less able to find a new job was more acute for personal labour market uncertainty when people had a temporary contract.

**Number of colleagues who have a Polish/Moroccan background.** People were asked how many of their colleagues had a Moroccan background. The same question was asked about Polish colleagues. On average, respondents answered that they worked together with 0.9 people from a Polish background and with 0.3 people from a Moroccan background.

**Ethnicity of the three closest colleagues.** Respondents were asked to state the age, gender and ethnicity of the colleague with whom they worked most often, the colleague with whom they worked the second most often and the colleague with whom they worked the third most often. Dummy variables were created to describe whether one of the three colleagues had a Polish or Moroccan background (1) or not (0). Not many respondents indicated that this (1) was the case (20 of the 1007 respondents; 2%).
Ethnic identity. Ethnic identity can be measured in several ways (Snyder et al., 2006). According to social identity theory, the need to have a positive group identity can result in a negative evaluation of other groups. The degree to which people identify with a group can differ among the memberships that they have (Ellemers et al., 2002). It is expected that people who identify more with a certain ingroup will evaluate the associated outgroup less positively and have a stronger preference for the ingroup. Therefore, measures that benefit ethnic minorities are less often supported by people who identify more with their Dutch ethnicity. Because the focus of this study is on the impact of the composition of the workforce, ethnic identity was used as a control variable. Eight items were used: 1) 'I feel a bond with other Dutch individuals', 2) 'I feel solidarity with other Dutch individuals', 3) 'I’m glad to be of Dutch descent', 4) 'I think that the Dutch have much to be proud of', 5) 'The fact that I’m Dutch is an important part of how I see myself', 6) 'I have a lot in common with the average Dutch individual', 7) 'People of Dutch descent have much in common' and 8) 'People who are not of Dutch descent have much in common'. The items reflect group solidarity (item 1), satisfaction (items 2, 3 and 4), centrality (item 5), individual self-stereotyping (item 6), ingroup homogeneity (item 7) and outgroup homogeneity (item 8) (Leach et al., 2008). This was made into one scale using the factor weights of the first factor. All items had a factor loading of more than 0.45 (should be above .4; Hornburg and Giering, 1996): all except item 8 had a loading above .68. The variance explained by the selected factors was 51% (it should be more than 50%; Peterson, 2000). The reliability of the scale is .85 (Cronbach's Alpha > 0.7; Churchill, 1979).

Interaction between ethnic identity and three closest colleagues. An interaction term was created by multiplying ethnic identity by having a close colleague from a Moroccan or Polish background.

4.4.5 Control variables
Composition of the workforce ethnic minorities/Dutch employees. Because the relationship between colleagues from specific ethnic minorities is central in this chapter, it was necessary to control for the share of ethnic minorities in the workforce in general. Using a five-point scale, respondents could indicate whether they worked mostly with native Dutch colleagues or mostly with colleagues an immigrant background. The answers ranged from 1, ‘Only native Dutch colleagues’ (26.4%) to 5, ‘All are have an immigrant background’ (0.2%). The mean score was 1.9.

Contact outside the workplace. Despite the fewer possibilities to select one’s colleagues based on one’s preferences for ethnicity compared to, for example, selecting friends, people with negative attitudes towards ethnic minorities may still be less likely to work in a company with many colleagues from another ethnic background than their own. In this dissertation, this is taken into account by asking respondents whether (1) or not (0) they personally knew, at least by name, Polish and Moroccan people outside the workplace whom they did not know from public channels, such as television people. This prevented possible effects from being incorrectly attributed to contact in the workplace. More than one in four respondents (27%) knew somebody from a Polish background outside the workplace, and 37% knew somebody from a Moroccan background.
Education. The risk of obtaining socially desirable answers was reduced by using vignettes, but it was not nullified. Therefore, to ensure that the results were not caused by other factors, we controlled for educational level. There is a large body of literature that points to a positive relationship between education and positive attitudes towards minorities (e.g. Gaasholt and Togeby, 1995; Hello et al., 2002). Studies that tested for social desirability have shown that more highly educated people not only seem to have, on average, more positive attitudes towards ethnic minorities, but they are also more likely to give socially desirable answers (Ostapczuk et al., 2009). The level of education is also related to the level and stability of the labour market position, which is, according to threat theory, an important factor explaining personally experienced threat, and therefore prejudices. In this study, education was measured on an ordinal scale ranging from ‘No education/elementary education’ (1) to ‘Master’s degree or higher’ (7).

Size of the organisation. The number of colleagues who have an ethnic background shows a significant positive correlation with the size of the organisation (Pearson corr .201 sig .000 level). To check that the potential effect of the number of people from an ethnic minority background is not caused by size, the size of the organisation was taken as a control variable. Participants were asked the following question: ‘How many other people are working at your branch of the organisation?’ Possible answers were: 1 (3); 2–4 (59); 4–9 (70); 10–19 (124); 20–49 (166); 50–99 (130); 100–249 (152); 250–499 (94); more than 500 (208); and ‘don’t know’ (20). This scale was transformed into a continuous scale by taking the class middle of every category. For the category ‘more than 500’, the value of 700 was given.

Gender: To control for the potential differences between men and women in their ingroup preferences, gender was added as a control variable. The questionnaire was filled in by 544 male and 463 female respondents.

4.5 Method of analysis

Because the seven vignettes were nested within the respondents and the dependent variable was nominal, a logistic multilevel model was used to analyse the data (see Table 4 for the construction of the variables). In a first step, the respondents’ choices are explained using only the characteristics of the vignettes. This gives an idea of the relative importance of the characteristics. In the next step, the respondents’ characteristics are added to explain the choice to fire employees belonging to certain ethnic groups.

4.6 Results

4.6.1 Descriptive results

Since the characteristics of the employee depicted in either vignette A or vignette B were random, the chance that a respondent would choose A rather than B was 50% (see Table 4). The more interesting dependent variables concern the choice to fire an employee from a certain ethnic background rather than the other employee. Four variables measure the preference for firing Polish/Moroccan employees over Dutch employees, Moroccan employees over Polish employees, Moroccan employees over Dutch employees, and Polish employees over Dutch employees. A positive value indicates a preference for firing the first group rather than the second. Apart from the preference for firing Moroccan rather than Polish employees,
which does not differ significantly from the expected 50%, all variables show on average a preference for firing the first group (see Table 4). For example, when the respondents had to choose between a native Dutch or a Polish employee, they choose to fire the Polish one in 62% of those vignette pairs.

4.6.2 Importance of ethnicity in relation to other vignette characteristics

The characteristics of the employees presented in the vignettes varied on four aspects: gender, type of job, having children and ethnic descent. As shown in Table 5, most of the characteristics of the presented employees significantly affected the respondents’ choice. If the employee presented in the vignette worked in the laboratory or had two children, this reduced the chance that this vignette would be chosen. When a vignette presented an employee of Moroccan or Polish descent (compared to a native Dutch employee), this increased the chance of the employee being fired. No difference was found between the male and female employees depicted in the vignettes. To control for the possibility that men and women have gender ingroup preferences, separate analyses were performed for women and men. Neither men nor women showed a significant preference for their own ingroup.

Table 5. Dependent variable; firing employee represented in vignette A (1) or B (0). Logistic multilevel model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All native Dutch respondents</th>
<th>Male Dutch respondents</th>
<th>Female Dutch respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignettes N=7049 Respondents N=1007</td>
<td>Vignettes N=3808 Respondents N=544</td>
<td>Vignettes N=3241 Respondents N=463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(intercept)</td>
<td>0.006 ± 0.034</td>
<td>-0.010 ± 0.043</td>
<td>0.023 ± 0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0.064 ± 0.044</td>
<td>0.079 ± 0.054</td>
<td>0.049 ± 0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>-0.516*** ± 0.044</td>
<td>-0.557*** ± 0.055</td>
<td>-1.065*** ± 0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two children</td>
<td>-1.085*** ± 0.047</td>
<td>-1.105*** ± 0.058</td>
<td>-1.056*** ± 0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>0.392*** ± 0.047</td>
<td>0.458** ± 0.069</td>
<td>0.320*** ± 0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>0.481*** ± 0.056</td>
<td>0.446*** ± 0.069</td>
<td>0.521*** ± 0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>937,626</td>
<td>-764,796</td>
<td>730,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05  **=p<.01, ***=p<.001

27 Other models that included the interaction effects women*children, Moroccan/Polish*children, Moroccan/Polish*women were run. None of the interaction terms had a significant effect on the firing preferences and they did not influence the main effects.
Respondents had the opportunity to comment on the vignettes. They often used this to explain their choices. For example, some said that they more often selected the Polish employee because they assumed that they were more likely to be in the Netherlands temporarily than Moroccan and Dutch employees were.

4.6.1 Explaining dismissing Polish, Moroccan or Dutch employees

Four analyses were conducted in which the dependent variables indicated whether the respondent had a preference for firing employees based on ethnicity. In the first analysis, which is relevant to most hypotheses, the choice to dismiss an employee from a Polish or Moroccan background rather than a Dutch background (Table 6) is shown. The other analyses (shown in the appendix to improve readability) explain the choice to dismiss an employee from a Moroccan background rather than an employee from a Dutch background (Table 7, first part), a Polish background rather than a Dutch background (Table 7, second part) and a Moroccan background rather than a Polish background (main results in Table 8 total analysis Table 30).

**Table 6** Dependent variable: preferences for firing Moroccan/Polish vs Dutch employees; logistic multilevel model. Respondents N=1002, vignettes N=3629
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Bivariate Model</th>
<th>Final Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(intercept)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A: Share of colleagues from a Polish or Moroccan background</td>
<td>-.146 (.451)</td>
<td>.916 (.540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B: The norms and values of ethnic minorities are a threat to the norms and values in the Netherlands</td>
<td>.246** (.041)</td>
<td>.114* (.052)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 1 (higher threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>-.395 (.068)</td>
<td>-.233 (.145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 2 (equal threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>.220 (.073)</td>
<td>-.162 (.128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 3 (lower threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>.468 (.107)</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C: Immigrants are a threat to the employment in the Netherlands</td>
<td>.243** (.053)</td>
<td>.107* (.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 1 (higher threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>-.345 (.070)</td>
<td>-.198 (.156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 2 (equal threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>.220 (.073)</td>
<td>-.261* (.140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 3 (lower threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>.587 (.114)</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D: Job uncertainty</td>
<td>-.022 (.015)</td>
<td>-.019 (.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A: Number of colleagues who have a Polish or Moroccan background</td>
<td>-.010* (.004)</td>
<td>-.010* (.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues has a Polish or Moroccan background</td>
<td>-.483 (.239)</td>
<td>-.526* (.294)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues has an immigrant background</td>
<td>-.154 (.102)</td>
<td>-.006 (.123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C: Ethnic identification</td>
<td>.099** (.036)</td>
<td>.066* (.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C: Ethnic identification * at least 1 of 3 closest colleagues has a Polish or Moroccan background</td>
<td>-.147 (.311)</td>
<td>-.478* (.286)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working predominately with colleagues of a non-Dutch descent</td>
<td>-.141* (.041)</td>
<td>-.063 (.314)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows by name at least one Polish or Moroccan person other than colleagues</td>
<td>-.241 (.068)</td>
<td>-.200** (.073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest attained education</td>
<td>-.093** (.011)</td>
<td>-.040 (.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees at the workplace</td>
<td>-.000 (.000)</td>
<td>-.000 (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>.031 (.068)</td>
<td>-.001 (.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001
Table 7 Dependent variables: preferences for firing employees based on their ethnicity. Logistic multilevel models. Moroccan vs Dutch employees and Polish vs Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firing Moroccan rather than Dutch Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=917 Vignettes N=1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Firing Polish rather than Dutch Respondents</td>
<td>N=922 Vignettes N=1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(intercept)</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>1.031*</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A: Share of colleagues who have a Moroccan background</td>
<td>-.464</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A: Share of colleagues who have a Polish background</td>
<td>-1.450*</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>-.753</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B: The norms and values of ethnic minorities are a threat to the norms and values in the Netherlands</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.178**</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 1 (higher threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>-.391</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 2 (equal threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 3 (lower threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C: Immigrants are a threat to the employment in the Netherlands</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 1 (higher threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>-.371</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 2 (equal threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.299</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 3 (lower threat average than related to ethnic minorities)</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D: Personal labour market uncertainty</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A: Number of colleagues who have a Moroccan background</td>
<td>-.030**</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.030**</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A: Number of colleagues who have a Polish background</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B: At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues has a Moroccan background</td>
<td>-.444</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B: At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues has a Polish background</td>
<td>-1.068</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>-1.014</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues has an immigrant background</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C: Ethnic identification</td>
<td>.137**</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.102*</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C: Ethnic identification * at least 1 of 3 closest colleagues has a Moroccan background</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C: Ethnic identification * at least 1 of 3 closest colleagues has a Polish background</td>
<td>-2.052</td>
<td>1.778</td>
<td>-1.224</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7 Continuation page 56. Dependent variables: preferences for firing employees based on their ethnicity. Logistic multilevel models. Moroccan vs Dutch employees and Polish vs Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Firing Moroccan rather than Dutch Respondents N=917 Vignettes N=1836</th>
<th>Firing Polish rather than Dutch Respondents N=922 Vignettes N=1793</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working predominately with colleagues of a non-Dutch descent</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows by name at least one Moroccan person other than colleagues</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows by name at least one Polish person other than colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest attained education</td>
<td>-.069**</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees at the workplace</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001

### Table 8 Part of analyses, for total analysis see Table 30. Dependent variable: preferences for firing employees based on their ethnicity. Logistic multilevel model. Moroccan rather than Polish employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Firing Moroccan rather than Polish Respondents N=904 Vignettes N=1784</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A: Share of colleagues who have a Moroccan background</td>
<td>-.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A: Share of colleagues who have a Polish background</td>
<td>2.475*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A: Number of colleagues who have a Moroccan background</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A: Number of colleagues who have a Polish background</td>
<td>.059*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues has a Moroccan background</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues has a Polish background</td>
<td>1.877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001
The share of Polish and Moroccan ethnic minorities (hypothesis 1A)
Only the combined relative group size increased the chance that people would fire the Moroccan or Polish employee rather than the Dutch one (Table 6). Studied bivariately this effect was not found (it was insignificant in the opposite direction). This effect of the relative size of the specific immigrant group was not found for the relative group size of Polish employees and Moroccan employees tested separately from each other (Table 7). This does not necessarily indicate that only the combined number of Moroccan and Polish employees is relevant; the two separate analyses contain fewer respondents. In addition, the relative group size of ethnic minorities in general did not further influence the ethnic preference in these fictitious firing decisions.

Threat from ethnic minorities regarding norms and values (hypothesis 1B)
Respondents who felt that the ethnic minorities’ norms and values were a threat to Dutch norms and values more often chose to fire employees with a Polish or a Moroccan background rather than a Dutch background, a Moroccan background rather than a Dutch background and a Moroccan background rather than a Polish background (see Table 6, Table 7 and Table 30). As expected, this threat did not influence the preference for dismissing a Polish employee over a Dutch one. Figure 2 shows an impression of the uncontrolled effect that both types of threat have on the ethnic preferences (showed by the percentage of dismissals).

Threat from ethnic minorities regarding employment (hypothesis 1C)
Respondents who felt that ethnic minorities are a threat to employment more often chose to fire employees with a Polish or a Moroccan background than a Dutch background (Table 6) and with a Polish background more often than a Dutch background (Table 7). As expected, this threat did not influence the preference for a Dutch employee over a Moroccan one.

---

28 This figure, like the following figures, is based on the average of dismissals over all included vignettes, disregarding the fact that the vignettes are clustered within the respondents. This means that some respondents will be presented with (at most) seven vignettes while others will get only one.
Figure 2 The percentage of dismissals in the vignettes of Moroccan/Polish rather than Dutch employees by experienced threat 29

Personal uncertain labour market position (hypothesis 1D)
An uncertain labour market position did not affect the preference for firing a Polish/Moroccan employee instead of a Dutch employee. However it did increase the probability that people showed a preference for firing the Moroccan employee over the Polish employee in the vignette.

29‘Threat was measured by the statements ‘Immigrants form a threat to the norms and values in the Netherlands’ and ‘Immigrants form are a threat to the employment in the Netherlands’.'
Contact with ethnic minorities (hypotheses 2A/2B)

Working with more people from a Polish or Moroccan background decreased the probability of respondents choosing to fire Polish or Moroccan employees rather than Dutch employees. Knowing people from a Polish or Moroccan background outside the workplace also decreased this probability. Also, more intense contact (at least one of the three closest colleagues is Polish/Moroccan) has this effect. Thus, contact in and outside the workplace had a cumulative negative effect on the preference for firing employees who have a Polish or Moroccan background over employees who have a Dutch background (Table 6). The effect of the absolute number of colleagues with such background was modest in size; more intense contact in the workplace and having contact with ethnic minorities outside the workplace seemed to be more relevant predictors (although contact outside the workplace was at the same time more vulnerable to selection effects). For an impression of the uncontrolled effects of contact with Polish or Moroccan employees and the effect of contact with ethnic minorities in general at the workplace, see Figure 3.

The absolute number of Polish colleagues seemed to increase the chance that respondents would choose to fire Moroccan employees rather than Polish ones, but having more Moroccan colleagues did not have any effect (Table 30). Testing which factors affect the preference for firing the Moroccan rather than the Polish employee was especially performed to investigate whether contact indeed had a different effect on the preference for firing Moroccan employees. It was expected that (due to more ingrained stereotypes about Moroccans) contact with Moroccan colleagues would have less effect. Some support for this was found: having more colleagues who have a Polish background did decrease the chance of firing the Polish employee in the vignette, whereas having more Moroccan colleagues did not have the opposite effect (Table 30).

Together, the results in this section indicate that the effect of contact depends on the specific immigrant group (the results hold even when controlled for having colleagues from an ethnic minority group in general). Although more indicators of the effect of contact with Poles had a significant effect on the ethnic preferences in the dismissal decision, some indicators of the contact with Moroccan employees also had a significant effect. Whether these differences are related to more ingrained stereotypes of Moroccans cannot be concluded based on this result.

Also, an alternative approach for the number of ethnic minorities was used, to check whether the effect of the number of colleagues was linear. One could imagine that in a very large organisation, the effect of having contact with a colleague from an ethnic minority background is smaller compared to a very small organisation where everybody knows each other. On the other hand, as mentioned also superficial contact is expected to have beneficial effects. Instead an analysis was performed where the log of the number of colleagues was taken. Results showed that a linear approach best described the effect of the number of colleagues from another background. Another alternative approach was to check whether or not controlling for the number of employees at a branch would influence the effect of the number of Polish and Moroccan colleagues. However, it did not change the significance levels of the number and the percentage of Polish and Moroccan colleagues or any of the other independent variables.
Ethnic identity and contact (hypothesis 2C)

Indirectly deduced from contact theory, it was expected that contact has more effect for Dutch employees who identify to a greater extent with their ethnicity (controlled for the positive effect of identity on the preference for firing Polish or Moroccan employees) than for the employees who identified less with their ethnicity. The respondents who identified more strongly with being Dutch, more often choose to fire the Moroccan employee rather than the Dutch one in the vignette. The same effect was not found for the vignette pairs in which the respondent had to choose between a Polish and a Dutch employee. One explanation could be that Poles are seen as more similar to Dutch people. For people for whom the group membership was more salient because of this stronger identification, it was expected that contact would affect preferences to a larger extent. This effect was found only for the preference for firing a Moroccan or Polish employee over a Dutch one. Together the results provide support for contact theory including the beneficiary conditions.

---

31 Know Moroccan/Pole outside work= respondent knows somebody who has a Polish or Moroccan background personally outside the work context. Close Moroccan/Polish colleague= at least one of the three colleagues with whom respondents work most often has a Moroccan or Polish background. Close immigrant colleague = at least one of the three colleagues with whom respondents work most often has an immigrant background. For visualisation purposes, the variables ‘number of migrant colleagues’ and ‘number of colleagues who have a Polish or Moroccan background’ are recoded in dummy variables, while the latter is used in its original continuous form in the analyses.
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**Education**
The control variable education had a significant negative effect in only one of the four final models: people with a higher education less often showed a preference for firing Polish rather than Dutch employees (Table 7). Notable is that in all three analyses in which respondents chose between Dutch and one or two of the other ethnicities (Table 6 and Table 7), education was a significant predictor in the models without other independent variables. However, most educational differences in preferences can apparently be explained by the other factors. An impression of the uncontrolled effect of education on the preferences is shown in Figure 4.

**Figure 4** Percentage of dismissals of Moroccan/Polish employees (rather than Dutch employees), by highest attained educational level respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 elementary</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To get an impression of the effect of all the investigated variables of dismissal (based on Table 6), two of the respondents (Mina and Maxima - fictitious names, but real respondents) are presented as explicit examples. Mina is 52 years old and works in the educational sector; she belongs to the group with the lowest predicted likelihood of dismissing a Polish/Moroccan employee rather than a Dutch employee. Maxima is 44 years old and works in the cleaning industry; she belongs to the group with the highest predicted likelihood of firing Polish/Moroccan employees rather than Dutch employees. Both respondents will be described in a little more detail.
Mina has a predicted 31% likelihood that she would fire a Polish or Moroccan employee rather than a Dutch one. She holds a Bachelor’s degree and has a permanent contract with an organisation that has about 175 employees, most of whom have a Dutch background. Asked how long it would take her to get a new job, if needed, she predicted less than two months. Only 2% of her organisation’s workforce have a Polish or Moroccan background (three Moroccan colleagues in absolute numbers). Outside work she knows by name at least one Polish person. She somewhat disagreed with the statement that ethnic minorities are a threat to Dutch values and was neutral about the statement about the threat ethnic minorities pose to employment in the Netherlands. She identifies a little more with her ethnicity than the average respondent (.89 standard deviation).

Maxima (female) has a predicted 81% likelihood that she would fire a Polish or Moroccan employee rather than a Dutch one. She completed a few years of high school and now works for a small organisation (7 people) on a permanent contract. None of her colleagues has an immigrant background. Outside the workplace she does not know by name anybody from a Polish or Moroccan background. She totally agreed with the statement that ethnic minorities are a threat to Dutch values and also totally agreed that they are a threat to employment. Like Mina, she was positive about finding a new job, if necessary, and would expect to find a job with similar benefits within two months. Also comparable to Mina, she identifies a little more than average with her ethnicity (.88 standard deviation).

4.7 Conclusion and discussion

We used a vignette study to investigate the ethnic preferences of native Dutch employees in the labour market. The workplace context provides new opportunities to test threat theory and contact theory to explain ethnic preferences. In the vignette study, respondents had to fire one of two fictitious employees. Firing an employee who belonged to the respondent’s outgroup was considered to be an indicator of ethnic ingroup preference. The fictitious employees in the vignettes differed not only in their ethnic background, but also with regard to gender, type of job and having children. Notably, the gender of the employee in the vignettes appeared to matter less to the respondents when choosing which employee should be fired than ethnicity did.

We drew on threat and contact theory and formulated hypotheses regarding the expected effects in the work context. Threat theory predicts that preferences for the ingroup are caused by fear of losing goods and power (such as employment) to minority groups, as well as the fear that minorities’ values are a threat to those of the majority. Both types of fear appeared to matter in the investigated setting. A larger share of employees from a Moroccan or Polish background in the respondents’ workplace increased the chance that a native Dutch employee would prefer to fire Polish and Moroccan employees rather than employees from the Dutch ingroup (although the effects were relatively small). However, people who have an uncertain labour market position (indicated by having a temporary contract and a lower chance of finding a comparable new job) are not more affected by a larger share of Polish and Moroccan employees in the workplace. In all analyses, the fear that ethnic minorities’ norms and values are a threat to Dutch values increased the likelihood that respondents would choose to fire Moroccan and/or Polish employees rather than Dutch ones. It also increased the chance that Moroccan employees would be fired rather than Polish employees.
Fear that ethnic minorities are a threat to employment was also found to be a relevant indicator, but it seemed to be more important for the preference for firing the Polish employee than to fire the Moroccan employee in the vignette study, which was according the lines of how those two groups are discussed in the public debate and come across in public opinion research.

Contact theory is generally supported by the results. Having a higher combined number of Moroccan and Polish colleagues decreased the chance that Moroccan or Polish employees were fired rather than Dutch employees. Knowing Dutch or Moroccan people outside the workplace had the same effect, and was cumulative. These results indicate that the mechanisms of contact and threat can work simultaneously. Having contact with specifically Moroccan and Polish colleagues seems to have a bigger impact on preferences than contact with colleagues who have an immigrant background in general. Evidence for the secondary transfer effect (Pettigrew, 2009) was not found. Contact with immigrant groups other than Poles and Moroccans did not affect preferences to fire Polish and Moroccan employees. The absolute number of the respondents’ Polish colleagues increased the chance that Moroccan employees would be fired, but having more Moroccan colleagues did not have the opposite effect. Based on an extension of contact theory, it was expected that respondents’ experiences with Moroccan employees or other contact with members of this group would affect the respondents’ choice less than experiences with Polish employees would, because stereotypes about Moroccans are more deeply ingrained. The results of the analyses generally support this hypothesis.

A limitation of this study is that the choice of the vignette (firing employees) is probably not exemplary for all group preferences in all dismissal situations. For example, field experiments have shown that gender plays a significant role in hiring employees, but the preference for men and women differs between different jobs and organisations (Booth and Leigh, 2010; Neumark et al., 1996; Petit, 2007). In this study, respondents on average showed no preference for male or female employees, which therefore cannot be generalised to dismissals in general. Future research could investigate whether preferences for men or women are dependent on the jobs depicted in the vignettes, and whether they differ between the phases of the employment cycle (this study focused on firing rather than hiring) or according to the methods used (vignettes rather than field experiments). In this vignette study, preferences regarding three ethnicities (Polish, Dutch and Moroccan) were tested. The hypotheses concerning the preferences between two groups could only be tested using some of the vignettes. On the one hand it reduced the power of those analyses, which probably resulted

32 Field experiments concerning the hiring chances of women show that women are not always in a disadvantaged position compared to men. For example, Booth and Leigh (2010) show that women have higher hiring chances in entry level jobs. Neumark et al. (1996) studied the chances of being hired in higher paying high-quality restaurants, and found that women had less chance of being hired. Petit (2007) showed that for high skilled commercial jobs young women (25 years) had a disadvantage compared to men of the same age. But older women (37 years) had about the same chances as men. Because field experiments like this are very labour-intensive they can only take into account specific sectors or jobs, which makes it difficult to generalise the results to the hiring chances of men and women in the total labour market. However, it does show that women are not always disadvantaged.
in a smaller explained variance. On the other hand, it enables the comparison of ingroup preferences between multiple ethnic groups.

A shortcoming of the theories used is that they neglect a factor that seems important for at least some of the respondents, who assumed that Polish employees would be in the Netherlands only temporarily, which made keeping a job less important for them than for Dutch and Moroccan employees. The used theories focus on the feelings towards ethnic groups based on the experienced social characteristics, competences and closeness to one’s own ethnic group. Thus, they do not include the need for a job. Van Oorschot (2010) uses the concept of deservingness to explain whether people feel that certain groups deserve to benefit from the welfare state. This concept includes the needs of particular groups in society. Future research may show whether this concept is also useful to explain feelings towards ethnic minorities in labour market-related issues, as described in this chapter.

Another possible direction for future research is to focus on how workforce diversity influences the ethnic preferences of minority groups. The ethnic preferences of lower status minority groups are known to be influenced by ingroup–outgroup mechanisms that are different from those of majority groups (Dasgupta, 2004). How these mechanisms apply to ethnic minorities in the workplace was not established by this study due to limitations in the data (which mainly concerned native Dutch employees).
To meet or to compete? The effect of the ethnic and gender workforce diversity on ingroup preferences in the workplace
CHAPTER 5

Support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities
5.1 Introduction

In the Netherlands, ethnic minority candidates have a smaller chance of being hired than native Dutch candidates, even when they are equally qualified. This has been shown in field experiments in which all factors apart from ethnicity that could explain differences between ethnic minority and native Dutch candidates were kept constant (Andriessen et al., 2012). Some argue that such patterns of discrimination are so difficult for individuals to detect that affirmative action is necessary to combat this structural inequality at a macro-level (Clayton and Crosby, 1992; Shteynberg et al., 2011). Affirmative action is defined as the implementation of policies that promote equality for specific groups. This is not restricted to quotas and preferences: also open recruiting procedures and monitoring progress in hiring minorities can be defined as affirmative action (Steeh and Krysan, 1996). Affirmative action can be taken in a wide range of areas (e.g. housing, work and education).

Kravitz and Platania (1993), among others, perceive affirmative action as a measure to combat participation differences caused by past discrimination,33 and not primarily to address current discrimination. Since the mid 1980s, some have adopted a more forward-looking perspective and supported affirmative action because it would lead to more diversity (Gilbert et al., 1999; Kelly and Dobin, 2001)34,35. Diversity in itself is then framed as positive because of its presumed positive effects on an organisation and its employees (Kang and Banaji, 2006). According to Kang and Banaji, however, both the diversity and past discrimination frames are problematic. First, the past discrimination frame is problematic because it tries to solve a group problem (it created a disadvantageous position for minority groups), but affirmative action measures take place within organisations in which the effects concern individuals.

33Affirmative action in relation to legitimising past discrimination was mainly found in American literature. An example of what past discrimination can entail is given by Kang and Banaji (2006, p. 1038): ‘For example, orchestras now have candidates audition out of the sight of evaluators to remove gender biasing cues. However, to the extent male performers have accrued the benefits of past discrimination resulting in a distinguishable difference in ability (e.g., opportunity to attend Juilliard), men will continue to “maintain relative success” because the “[d]isadvantages [women have] inherited from past discrimination are not undone by blinding”’.

34To read more about the transition from affirmative action to diversity management from the employer perspective, see the chapter by Kelly and Dobbin (2001) in ‘Color lines: Affirmative action, immigration and civil rights options for America’. They quote a human resource (HR) executive as early as 1986 talking about diversity as a business case: ‘We have learned that cultivating differences in our work force is a key competitive advantage for our company. The differences among people of various racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds generate creativity and innovation as well as energy in our work force. Differences between men and women, managed well, have several benefits ...’(p.100). They also show that during the late 1980s, the number of articles about affirmative action in two HR journals decreased in favour of articles about diversity. In the Netherlands, the popularity of the business case diversity frame seems to be more recent.

35Verhaar (2002) describes this shift for the Netherlands, where the socioeconomic frame of inequality between ethnic minorities and the ethnic majority (doelgroepenbeleid) shifted towards the diversity frame, which puts more emphasis on the added value of ethnic minorities for an organisation and also promises to pay more attention to differences within groups. Verhaar sketches the potential contradiction to this promise to pay attention to individual talent and the assumed added value of diversity, which is often based on cultural stereotypes (in which individual differences get little attention).
These individuals are not necessarily victims of past discrimination, and individuals who are not targeted by the measures often do not feel individually responsible for past discrimination. Second, the diversity frame leads to debates about whether diversity does indeed have all of the presumed benefits; however, even if this is not the case, a behavioural argument for affirmative action still holds, according to Kang and Banaji (2006). Therefore, they propose a behavioural realism frame. Affirmative action is then framed as a way to compensate for the current bias against women and ethnic minorities caused by the implicit stereotypes about those groups. The implicit nature of the bias is such that the will to treat all candidates equally is supposed to be insufficient to achieve this goal.  

In the USA, affirmative action has been a controversial policy (Crosby et al., 2003; Aberson, 2007) since its introduction in 1965 (Weathers and Truxillo, 2006). Affirmative action in the Netherlands is also considered controversial (Schaafsma, 2006). The aim of this chapter is to explain the support in the Netherlands for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities in the job recruitment process. As will be shown later in this chapter, although preferential treatment of ethnic minorities is supported by approximately half of all native Dutch employees, 46% consider it unacceptable for an employer (because of ethnic minorities’ poorer labour market position) to choose to hire a candidate from an ethnic minority rather than an equally qualified native Dutch candidate. The main reason for looking at support for preferential treatment is that some aspects are expected to reflect ingroup preferences.

A large body of sociological, political and psychological literature discusses some of the factors that explain support for affirmative action (Harrison et al., 2006). Some models that explain support are partly interrelated. Commonly used models are self-interest, racism beliefs, and fairness and social justice beliefs. All have received some empirical support (Oh et al., 2010; Kane and Whipkey, 2009). Other psychological factors have also received attention, such as ethnic identity and personal experiences with discrimination (Harrison, 2006). People’s social circumstances, on the other hand, have received less attention, although they could potentially explain racism beliefs and attitudes related to ethnic minorities (which have been shown to be important to explain support for affirmative action). In this chapter, the focus is on one of these circumstances, namely ethnic workforce diversity. This is relevant

36 Krieger and Fiske (2006) also draw attention to the fact that legal constructions such as equal treatment at work are constructions that do not fit the behavioural effects of implicit stereotypes. Implicit bias affects which qualifications are deemed most relevant for a job to accommodate the candidate that stereotypically fits the job best. Because of the ease with which the importance of the criteria can shift, it is really difficult to establish objectively whether candidates are equally qualified for a job.

37 Schaafsma (2006) provides a short literature review on the mixed reactions of employers to their legislative obligations until 2004 to report the progress of the number of ethnic minority employees in their organisation (this obligation is described in Section 1.3). Schaafsma concludes based on her own research that included 219 in-depth interviews with employees, managers and HR professionals within 15 Dutch ethnically diverse organisations that resistance to implementing such affirmative action measures in the own organisation was substantial (between 78% and 91% of the interviewees in organisations did not support affirmative action).

38 Racism beliefs are beliefs about the existence of discrimination based on ethnicity in society or in a specific area such as the labour market.
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because it provides more insight into how people assess the prevalence of discrimination in the labour market and whether people’s social environment directly influences their support for preferential treatment. The results will also indicate whether theories commonly used to explain racism beliefs, being threat theory and contact theory, can also explain support for preferential treatment. In addition to the added theoretical value, including ethnic workforce diversity as a predictor also generates valuable policy information. Employers who are considering implementing preferential treatment can use the degree of workforce diversity as an indicator for the expected initial support for such measures in the organisation.

Although many affirmative action measures relate to the workplace, workforce diversity has not been studied as a factor in any of the meta-analyses or other found studies explaining support for affirmative action (Harrison et al., 2006; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001). As was previously indicated, workforce diversity is expected to affect people’s perception of equal opportunities in the labour market, which in turn is expected to affect their support for affirmative action. In addition, it is also expected to directly affect the support of affirmative action via the mechanisms of contact theory and threat theory. Using structural equation modelling, this chapter disentangles the direct and indirect influences that explain the relationship between people and their work environment, their perception of equal opportunities for ethnic minorities in the labour market and their support for affirmative action in the labour market. This will provide more insight into the mechanisms (not only the factors) behind the perceived prevalence of discrimination and support for affirmative action.

**Preferential treatment**

This chapter focuses on preferential treatment (a specific form of affirmative action) in the Dutch labour market. Only tiebreak preferential treatment in the workplace is legal in the Netherlands, and only under strict conditions (equal treatment act: article 2 (3)). One of the conditions for implementing preferential treatment in the job recruitment process is that an employer must be able to demonstrate that ethnic minorities are underrepresented in a certain function within the organisation. This should be contrasted with the percentage of ethnic minorities within the labour force that is relevant to that function. Another condition, based on European jurisprudence, is that ethnic minority job candidates can only be chosen over other candidates if they are equally qualified. Preferential treatment in the case of two equally qualified candidates is considered to be a softer form of preferential treatment compared to, for example, quotas or preferential treatment of ethnic minority candidates who are possibly less but sufficiently qualified (Faniko et al., 2012). Some therefore call tiebreak preferential treatment soft or weak preferential treatment. Even softer forms of affirmative action exist, such as enhancement of equal treatment (Harrison et al., 2006).

---

39 As the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights explains in opinion number 2008-52, the fact that this condition stems from European jurisprudence provides a little more room for exceptions (compared to the situation when the condition was based on national law). This will be explained in Chapter 7, when an opinion from the institute about the preferential treatment policy of TU Delft is discussed. See footnote no 42.
This study’s focus on tiebreak preferential treatment means that its results are not necessarily generalisable to affirmative action. Indicators of support can differ between different affirmative action policies. For example, previous research has shown that education is not an indicator of ‘softer’ affirmative action, but is related to support for ‘harder’ affirmative action (Faniko et al., 2012).

5.2 Theory

The goal of affirmative action for ethnic minorities is to challenge a societal structure that benefits the ethnic majority group. Threat theory explains prejudice by the threat that ethnic minorities pose to that same benefiting structure. People who belong to the majority group and experience threat will therefore probably not support affirmative action measures. Threat theory explains who may potentially experience more threat, and it is expected to be relevant to understand support for affirmative action and, for this study, preferential treatment (see Section 5.2.1).

Contact theory predicts that prejudices decrease when ingroup and outgroup members have contact. This makes contact theory potentially relevant to explain support for affirmative action (Section 5.2.2).

As was previously indicated, three models are often used to explain support for affirmative action: racism beliefs, self-interests/social identity, and social justice/fairness beliefs (Oh et al., 2010). Racism beliefs are a set of beliefs that have been found to affect support for affirmative action (Oh et al., 2010; Federico and Sidanius, 2002; Renfro et al., 2006). In this chapter, a specific racism belief is taken into account, namely a colour-blind attitude (Section 5.2.3). The second subject (self-interest) cannot be investigated via group membership, as is often done. People who belong to a group that is not targeted in an affirmative action programme less often support it because their group will not benefit from it. Awad et al. (2005) show that men are less inclined to support affirmative action for women, and whites less often support affirmative action measures for ethnic minorities. In this dissertation, only the support of native Dutch employees for tiebreak preferential treatment of ethnic minorities is taken into account (not the support of ethnic minorities themselves for this measure). This makes it impossible to investigate the effect of self-interest based on group membership, because none of the respondents have an interest in the measure. However, the degree to which people identify with their ingroup is also considered to be relevant: people who identify more with their ingroup may experience a higher level of self-interest (see Section 5.2.4).

The third model (social justice and fairness concerns) cannot be taken into account in this study, because the data do not provide the relevant indicators and they are not the main topic of interest. The rationale behind the opinion that affirmative action is unfair is that it allows (at least in some policies) the inclusion of race in the selection criteria, which could be seen as violating the principle of meritocracy (Son Hing et al., 2002). These concerns are also called distributive justice concerns. Procedural justice concerns can also play a role: this refers to the idea that implementing affirmative action policy will lead to the inconsistent treatment of people. Research has shown that those justice concerns predict support for affirmative action and are partly independent of feelings of prejudice and racism, but are also
partly only masking such beliefs (Awad et al., 2005). To control whether such concerns interfere with the factors that will be taken into account in this dissertation, also an additional analysis will be performed to explain the support for equal treatment of ethnic minorities and the ethnic majority. In equal treatment, such justice concerns are not relevant. If the same factors that explain the support for preferential treatment are relevant to explain the support for equal treatment, this suggests that not taking social justice concerns into account is not altering the effect of other factors. Such a result also suggests that support for preferential treatment indeed partly reflects ingroup preferences.

5.2.1 Threat theory
As described in Section 2.2, according to threat theory, a larger percentage of ethnic minority groups represents a threat to existing social structures and leads to competition for goods and power. Affirmative action is aimed at changing existing social structures. People who, due to a larger percentage of ethnic minorities, may already feel that social structures are threatened are expected not to support a measure that is intended to change that same social structure. A direct relationship between the causes of the threat according to threat theory and the support for affirmative action is therefore expected. At a micro-level, in the workplace the same competition and threat effects are expected. Translated to the specific form of affirmative action investigated in this study, this leads to the following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1:** The larger the share of colleagues who have a minority ethnic background, the less support native Dutch employees have for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities in the workplace.

5.2.2 Contact theory
As described in more detail in Section 2.4, according to contact theory, interactions with minority groups reduce negative stereotypes about these groups (Allport, 1954). Beneficiary measures for those groups are therefore expected to receive more support from individuals who interact more with those groups. Furthermore, previous research has found a connection between stereotypes and support for preferential treatment (e.g. Renfro et al., 2006). The results of a longitudinal study show that participation in diversity-related campus activities at university increases the support for affirmative action measures in the university context (Aberson, 2007). This shows that contact in a specific context can relate to more support for affirmative action measures in that same context. Overall, the expectation is that contact with ethnic minority colleagues will lead to more support for their preferential treatment in the workplace.

**Hypothesis 2:** The more colleagues from an ethnic minority background native Dutch employees have, the more they support preferential treatment of ethnic minorities in the workplace.
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5.2.3 Colour-blindness

In the literature, people who are or claim to be unaware of racism and emphasise the existence of equal opportunities are, according to Neville et al. (2013), regarded as supporting the colour-blind racial ideology (CBRI). Colour-blindness is also sometimes simply described as the belief that racial discrimination is something from the past and that everybody who works hard has an equal chance of being successful (Oh et al., 2010). A large body of literature links CBRI to less support for affirmative action (e.g. Oh et al., 2010; Aberson, 2007; Smith, 2006; Awad et al., 2005). People who deny or are not aware that discrimination affects the chances of ethnic minorities in the labour market will probably not support affirmative action, because to them it is a solution to a non-existent problem (Harrison et al., 2006). Awad et al. (2005) indicate that adopting CBRI can also be used as an excuse to maintain the system that benefits the ethnic majority and not to change the status quo with affirmative action measures. In this vein, colour-blind beliefs have been found to be related to more prejudice against ethnic minorities (e.g. Richeson and Nussbaum, 2004).

The affirmative action measure of interest in this dissertation is preferential treatment in the recruitment process. A colour-blind belief regarding this subject is that people from different ethnic backgrounds have the same chances of being hired when they are equally qualified. This leads to the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3: The more a native Dutch employee believes that the chance of a native Dutch person being hired is higher relative to an equally qualified member of an ethnic minority, the higher the chance that he or she will support the preferential treatment of ethnic minorities in the recruitment process.

Indirect effects of workforce diversity via perceived labour market discrimination

Based on threat theory, it is expected that the share of ethnic minorities in the workforce directly affects support for affirmative action negatively. Another hypothesis is that the share of ethnic minorities also has an indirect effect on the support for affirmative action, namely via the perceived discrimination in the labour market. It is expected that people use their own working environment in terms of ethnic composition as a proxy for labour market opportunities for ethnic minorities in general. It is also expected that people assess the prevalence of discrimination in the labour market partly based on what they see around them in their own workplace, because this is their most visual and personal experience of the labour market. If people work with many ethnic minorities, this could lead to the idea that this is representative of society in general and that ethnic minorities are not in a disadvantageous position. This leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: Native Dutch employees who work with a larger share of colleagues with an ethnic minorities less often think that the chances in the labour market are worse for ethnic minorities compared to native Dutch people.
Hypothesis 4 describes the relationship between the share of ethnic minorities in the workforce and people’s perception of discrimination in the labour market. The question is whether a potential positive relationship is indeed caused by the mechanism whereby the workplace functions as a proxy, thus affecting the sincere conviction that there is little discrimination in the labour market. An alternative mechanism would be that a larger percentage of ethnic minorities in the workforce represents a threat and in turn leads to prejudices (according to threat theory). It is possible that these prejudices not only lead directly to less support for preferential treatment, but also lead to people indicating that equal opportunities exist. To distinguish between these mechanisms, this study investigates whether feelings of threat related to ethnic minorities are a mediator between the percentage of ethnic minorities in the workforce and the perception of discrimination in the labour market. Adding this extra path is necessary because the support for preferential treatment is not explained only by feelings of prejudice.

**Hypothesis 5:** Threat posed by ethnic minorities mediates the negative relationship between the share of ethnic minorities in the workforce and the perceived prevalence of discrimination against ethnic minorities in the labour market.

5.2.4 Self-interest/social identity theory

According to social identity theory, people need a positive group identity. This group-based identity is the central part of people’s sense of who they are (Sniderman et al., 2004). The need to have a positive group identity can result in a negative evaluation of other groups. The complicating factor is that there are several types of ingroups and outgroups in society (and in the work environment). People belong to several overlapping social groups (Miller et al., 2009). The degree to which people identify with a group can differ among the memberships that they have (Ellemers et al., 2002). It is expected that people who identify more with a certain ingroup evaluate the associated outgroup less positively and have a stronger preference for the ingroup. We expect that people who identify more strongly with their ingroup are also more aware of the interests of that particular group. The degree of identification is therefore expected to be related to support for measures that are of interest to the group with whom individuals identify more strongly (or in this case, the potential harm to self-interest). This leads to the following hypothesis

**Hypothesis 6:** Native Dutch employees who identify more strongly with their ethnicity show less support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities in the workplace.

A summary of the discussed theory and the derived hypotheses is given in Figure 5.
Figure 5 Theoretical model of support for preferential treatment for ethnic minorities
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Testing hypotheses 1, 4 and 5 in one model provides more insight into the way people assess the prevalence of discrimination in the labour market. Could indicating that discrimination against ethnic minorities is not a big issue be seen as a form of modern racism (as argued by e.g. Kane and Whipkey, 2009)? Some authors, such as Wekker (2014), argue that Dutch racism in particular is characterised by denial, although arguments could be made that this phenomenon cannot be characterised in this way or is not particularly Dutch. Is it possible that people also honestly use the diversity level of the workforce in their organisation as a proxy for the prevalence of discrimination? If the assessment of the prevalence of discrimination is partly affected by workforce diversity, while controlling for the direct influence of the composition on support for preferential treatment, then this is an indication that differences in the assessments could be explained by the different makeup of the workforce. The total model provides insight into whether threat and contact mechanisms could be working simultaneously.

5.3 Method
To test the model, including the expected indirect and direct effects of workforce diversity, structural equation modelling is the preferred method.

60 Wekker reasons in the chapter ‘Diving into the wreck: Exploring intersections of sexuality, “race”, gender, and class in the Dutch cultural archive’ in Dutch Racism as follows: ‘I am intrigued by the ways in which racism pops up in unexpected places and moments, as the return of the repressed, while the dominant discourse stubbornly maintains that the Netherlands is and always has been colour-blind and anti-racist. Denial and disavowal, the simultaneous affirmation and denial of a thought or desire, are important modes to deal with race. The concept of disavowal speaks of deep ambiguity with regard to race: repressed material can make its way into the conscious on the condition that it is denied.’ (Wekker, 2014 pp. 159–160).

61 For example, Siebers (2017) in his reflection of the Dutch critical race literature, is critical about the characterisation of not acknowledging racism as racism. One of the arguments he uses is that it breeds a tautology: both denying and confirming racism confirms the existence of racism.

62 The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (Den Ridder et al., 2017) showed, based on data from the Eurobarometer (Eurobarometer 83.4 from 2015), that respondents from the Netherlands compared to the inhabitants of other EU countries relatively often acknowledge that discrimination occurs in their country (fourth highest score of the 28 reported EU countries). This cannot be explained by the degree of experienced discrimination. However, this score was not specific to ethnic discrimination but was based on eight items, each of which referred to the occurrence of discrimination on different grounds (such as ethnicity, as well as gender and age). Using the same Eurobarometer data, the comparison was made specific to the item that referred to ethnic discrimination, namely ‘In your opinion, does discrimination based on ethnicity occur very often, often, not so often or seldom in the Netherlands?’ With an average of 1.88 (on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 stands for very widespread and 5 for non-existent), the Netherlands is second in acknowledging most often that discrimination occurs in the Netherlands (the average score over all respondents from the participating countries is 2.42). This raises the question whether there are enough grounds to characterise the type of racism that occurs in the Netherlands specifically by denying discrimination.
5.3.1 Dependent variables

Support for tiebreak preferential treatment of ethnic minorities. Respondents indicated on a five-point scale whether they totally disagreed (1) or totally agreed (5) with the following statement: ‘Because of the worse position of ethnic minorities in the labour market, I find it acceptable when employers choose to hire a candidate from an ethnic minority group when two equally qualified candidates apply for a job.’ Almost half of the respondents (46%; see Table 9) disagreed or totally disagreed with this statement.

Support for equal treatment based on ethnicity. This dependent variable is used in the additional analysis rather than support for preferential treatment (as described in the theory section). Respondents indicated on a five-point scale whether they totally disagreed (1) or totally agreed (5) with the following statement: ‘I think it is important that people from an ethnic minority background and people from an ethnic majority background are treated equally at work.’ This item was less controversial among the respondents than preferential treatment: 87% agreed or totally agreed with this statement (see Table 9).

Table 9 Support for preferential treatment and equal treatment of ethnic minorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support for preferential treatment</th>
<th>Support for equal treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (N=544)</td>
<td>Female (N=463)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prevalence of discrimination. Two questions were asked: ‘What do you think is the probability nowadays that a native Dutch individual will not get a job or promotion because an equally or less qualified person from another ethnic background will get it instead?’ and ‘What do you think is the probability nowadays that a person from an ethnic background other than native Dutch will not get a job or promotion because an equally or less qualified native Dutch will get it instead?’ Both were rated with the following categories: a small chance, a reasonable chance and a big chance (values ranged from 1 to 3). Combining the two questions showed whether respondents thought that ethnic minorities had a smaller chance of being hired. Subtracting those questions resulted in a scale ranging from -2 to 2. A positive number indicated that the respondents thought that ethnic minorities had a smaller chance of obtaining
the job or the promotion. About 1 in 10 (11%) thought that native Dutch candidates had a smaller chance of being hired, 42% thought that the chances were about the same and 47% thought that ethnic minorities had a smaller chance of being hired.

**Experienced threat from ethnic minorities.** Four items were used as indicators for a broader latent variable for experienced threat. Two items – perceived values threat and perceived economic threat posed by ethnic minorities – were used in the previous chapter. They were measured by ‘The norms and values of ethnic minorities are a threat to the norms and values in the Netherlands’ and ‘The number of ethnic minorities in the Netherlands is a threat to employment’, respectively. The last two questions were ‘Due to the number of ethnic minorities in the Netherlands the economy is in a bad state’ and ‘Due to the number of immigrant families there are is not a sufficient amount of affordable housing in the Netherlands’. All statements were measured on a five-point scale ranging from totally disagree to totally agree. Cronbach’s alpha for the four items is .83.

5.3.2  Independent variables

**Composition of the workforce: ethnic minorities/Dutch.** On a five-point scale, respondents could indicate whether they predominantly worked with native Dutch colleagues or with colleagues from another ethnic background. The answers ranged from 1, ‘All are native Dutch’ (26.4%), to 5, ‘All are ethnic minorities’ (0.2%). The mean score was 1.9.

**The number of colleagues who has an ethnic minority background.** Six questions were asked to investigate the number of people working at the respondents’ workplace who have another ethnic background. People where asked how many of their colleagues had a Moroccan, Turkish, Surinamese or Antillean, or Polish background (the largest immigrant groups); they were also asked whether they cooperated with people from another ethnic background. This was done to help people visualise their colleagues, which was assumed to make the counting easier. The answers to these questions were added up. On average, people worked with 10 people from another ethnic background. This variable was largely skewed, however, as 45% worked with no such colleagues or only one.

**Ethnic identity.** Ethnic identity can be measured in several ways (Snyder et al., 2006). Ethnic identity was constructed as described in Section 4.4.2. using eight different items: ‘I feel a bond with other Dutch people’, ‘I feel solidarity with other Dutch people’, ‘I’m glad to be of Dutch descent’, ‘I think that the Dutch have much to be proud of’, ‘The fact that I’m Dutch is an important part of how I see myself’, ‘I have a lot in common with the average Dutch person’, ‘People of Dutch descent have much in common’, and ‘People who are not of Dutch descent have much in common’ (Leach et al., 2008). Factor scores were saved to create one scale (see Section 4.4.2 for more details), which was directly used in the structural equation analyses.

5.3.3  Control variables

Many studies include variables such as race or personal experience with discrimination based on ethnicity to control for group-based self-interest in affirmative action (Harrison et al., 2006). However, the present study did not include enough members of ethnic minorities, and the native Dutch employees included in the database almost never experienced discrimination based on their ethnicity (8 out of 1,007). Therefore, the study focused on native
Dutch individuals and no control was included for personal experiences with discrimination. Personal labour market insecurity, having at least one out of three colleagues from an ethnic minority background and the interaction term of the last with ethnic minorities are derived from respectively threat theory and contact theory. They are not central to this study because of the focus on the workspace composition part of both theories. They will, however, be taken into account as control variables because of their potential relevance. The operationalisation of both variables is described in Section 4.4.4.

**Gender.** Studies that investigated the support for affirmative action in general (not specific, for example, to women or ethnic minorities) have shown that women tend to support such policies more often (Harrison et al., 2006; Snyder et al., 2006). It is possible that this is due to self-interest (because women are often beneficiaries of affirmative action policies). If self-interest plays a role, it could affect women’s support for affirmative action measures for ethnic minorities. Women might only support this form of affirmative action to be able to hold an internally consistent ideology, in line with their support for affirmative action for women. The questionnaire was filled in by 544 male and 463 female respondents.

**Education.** Education was used as a control variable because other studies have shown that more highly educated people are more inclined to give socially desirable answers (Ostapczuk et al., 2009). In addition, this also provided the opportunity to test whether the results of Faniko et al. (2012), who found that education had no significant effect on the support for tiebreak preferential treatment of women, can also be found in the Dutch context for measures for ethnic minorities. Education was measured on an ordinal scale ranging from ’No education/elementary education’ (1) to ’Master’s degree or higher’ (7).

**Size of the organisation.** The number of respondents’ colleagues from another ethnic background showed a significant positive correlation to the size of the organisation (see the previous chapter). To measure the real effect of the number of ethnic minority members in the workplace, the size of the organisation was taken as a control variable. Participants were asked the following question: ‘How many other people work at your branch of the organisation?’ The possible answers were: 1 (3); 2–4 (59); 4–9 (70); 10–19 (124); 20–49 (166); 50–99 (130); 100–249 (152); 250–499 (94); more than 500 (208); and ’Don’t know’ (20). This scale was transformed into a continuous scale, taking the class middle of every category. For the category of more than 500, the value of 700 was given.

### 5.4 Results

Respondents indicated whether they agreed with the statement that it is acceptable when employers choose to hire a candidate from an ethnic minority group when two equally qualified candidates apply for a job. Almost half (46%) of the respondents disagreed or totally disagreed with the statement, while 31% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 23% agreed or totally agreed. There were fewer in the extremes: 17% totally disagreed and only 4% totally agreed.

Structural equation modelling was used to test the expected direct and indirect influences of the workforce composition on the support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities. The model fit, will be discussed for the common fit indices. Although the normed chi-square
was relatively high (4,783), it fell within the range of different recommendations for this value (Hooper et al., 2008). Another important fit index is the RMSEA (which is more sensitive to the number of estimated parameters in the model). At .061, the RMSEA of this model fell within the recently more stringently advised upper limit of .070 (Steiger, 2007). Furthermore, other absolute fit indices, such as the GFI (.968), fall well within the recommended range. Absolute fit indices (such as RMSEA, normed chi-square and GFI) are global measures that indicate how well the model reproduces the observed data. For the incremental fit indices, the CFI of this model (.917) was considered to be a good enough fit (Hu and Bentler, 1999). Incremental fit indices assess how well the estimated model fits relative to an alternative baseline model (in this case a null model, in which it is assumed that all observed variables are uncorrelated).

The results of the structural equation model are shown in Figure 6 and Table 10 (the total measurement model, including error terms and covariates, can be found in the appendix). The results of the analysis for the support for equal treatment are shown in the appendix in Table 31.

**Figure 6** Support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities. Unstandardised parameter estimates (standard errors between parantheses)
Table 10 Unstandardised, standardised and significance levels for structural model in Figure 6 (standard errors in parentheses) N=1007. Including control variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter estimate</th>
<th>Unstandardised</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Share of ethnic minority colleagues  Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.049 (.055)</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of ethnic minority colleagues Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.000 (.002)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.080 (.032)**</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Share of ethnic minority colleagues Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-.103 (.047)*</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Share of ethnic minority colleagues Perceived threat from ethnic minorities</td>
<td>-.103 (.040)**</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceived threat from ethnic minorities Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-.181 (.044)**</td>
<td>-.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceived threat from ethnic minorities Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.382 (.045)***</td>
<td>-.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identification ethnicity Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.069 (.035)*</td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.011 (.016)</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of three closest colleague ethnic minority Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.089 (.101)</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction closest colleague by ethnic identification Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.077 (.099)</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.350 (.064)***</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.009 (.022)</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size organisation Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>.824 (.037)***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>1.039 (.047)***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001
Note: CMIN/df=4.8, RMSEA=.061, GFI=.968; CFI=.917
Table 11 Total effects workforce composition on support for preferential treatment; see analysis Table 10
N=1007.

| Effect                                    | Unstandardised total effect on support for preferential treatment | Standardised  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction one of three closest colleagues ethnic minority * ethnic identity</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of three closest colleagues ethnic minority</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of ethnic minority colleagues</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ethnic minority colleagues</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 Ethnic composition of the workforce by the perceived prevalence of labour market discrimination

---

Table 11 illustrates the total effects of workforce composition on support for preferential treatment, as analyzed in Table 10, with N=1007. The table details the standardized and unstandardized total effects for various workforce characteristics, indicating the impact on support for preferential treatment.

---

Figure 7 presents the ethnic composition of the workforce according to the perceived prevalence of labor market discrimination. The graph shows the distribution of workforce composition across five categories: only native Dutch, mostly native Dutch, half native Dutch and half ethnic minorities, mostly ethnic minorities, and only ethnic minorities. The scale of the perceived prevalence discrimination ranges from -2 to 2.

---

Note: Only two respondents were working only with people from an immigrant background. The scale of the perceived prevalence discrimination of ethnic minorities in the labor market ranges from -2 to 2.
As shown in Table 10, the expected direct effects of the number (hypothesis 2) and the share (hypothesis 1) of colleagues who have an ethnic minority background were not found. The share of ethnic minority employees in the workforce had an indirect impact on the support for preferential treatment, namely via the respondents’ perception of labour market discrimination. See Figure 7 for an impression. Total effects of workforce are shown in Table 11, which shows that having close colleagues who have a migrant background has the largest total effect.

People who worked with a larger share of ethnic minorities more often indicated that ethnic minorities who applied for a job would in general have better chances of being hired compared to native Dutch candidates (hypothesis 4). People who thought that the chances of ethnic minorities being hired were relatively good less often supported preferential treatment (hypothesis 3). For an impression of the next step in this indirect relation, see Figure 8.

To distinguish between the various possible mechanisms behind hypothesis 4, an indirect path was included between the share of ethnic minorities and the perceived prevalence of discrimination in the labour market, namely via perceived threat from ethnic minorities in several areas. This indirect path (hypothesis 5) had a significant influence on the perceived prevalence of discrimination (see Figure 9 for the relation between the perceived prevalence of labour market discrimination and experienced threat).
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Mean perceived prevalence of labour market discrimination by experienced threat from ethnic minorities

However, the relation between the share of ethnic minorities in the workforce and the perceived prevalence of discrimination remained significant. This suggests that a larger share of ethnic minorities in the workforce could create feelings of threat that cause people to only say that discrimination against ethnic minorities is no longer an issue. At the same time a larger share could also lead to the sincere conviction that chances in the labour market as a whole between ethnic groups are about equal. The last hypothesis (6) was also supported: native Dutch employees who identified strongly with their ethnic identity less often supported preferential treatment.

Women supported tiebreak preferential treatment of ethnic minorities more often than men. Education, however, did not affect support for preferential treatment, which replicates Faniko et al.’s (2012) results for tiebreak measures for women (2012).

When comparing the results of the analysis explaining support for preferential treatment as described above with the results of the analysis explaining equal treatment (as shown in Table 31 in the appendix), one can see that although the percentages in favour of equal treatment are much higher than those in favour of preferential treatment (see Table 9), the underlying patterns of both phenomena are very similar. With the exception of ethnic identification and gender (women support preferential treatment more often than men), which are significant predictors of preferential treatment but not of equal treatment, all the relations that are significant in the analysis for preferential treatment are significant in the same direction for equal treatment and the other way round.
To get an impression of the effect of all the investigated variables of dismissal (based on Table 10), two of the respondents (Benjamin and Maxine – fictitious names, but real respondents) are presented as explicit examples. Benjamin did not finish secondary education and has a temporary contract. He expects that it would take him two to four months to find a new job with similar benefits. The workforce in his current workplace is mainly composed of native Dutch, and all of the three colleagues he most often works with have a Dutch ethnic background. Benjamin identifies more than average with his ethnicity (2.59 standard deviation above average). He experiences more threat from ethnic minorities than average (2.78 standard deviation) and expects that ethnic minorities face less discrimination in the recruitment process compared to native Dutch. His predicted support for preferential treatment is 1.04 (on a scale of 1-5). If one of his three colleagues he works with most often had an immigrant background, the predicted support would have been 2.67 (all other conditions being equal). On the other hand, if the workforce in general had mainly been composed of people from an immigrant background (all other conditions remaining the same), the predicted score would have dropped to 1.00.

Maxine works in the service sector based on a temporary contract. The workforce is ethnically diverse: half has a Dutch background and half has another ethnic background, although the three colleagues she most often works with are Dutch. She expects that it would take her more than a year to find another job with similar benefits. Maxine identifies less than average with her ethnicity (-2.07 standard deviation). She does not experience a lot of threat from ethnic minorities compared to other respondents (standard deviation -1.99) and expects that people from an immigrant background face more discrimination in the recruitment process compared to native Dutch. Her predicted support is 3.91.

5.5 Conclusion and discussion

The prevalence of discrimination was expected to have an intermediating effect between workforce composition and support for preferential treatment. People who worked with a larger share of ethnic minorities on average indicated indeed that discrimination against ethnic minorities occurred less often compared to people who worked with a smaller share of ethnic minorities. This relationship was significantly positive even when controlled for the direct effect of workforce diversity on the support for preferential treatment, other perceived threats posed by ethnic minorities and the possible effect of ethnic identification on the prevalence of discrimination. This is an indication that people use the workforce diversity within their organisation to assess whether discrimination is an issue in society. Seeing relatively many people who have an ethnic minority background in the same company as oneself could lead to the assumption that ethnic minorities are not that often discriminated in recruitment and selection processes in general. Support for the alternative mechanism was also found: people who felt threatened by ethnic minorities indicated a lower prevalence of discrimination. This finding potentially nuances the racism debate, in which having a colour-blind belief alone is sometimes directly seen as a form of modern racism (e.g. Bonilla-Silva, 2002). For the Dutch debate, in which to some people not acknowledging racism is racism, this is an important finding.
The analysis in Chapter 4 supported the idea that contact theory and threat theory are also applicable to the workplace to explain people’s ethnic preferences in labour market issues. In this chapter, however, contact did not affect support for preferential treatment, and the share of ethnic minorities in the workforce (part of threat theory) explained support only indirectly. A possible explanation is that support for preferential treatment is too indirectly related to prejudices against ethnic minorities compared to dismissals, which makes threat theory and contact theory less suitable. On the other hand, the share of ethnic minorities in the workforce did indeed indirectly affect preferential treatment via perceived threat. Perceived threat (also part of threat theory) did negatively affect support for preferential treatment.

Another indication that support for preferential treatment does reflect ethnic ingroup preferences, is that the analysis explaining support for preferential treatment based on ethnicity showed underlying patterns similar to those shown by the analysis explaining support for equal treatment. Whereas preferential treatment could also be affected by meritocratic objections (and perhaps therefore would not reflect ethnic preferences), equal treatment in recruitment in its core is about treating people based on merit and not ethnicity. Not finding equal treatment important is therefore more likely to be explained by ethnic ingroup preferences. Differences in results between this chapter and the previous one are therefore probably not caused by the fact that support for preferential treatment does not reflect ethnic preferences. An alternative explanation why especially contact did not have the expected effect, is that in Chapter 4 the indicators for contact were specific to two ethnic minorities (Polish and Moroccan people). Also the outcome measure was specific to those groups. That chapter showed that contact measures for ethnic minorities in general did not predict dismissals as well as the specific contact with Poles and Moroccans. It is possible that not all ethnic minorities affect ethnic preferences in a similar way, which weakens a potential relation when investigated for ethnic minorities in general. Making the contact and threat measures for the workplace as well as the measure for preferential treatment specific to an ethnic minority group, could verify whether this explanation for the different results in both chapters hold.
CHAPTER 6

Vignette study on gender ingroup preferences regarding dismissals
Empirical evidence suggests that men have a higher chance of being dismissed than women (Kopelman and Rosen, 2016). However, a study in Australia found that those differences disappear when occupation and type of industry are controlled for (Wilkins and Wooden, 2013). Aforementioned studies show that in real-life dismissals, gender is one of the often-interrelated factors (e.g. gender and part-time work) that affect the chances of being fired. With a vignette study, it was possible to study the differences between people’s gender preferences in relation to dismissals while keeping the expected interrelated factors constant. The aim of this chapter is to understand the preference for dismissing an employee of the opposite gender. In addition to gender ingroup preferences, this chapter will also investigate factors that explain the preference for dismissing women over men despite the gender of the decision maker. To achieve this, it is essential to measure gender preferences without interference from other factors that are sometimes difficult to disentangle.

The downside to using vignettes is that they do not reflect a real-life dismissal situation in every respect. There are not many studies that primarily study gender preferences in involuntary job loss by allowing the covariates of job loss to vary (Wilkins and Wooden, 2013). However, studying real-life dismissals would not provide the necessary information about the potential factors explaining gender preferences in relation to dismissals. In the reviewed studies that investigate gender differences in resignations and dismissals, the focus is on the person who is fired or resigns (e.g. Kopelman and Rosen, 2016; Wilkins and Wooden, 2013; Albanesi and Sahin, 2013). In the case of dismissals, the role of social and psychological factors (such as ingroup identification) relevant to the person who takes the decision remain unknown. In this vignette study, it was possible to take into account both psychological and circumstantial factors. By using the vignettes in this way, potential factors that explain a preference for dismissing people on the basis of gender were revealed for the first time.

Chapter 4 showed that in a scenario in which respondents had to dismiss one of two fictitious employees, the gender of the employee was not a significant predictor of their choice (see Table 5 in Chapter 4). However, differences between respondents’ gender preferences remained unknown. In this chapter, potential factors such as gender, gender identification, the perceived legitimacy of men’s higher labour market position, workforce diversity and attitudes towards the role of women will be studied to understand gender preferences in a dismissal situation. In contrast to Chapter 4, in which only the ethnic preferences of native Dutch respondents were central (and not the ethnic preference of ethnic minorities), here it is possible to investigate ingroup–outgroup constructions and preferences from both sides. This enables the inclusion of theories and hypotheses besides those related to workforce diversity (such as threat theory and contact theory) that predict differences in ingroup preferences between groups that differ in status.

Section 6.1 will hypothesize the effect of the different societal positions of men and women on ingroup preferences; Section 6.2 will then cover the potential effect of workforce diversity; Section 6.3 will present the effect of more traditional attitudes towards gender roles.
6.1 High-status groups and ingroup preferences

Experimental studies show that group membership, even when the group is created ad hoc, can lead to ingroup preferences (see Section 2.4.1). Being a man or a woman is a real-life distinction. The interdependence between men and women is unique: a long-term relationship in which differences in status are paired with close intimacy (Glick and Fiske, 1999).

Real-life groups’ ingroup preferences are influenced by their position in society. The question is whether people who belong to a high-status group have stronger or weaker ingroup preferences compared to people who belong to a lower-status group in society. Arguments for both directions may be distilled from the social identity theory. On the one hand, the need for a positive social identity could be stronger for lower-status groups. On the other hand, their real status in society could restrict that urge (Mullen et al., 1992). This is also described as the psychological conflict between the need to evaluate members of one’s own group favourably and the need to justify the existing societal structure by endorsing the superiority of higher-status outgroups (Jost and Burgess, 2000). In their meta-analysis, Bettencourt et al. (2001) found evidence that higher-status groups show more ingroup preference compared to lower-status groups.

Politically, and relevant to this dissertation, men have a higher economic status in society than women do (Rudman and Goodwin, 2004). In that respect, the status of women could be regarded as being similar to that of ethnic minorities (Cameron and Lalonde, 2001). However, Rudman and Goodwin (2004) emphasise that men and women are different from other high- and low-status groups in various respects. For instance, they are much more interdependent and in closer contact with one another. The authors also found that men had weaker implicit and explicit ingroup preferences than women. However, their research was not related to the workplace, where some of the usually important interdependences between men and women in the personal context may well be less relevant. Moreover, as Cameron and Lalonde (2001) point out, although men identify less with their ingroup (because their higher status tends to make them less concerned with stereotypes), ingroup identification is not the only predictor of ingroup preferences. Situational norms (e.g. at the workplace) make the group membership salient and let men act according to their expected gender roles, even when in general they do not strongly identify with being male.

Some evidence related to the workplace suggests that men as a high-status group have stronger ingroup preferences than women. A study by Bowles and Gelfand (2010) shows that men judge the misbehaviour at work of female colleagues more harshly than that of male colleagues, whereas women show less bias in their judgements of these groups.
This leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 1:** Male employees have a higher ingroup preference than female employees

On average, men identify to a lesser extent with their gender than women do (Cameron and Lalonde, 2001). Based on social identity theory, regardless of gender, a stronger identification with the ingroup is expected to be positively related to ingroup preferences (see Section 2.4.1). This leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 2:** The more strongly employees identify with their gender, the more ingroup preference they show.

Members of low-status groups use different strategies to deal with their status, depending on the perceived legitimacy of the status. When the status is perceived as legitimate, members will try to adopt individual strategies to escape their collective low status. However, if the status is perceived as illegitimate and unstable, members of a low-status group will engage more quickly in collective action to challenge this structure. Indeed, Bettencourt et al. (2001) found in their meta-analysis that for low-status members, a status hierarchy that they perceive as illegitimate increases ingroup preference. How the perceived legitimacy of men’s status affects men’s preferences has only been studied to a lesser extent (Cameron and Lalonde, 2001). In general, Bettencourt et al. (2001) found that whether the status of a high-status group was perceived as illegitimate or legitimate did not affect the ingroup preference of that high-status group.

In this dissertation, the perception that men’s status in the labour market is illegitimate or partly illegitimate is expected to have different effects on women than on men. The conviction that the lower labour market position of women is caused by discrimination in the labour market and by fewer provided opportunities in the educational system is regarded as illegitimating the status hierarchy. Reasons that legitimize the status hierarchy are, for example, related to the different choices that men and women make, or to the different capacities that men and women have (such as the idea that women more often take care of the children, that they are less motivated or that they are less intelligent); these reasons do not relate to unfair treatment in society based on gender. Unequal treatment based on gender is regarded as defining the higher position of men as illegitimate. Based on the results in Bettencourt et al. (2001), the expectation is that men who believe that their status in the labour market is illegitimate have on average the same ingroup preferences than men who perceive it as legitimate. Women who consider the status of men to be illegitimate are expected to show stronger ingroup preferences than women who do not consider the status to be illegitimate.
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6.2 Gender composition of workforce

Men and women are not equally divided among workplaces and types of jobs (Dolado et al., 2003). However, much has changed since the beginning of the industrial revolution, when men and women were sometimes strictly separated from each other at work. Reskin and Padavic (1994) describe how in the second half of the 19th century, the British Foreign Office had female employees work in the attic to prevent contact with male colleagues. When women had to pick up their wages downstairs, male colleagues had to stay out of the way. Although situations such as the one that Reskin and Padavic describe no longer exist in the western world, substantial differences can still be found between the composition of the workforce in different in organisations with regard to gender (as Reskin et al. 1999 describe for the USA). Women in the USA and Europe are still underrepresented in male occupations and fields, and at the top of large corporations (Heilman, 2012). In the following, three theories are discussed that propose different mechanisms behind the compositional make-up and gender ingroup preferences.

6.2.1 Threat theory

Because the labour force is becoming increasingly diverse in terms of gender, men and women more often have to compete for jobs. Blalock’s (1967) studies on the threat that a minority group posed to the majority were aimed at explaining race relations (see Section 2.2 for more on threat theory), but some argue that the same mechanisms are also relevant for the effects of gender composition in organisations (Reskin et al., 1999). This means that a relatively larger minority of female colleagues would increase men’s ingroup preferences. An organisation that has a majority of women does not necessarily mirror this situation, however: There being more women in an organisation does not indicate the structural power that they hold over the organisation, whereby a larger minority of men would threaten their structural power. Longitudinal studies based in sectors and in companies show that when employment conditions are improved, the composition shifts towards more men (Reskin 1999), indicating that in places with a majority of women employees, women do not control attractive positions as men do in male-dominated places. Moreover, Blalock (1967) argues that only the groups with more status and power in society can impose negative reactions towards minority groups, so a threat mechanism may not be in place in a female-dominated workforce.

Hypothesis 3m: Male employees who perceive their labour market status as illegitimate show the same ingroup preference as men who perceive the status as legitimate.

Hypothesis 3f: Female employees who perceive men’s labour market status as illegitimate show a higher ingroup preference compared to female employees who consider the status to be legitimate.
Acker (1990), a self-declared feminist social scientist, argues that men in women-dominated workforces do not experience threat. According to her, organisational structures are often not neutral but male-dominated even when women make up the majority. Men in such a context could even profit from being a relative minority. Some empirical support has been found for the notion that being a minority male in a female-orientated profession has advantages that are not found the other way round (Williams, 1992). Budig (2002) showed that the proportion of women in a certain type of job does not impact the wage advantage that men have over women. Moreover, although Budig (2002) also found that men in female-dominated jobs were less often favoured over women in promotions compared to men in other settings, on average they were still favoured over women in these settings. Based on these findings, it is assumed that a higher share of female employees does not necessarily indicate threat for male employees. Thus, for male employees, the following hypothesis is derived:

**Hypothesis 4ma:** The share of female colleagues does not affect male employees’ ingroup preferences.

Based on the general reasoning from threat theory that a larger minority could form a threat even though that minority does not hold power over important resources, the following opposite hypothesis is also derived.

**Hypothesis 4mb:** The larger the share of female colleagues, the more ingroup preferences male employees show.

### 6.2.2 Being the male or female token

Kanter (1977) argues that small minorities in an organisation are highly visible and will therefore probably be stereotyped more compared to minorities in organisations who represent a larger (than 15%) share of the employees. To be accepted, they have to confirm the stereotypes that already exist, which Kanter calls role entrapment. A single token in a higher position where being known is important could even profit from this token position because it increases visibility. Therefore, tokens do not necessarily view potential new colleagues from their ingroup positively. On the other hand, belonging to a larger minority group would help members of this group to escape their isolated position and is expected

---

45 That the organisational structure is relevant for threat mechanisms was shown by Kvande and Rasmussen (1994): in their study, women in male jobs within organisations that were characterised by less hierarchy and more flexibility, and that more often operated in changing markets, received similar opportunities as men did, whereas women in male jobs in companies that were not characterised in that way were more often discriminated against.
to lead to more interaction with the majority group. Interaction would in turn lead to more realistic views and the disconfirmation of stereotypes. It is expected that the more equal in size the groups of men and women, the less important group membership is and the weaker the effect on ingroup preferences. Although the disconfirming of stereotypes via contact may seem similar to contact theory, the latter does not assume that a larger minority is needed to create the right conditions for contact. Token theory differs from threat theory both by including the perspective of the token (instead of only the perspective of the majority group) and by differentiating between being the absolute minority as a token and being a minority in general. And, most obviously, by the different direction of a growing minority (leading to less stereotyping according to the token theory and more according to threat theory).

Kanter does not explicitly describe different processes for men and women when they are in small minority positions. This gender-neutral aspect of the theory has been criticised because it does not consider the different societal status of men and women (Yoder, 1991; Zimmer, 1988). Kanter does admit that a higher societal status could work to the advantage of tokens, but this notion is not woven into his theoretical framework. According to Derks et al. (2011), token women (and token ethnic minorities) who work in high positions in an organisation where negative opinions about minorities or women are common are likely to adopt the negative attitudes about their own ingroup to protect their personal position. Since the 1990s, several empirical studies have pointed to different mechanisms for male tokens. In a longitudinal study on engineering companies, Powell et al. (2009) found that token women in a male-dominated profession (i.e. engineering) developed different strategies in order to be accepted by the majority (i.e. the male employees). One of these strategies was to adopt a negative attitude towards other women. Moreover, female managers in male-dominated companies identify less with their gender than female managers in organisations with other types of gender compositions (Ely, 1994).

Empirical findings regarding male tokens in female-dominated professions paint a highly different picture. Male tokens seem to be rewarded with a privileged minority status, leading to, for example, greater chances of upward mobility (Zimmer, 1988; Wingfield, 2009). For instance, a qualitative study on four female-dominated professions (Simpson, 2004) showed that being the male token indeed had career advantages. This does not mean, however, that no disadvantages were found for male tokens; for example, they had to deal with stereotypes about being a male in a job that was regarded as women’s work. They dealt with this by distancing themselves from the supposed feminine nature of their work. Nevertheless, a survey on the token position of male elementary and secondary school teachers showed that men were more likely to be promoted than women were (Cognard-Black, 2004). Moreover, a study on token male nurses showed that they did not develop strategies to be accepted by the female nurses (as women do in male dominated fields). On the contrary, they developed strategies to distinguish themselves from female colleagues and to try to promote the careers of male colleagues (Evans, 1997).

In the present study, the unit of interest is organisations, not professions. It is expected that being a token in an organisation is correlated with being a token in certain professions (but not necessarily so; for example, not for a single female secretary in a male-dominated IT company). A potential difference could be that in the case of only being a token in the
organisations, tokens do not have to face potential conflict between their gender role and the ascribed characteristics required for the profession. However, even if someone is only a token in his or her organisation and not the entire profession, the social interaction processes with colleagues are expected to be similar. The effect of being a token within an organisation is expected to reflect the findings regarding gender token positions within professions.

Hypothesis 5m: Male employees who work in a female-dominated organisation (compared to men working in other gender compositions) show a larger ingroup preference.

Hypothesis 5f: Female employees who work in a male-dominated organisation (compared to women working in other gender compositions) show a smaller ingroup preference.

6.2.3 Contact and stereotype content

Contact theory (see Section 2.4) describes the mechanism behind contact and prejudices/stereotypes, but not the content of those stereotypes. According to the stereotype content model, it is possible to distinguish two fundamental dimensions within all stereotypes, namely warmth and competence. The intentions of people (warmth) and their ability to achieve those intentions or goals (competence) in the outgroup predict the content of the stereotypes attached to the outgroup by the ingroup. This leads to, for example, the stereotype of career women being cold but competent, and to that of the housewife being warm but incompetent (Fiske et al., 2002). These mixed contents of positively and negatively perceived traits are called the paternalistic stereotype in cases of high warmth and low competence for outgroups that are neither capable nor have the intention to harm, and the envied stereotype in cases of low perceived warmth and high competence.

When people are asked about women, a paternalistic stereotype generally emerges even though subtypes of women, such as career women, are categorised in the envied stereotype (Eckes, 2002; Fiske et al., 2002). The expectation is that working closely with women leads to more competence-based stereotypes because career women in general are seen as competent but colder (the envied). The question is whether contact with working women also leads to less warmth. Two arguments point in the opposite direction. First, it is unclear whether working women in general are considered career women, or whether perceptions of career women only involve women in high-powered positions. Second, Brambilla et al. (2012) found that imagined contact with both envied groups (in their case, Chinese immigrants in Italy) and paternalised groups (in their case, Peruvian immigrants in Italy) increased perceptions of both warmth and competence. If the same process occurs when men work with women, this could lead to an improved overall picture.
In the present study, contact is operationalised as having at least one colleague of the opposite gender (out of the three colleagues with whom employees work most closely). In chapters 4 and 5, contact at work with ethnic minorities was also operationalised using the total number of colleagues from a specific ethnic minority background. For gender contact, the total number of female or male colleagues seems to be less relevant. Seeing female/male colleagues with whom one does not work closely is expected to be less relevant. This type of contact is expected to have less extra effect than regular interactions with women on a daily basis outside of the work context. Actually working with a female colleague could provide disconfirming information that could lead to improved competence stereotypes (without necessarily suffering less warmth stereotypes) about women.

Based on contact theory and social identity theory, it is expected that more contact with working women leads to an overall more positive picture and therefore less ingroup preference.

*Ingroup preference compared to men who do not work closely with a female colleague.*

In traditional stereotypes, men are regarded as competent but not warm (Cuddy et al., 2008). Close work-related contact with men compared to other types of contact with men probably does not provide disconfirming information on the competence–warmth dimensions. This is because it is expected that work-related contact will primarily influence the competence dimension, on which men are generally already scored highly. Because of the expected unchanged stereotypes of men, the ingroup preferences of women are not expected to vary between women who have more and women who have less contact with men at work.

**Hypothesis 6f:** Female employees who work closely with a male colleague do not differ in their ingroup preference from women who do not work closely with a male colleague.

### 6.3 Role incongruence

Role incongruence refers to the incongruence between the perceived characteristics of a social group and the characteristics assumed to be necessary to occupy a specific role successfully. If stereotypes about women are incongruent with the stereotypes that people associate with leadership roles, this leads to potential prejudices. These prejudices make it less likely that a woman, regardless of differences in individual competences, will be regarded as suited to a leadership position compared to a man. People perceive women as more communal (kind, warm and gentle) than men, which suits subordinate and service roles better than leadership roles (Eagly and Karau, 2002). These differences are even found in recent research (Heilman, 2012). According to role theory (Eagly and Karau, 2002), the differences between the stereotypes attached to men and women originate in their original division of labour: In this chapter, the expectation is that people with more traditional
views about the ideal division of labour more often show a preference for men in labour market issues.

Role incongruence can lead to gender segregation and a lower labour participation rate of women. This is not only because it affects employers’ gender preferences in terms of hiring, promoting and firing, but also because it affects the preferences of men and women regarding the division of domestic and paid work. As Fortin (2005) shows, attitudes towards gender roles in countries predict employment and part-time rates that are assumed to also reflect individuals’ choices. However, there are also studies that indicate that more traditional roles for women lead to other employer decisions. For instance, in an experimental study, Rudman and Glick (2001) found that women suffered more than men when a role conflict occurred between personality and type of job. Agentic women were less often hired than agentic men were for jobs that required both social skills and strong competence. This shows that there was a backlash effect for women who did not fit the female gender role. A strong predictor of this backlash effect of role incongruence was a stronger implicit association (measured via the implicit association test) with women and characteristics that relate to warmth. This shows that gender stereotypes are not only descriptive but also prescriptive. When women do not fit the communal role, they are perceived as being less nice (Rudman and Glick, 2001). Similar results were found in an experimental study by Heilman et al. (2004), where successful women in a male-dominated area were judged as being less nice whereas equally successful men did not face those consequences.

For management positions and other jobs that are not characterised as subordinate, the expected role incongruence for women is clear: Some studies suggest that role incongruence could also occur for paid labour in general for women (not only for a special subset of jobs). According to Konrad and Cannings (1997), the requirements for full-time jobs are not as compatible with the traditional female role as they are with the traditional male role. Managers may therefore expect worse performance from women and, when acting in a risk averse way, this leads to discrimination. Moreover, recruitment officers believe that women are less committed to paid work than men, and more absent from work than men (Konrad and Cannings, 1997). Other research shows that more traditional attitudes towards gender roles in a country are related to a larger gender pay gap (Fortin 2005). This relation could reflect both the effect that traditional roles have on women’s labour market choices, and the impact of traditional roles on employers’ gender preferences. If traditional gender roles also effect preferences for labour market issues that are not explicit for top positions, the following is expected for men and women.

**Hypothesis 7m:** The more traditional male employees’ attitudes towards gender roles, the stronger their ingroup preference.

**Hypothesis 7f:** The more traditional female employees’ attitudes towards gender roles, the weaker their ingroup preference.
6.4 Method

The main reason for using vignettes in this study was that they made it possible to investigate why respondents had a certain gender preference in a dismissal situation. Vignettes are more suitable for this goal than empirical studies, for instance, in which it is more difficult to take the assessor’s characteristics into account. In some cases, field experiments could do so, but it is not possible to study dismissals using such experiments, since they are mostly aimed at explaining hiring decisions.

Gender is associated with characteristics that are also potentially important in relation to dismissals. For example, in the Netherlands women’s participation in the labour market was historically very low. Relative prosperity made it possible to realise the ideal of full-time motherhood, resulting in a relatively large number of women working part time (Benschop and Brouns, 2003). Therefore, it is necessary to control for work-related assumptions based on a person’s gender that are also potentially relevant for dismissal choices (such as working part time).

Measuring gender preferences using vignettes made it possible to keep some of those potentially co-occurring variables constant or to control for them. Other advantages of using vignettes are that they are less vulnerable to eliciting socially desirable answers. With at least two varying characteristics in the vignettes, one individual choice between two fictitious employees does not reveal the respondent’s gender preferences. All other advantages of using vignettes were described in Sections 4.1 and 4.4.

6.4.1 Dependent variables

Respondents read the following description of the situation. The characteristics of employees A and B varied, and every respondent rated seven choice situations. For more information about the construction of the vignettes, see Section 4.4.1.

_The CEO of a company with 15 employees has to lay off an employee because the company is on the edge of a financial abyss. He has to choose between two employees. Both have been in service for approximately the same length of time and both function properly._

Employee A [for example]: Female, two children, works full time, works in financial administration, Moroccan background.

Employee B [for example]: Male, no children living at home, works full time, works in the laboratory, Dutch background.

_If you were the CEO and had to choose, which employee would you fire - Employee A or Employee B?_

Choosing to fire a gender outgroup member rather than an ingroup member: Gender was one of the four varying characteristics presented in the vignette (working full time was fixed in every vignette pair). Each vignette depicted either a male or a female employee. Every time the respondent had to choose between two male employees or between two female employees, a missing score was given for that pair of vignettes. This left 4,227 vignettes to analyse. All of the 1,007 respondents had at least one vignette pair in which gender varied and they had to choose between a male and a female employee. On average, the respondents had 4.20 choices between a male and a female employee (minimum 1, maximum 7, standard deviati-
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6.4.2 Independent variables

Gender identity. Gender identity was measured for male respondents using the following eight items: 'I feel a bond with other men'; 'I feel solidarity with other men'; 'I’m glad to be a man'; ‘I think that men have much to be proud of’; ‘The fact that I’m a man is an important part of how I see myself'; ‘I have a lot in common with the average male'; ‘Men have much in common'; and ‘Women have much in common'. The female respondents replied to the same items, but with the word ‘woman/women' replacing ‘man/men', and vice versa. The items reflect the way ethnic identity was constructed (see Section 4.4.2). This was made into one scale using the factor weights of the first factor. All items had a factor weight of more than 0.57 (loadings >0.4; Hornburg and Giering 1996). The variance explained by the selected factors was 47% (although it should be more than 50%; Peterson, 2000). The reliability of the scale is .84 (Cronbach’s alpha > 0.7; Churchill 1979).

Male status illegitimacy. The illegitimacy of a higher-status position is an abstract phenomenon. Concrete illegitimate reasons for a lower status, such as unequal treatment, discrimination and fewer provided opportunities, were thought to be easier for respondents to understand. Therefore, the following question was framed to inquire about perceived reasons for women’s lower status in the labour market: ‘The average woman less often has a job and earns less than the average man. What do you see as the most important reason for this situation?’ Respondents could choose from the following options: (1) because of discrimination against women in the labour market; (2) because women have less learning potential than men do; (3) because women are not provided the same opportunities in the educational system; (4) because women are less motivated to work; (5) because women more often take care of the children (6); because of other reasons (which was an open category). Reasons 1 and 3 indicate that the respondent believed that at least part of the difference between the labour market positions of men and women are illegitimate because they are caused by different treatment in society based on gender. The other reasons indicate that at least the most important reason has to do with differences between men and women that make women less suited to paid labour (because of their capacities, choices or circumstances). Picking one of those last reasons still leaves the possibility open that the respondent considers differences between men’s and women’s positions to not only be explainable by legitimate reasons. For example, a respondent could consider the fact that women more often take care of the children as the most important reason, but could also to a lesser extent think that discrimination plays a role. For the final variable, a 0 indicates that the respondents thought that labour market differences are mostly caused by legitimate reasons, and a 1 that those differences are mostly due to illegitimate reasons. The open answer category (56 respondents) was analysed and recoded into those two options. For example, some people indicated that women more often want time for themselves than men do; this was recoded into category 0. On the other hand, an answer like ‘Men get preferential treatment. was coded into category 1. In the end, about three quarters (75.3%) of the responding fell into category 0, and about a quarter (24.7%)
into category 1. This division between the two categories was about the same for men and women (and was not significantly different).

Composition of the workforce gender outgroup/gender ingroup employees. Using a five-point scale, respondents could indicate whether their organisation predominantly consisted of male or female colleagues. The categories in the variable based on those answers range from 1, ‘Only colleagues from gender ingroup (8%)’, to 5, ‘All colleagues from gender outgroup’ (2%) (see Table 12). The mean score was 2.6.

Gender token. Based on the former variable, a dummy variable was created to indicate whether a respondent was the gender token within the organisation. A score of 1 was assigned to male respondents who indicated that only women worked in their organisation, and to female respondents who indicated that only men worked in their organisation. All other respondents were assigned a 0. Potentially problematic is that only 7 men and 11 women fell into the token category (see Table 12).

Gender of the three closest colleagues. Respondents were asked to give the age, gender and ethnicity of the colleague with whom they worked the most often, the colleague with whom they worked the second most often and the colleague with whom they worked the third most often. Dummy variables were created to describe whether at least one of the three colleagues was of the gender outgroup (1) or all were from the gender ingroup (0). Almost 6 out of 10 (59%) had no close colleague of the opposite gender, whereas 41% had at least one colleague of the opposite gender (see Table 13).

More traditional role patterns relating to men and women. Several scales and methods are used to measure individuals’ levels of support for a division of paid work and family responsibilities, called both gender roles and gender ideology (Davis and Greenstein, 2009). Davis and Greenstein summarise several possibilities that are used in well-known studies (such as the General Social Survey, the World Value Survey, etc.). Their summary contains items such as ‘If jobs are scarce, the wife shouldn’t work’, and ‘A woman’s place is in the home, not in the office or shop’. Some of them seem extreme for the Dutch context. The overview also shows that different studies make use of their own line of questioning. To ensure that the items were suited to capture differences in the attitudes towards gender roles in the present study, items were also used from a questionnaire that is already fruitfully used in the Dutch context. Three items were borrowed from the Dutch cultural changes questionnaire: 1) The government wants more women to participate in paid labour. What is your opinion about this goal in general? 2) The government should provide facilities so that parents can combine their work outside the home with the care of their children properly. 3) Men and women have to share childcare tasks equally. All items were measured on a five-point scale ranging from totally disagree (1) to totally agree (5). All items were reversely scored, so that a higher score reflected more traditional attitudes towards gender roles. Based on these items, a factor analysis was performed. All items had a factor loading of more than .69 on the underlying construct (>0.4 minimum rule; Hornburg and Giering, 1996). The explained variance was 53% (which should be more than 50%; Peterson, 2000).
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### Table 12 Gender composition of workforce, for male and female respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All colleagues from gender ingroup</th>
<th>Most colleagues from gender ingroup</th>
<th>Approximately half of colleagues from gender ingroup, half from gender outgroup</th>
<th>Most colleagues from gender outgroup</th>
<th>All colleagues from gender outgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 13 How many of the three colleagues that the respondent works with most closely are of the opposite gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 colleagues</th>
<th>1 colleague</th>
<th>2 colleagues</th>
<th>3 colleagues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.5 Results

Based on men’s higher labour market status, it was expected that male respondents would show a larger ingroup preference than female respondents by more often choosing to fire a gender outgroup member. Men chose to fire the female employee rather than the male employee in 52% of the vignettes. Women chose to fire male employees rather than female employees in 49% of the vignettes. This difference between men and women, which was tested in a bivariate logistic analysis (the effect of all independent variables were tested bivariately; see first column in Table 14) and in a final multivariate logistic multilevel analysis (second column Table 14), was significant and in the expected direction. It was expected that men and women who identified to a larger extent with their own gender would show a higher ingroup preference. Figure 10
d shows how gender identification had a positive effect on firing preferences.

---

\[66\] In the multilevel analyses, gender ingroup identification is a continuous variable created by factor analysis (as described in the operationalisation of the independent variables). Using the original variable, however, with often just one or two vignettes per identification value, would provide an unclear picture with dismissal means of 0%, 50% and 100%. Therefore, the original identification score for this figure is divided into seven categories, each containing (as far as possible) an equal number of respondents.
employees of the opposite gender. Support for the positive expected effect of gender identification was found in the analysis for all the respondents and in the separate analysis for men (see Table 14 and Table 15). The positive effect of ingroup identification was not significant for women, however (Table 15).

Female respondents who considered men’s better labour market position as illegitimate were expected to more often fire men rather than women, whereas for men no effects of men’s perceived status in the labour market were expected. This expectation was confirmed for women (Table 15) and for men (Table 15). The effects are shown in Figure 11.
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Based on different theories (threat, token and contact theory) that relate the gender composition of the workforce to gender preferences, multiple hypotheses were deduced (hypotheses 4, 5 and 6). The share of female colleagues did not affect the ingroup preferences of male employees, which confirms the hypothesis based on earlier findings that the proportion of women does not necessarily threaten the position of male employees. It does, however, disconfirm the hypothesis based on general threat theory that a larger percentage of women could threaten the majority group. The effect of being a token was in the expected direction and one of the biggest effects (Table 15), but it was not significant. This is also shown in Figure 12. However, the number of people who were considered a token in this database is very small. Based on contact theory, it was expected that for men, working closely with women would lead to a decrease in their likelihood of firing women rather than men. However, the opposite effect was found. This group of men fired women significantly more often (Table 15). As expected, for women no effect of contact was found (Table 15).

**Figure 12** Percentage of dismissals of the outgroup, by gender respondent and gender composition workforce

More traditional gender roles were expected to be related to the preference for firing women over men. This effect was found for both men and women. As shown in Table 15, for men more traditional attitudes towards gender roles were related to more often firing gender outgroup employees (i.e. women rather than men). Also shown in Table 15, for women more traditional values were related to the dismissal of gender ingroup members (i.e. also women rather than men). These results are shown in Figure 13. For a summary of the hypotheses and their results, see Table 16.
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Figure 13 Percentage of dismissals of the outgroup, by gender respondent and traditional gender roles

Table 14 Dependent variable: preferences for firing employees based on outgroup gender; logistic multilevel model. Outgroup gender vs ingroup gender employees. All respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Firing gender outgroup rather than employee's gender ingroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents N=1007 Vignettes N=4227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All respondents bivariate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B    SE    B    SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(intercept)</td>
<td>NA    .234    .342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Men</td>
<td>.121* .062    .205** .068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Gender identification</td>
<td>.097** .032    .137*** .034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male status in labour market is illegitimate</td>
<td>.127    .071    .147* .074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of gender outgroup employees</td>
<td>-.015    .026    -.049    .046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent is gender token</td>
<td>-.097    .227    -.009    .257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is from the gender outgroup</td>
<td>.078    .063    .162*    .079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles</td>
<td>-.008    .036    -.002    .033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education attained</td>
<td>.003    .019    .001    .022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees in the workplace</td>
<td>-.000    .000    -.000    .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>NA    2.849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001
Table 15: Dependent variable: preferences for firing employees based on outgroup gender; logistic multilevel model. Outgroup gender vs ingroup gender employees. For male and female employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Firing gender outgroup, female rather than male employees</th>
<th>Firing gender outgroup, male rather than female employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bivariate</td>
<td>Final model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(intercept)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender identification</td>
<td>165***</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m/3f: Male status in</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labour market illegitimate</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4m/4f: Share of gender</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outgroup employees</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5m/5f: Respondent is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender token</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6m/6f: At least 1 out of 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closest colleagues is</td>
<td>.072*</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the gender outgroup</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees in</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the workplace</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p<.05  ** = p<.01, *** = p<.001
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In the multilevel model it was tested whether a significant relationship between the share of male employees and the support for preferential treatment was found for female employees. Finding no support is not the same as finding support that no relationship exists (this would mean a lower threshold for confirming the hypothesis). A test of equivalence is necessary, but not possible in this type of analysis. Which means that not enough support was found to consider the hypothesis as confirmed.

Table 16 Summary of the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypothesis supported?</th>
<th>Relevant analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Male employees show a higher ingroup preference than female employees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: The more strongly employees identify with their gender, the more ingroup preference they show.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m: Male employees who regard their labour market status as illegitimate show the same ingroup preference as men who regard the status as legitimate.</td>
<td>Yes, but 47</td>
<td>Table 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f: Female employees who regard men’s labour market status as illegitimate show a higher ingroup preference compared to female employees who regard the status as legitimate.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4ma: The share of female colleagues does not affect male employees’ ingroup preferences.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4mb: The larger the share of female colleagues, the more ingroup preferences male employees show.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Table 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5m: Male employees who work in a female-dominated organisation (compared to men working in other gender compositions) show a larger ingroup preference.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Table 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5f: Female employees who work in a male-dominated organisation (compared to women working in other gender compositions) show a smaller ingroup preference.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Table 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6m: Male employees who work closely with a female colleague show less ingroup preference (compared to men who do not work closely with a female colleague).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Table 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f: Female employees who work closely with a male colleague do not differ in their ingroup preference (from women who do not work closely with a male colleague).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Table 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7m: The more traditional male employees’ attitudes towards gender roles, the stronger the ingroup preference.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f: The more traditional female employees’ attitudes towards gender are, the weaker the ingroup preference.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 In the multilevel model it was tested whether a significant relationship between the share of male employees and the support for preferential treatment was found for female employees. Finding no support is not the same as finding support that no relationship exists (this would mean a lower threshold for confirming the hypothesis). A test of equivalence is necessary, but not possible in this type of analysis. Which means that not enough support was found to consider the hypothesis as confirmed.
Four examples of real people included in the database (with fictitious names) chosen from the more extreme range of predicted probability scores (based on the two analyses in Table 15) are presented, with the aim of showing how the investigated variables affect the chances of somebody firing a gender outgroup member. More extreme probability scores would be possible had fictitious scenarios been chosen.

Based on his personal characteristics and work environment, Victor has a 34% probability of choosing to fire a woman rather than a man. Victor has a Bachelor’s degree and does not identify strongly with his gender (-4.5 standard deviation). He believes that women have a worse labour market position mainly due to discrimination. He works in an organisation where at his branch half of the employees are women and half are men (and therefore he is not in a token position). At least one of the three colleagues he works with the most is female. His values concerning gender roles are a little more progressive than average (-.63 standard deviation on traditional gender roles).

In contrast to Victor, Max has a relatively high probability (70%) of firing women rather than men in the vignette study. Max finished the highest level of high school and/or the first year of university. He identifies a little more than average with his gender (0.9 standard deviation). He is comparable to Victor in that he believes that women have a worse labour market position mainly due to discrimination. He works only with women and therefore is a gender token. Logically, at least one of the three colleagues he works with the most is female. His values concerning gender roles are rather traditional (.85). The different expected probabilities between Max and Victor are mainly caused by the fact that Victor does not identify that much with his gender and Max is a gender token in his organisation.

Sarah has a relatively low chance of firing an outgroup member: based on the investigated characteristics, she has a predicted 32% probability of firing a man rather than a woman.

Sarah followed intermediate vocational education and does not identify with her gender a lot (-1.8 standard deviation). She believes that the most important reason behind women having a worse labour market position has nothing to with discrimination. She works only with men (and is thus a token) and therefore at least one of the three colleagues she works with the most is male. Her values concerning gender roles are rather traditional (.7).

Maxime has a predicted 64% probability of firing a man rather than a woman. Maxime has a Bachelor’s degree/completed higher vocational training. She identifies more than average with her gender (2.3 standard deviation). She believes that the most important reason for the worse labour market position of women is gender discrimination. She mostly works with men. At least one of the three colleagues she works with the most is male. Her values concerning gender roles are more progressive than average (-1.6).

6.6 Conclusion and discussion

In this study, employees’ gender preferences were investigated using vignettes. Respondents had to fire one of two fictitious employees. Firing an employee who belonged to the respondent’s outgroup was considered to be an indicator of gender ingroup preference. The fictitious employees in the vignettes differed not only in gender, but also with regard to ethnicity, type
of job and parental status. Notably, the gender of the employees in the vignettes appeared to matter less to the respondents compared to the other characteristics (see chapter 4). This chapter aimed to explain differences between employees’ gender preferences.

Central to this study is workforce diversity. The workplace context provides new opportunities to test threat theory and contact theory applied to gender. The study also drew on token theory to formulate hypotheses regarding the expected effects of gender workforce diversity on gender preferences in the labour market. No significant effect was found of being a token, although effect sizes were reasonably large and in the expected opposite direction for men and women. A possibility is that the non-significance was caused by the small number of respondents who were in a gender token position; this should be investigated further with more suitable data.

Threat theory predicts that preferences for the ingroup are caused by fear of losing goods and power (such as employment) to minority groups. It was expected that a relatively larger group of women would pose a threat to men, but that a relatively larger group of men would not pose a threat to women. However, no effect of the relative size was found at all. Moreover, contrary to the hypotheses derived from contact theory, working closely with at least one person of the opposite gender led to men having an increased preference for firing female employees. Because the used data do not specify the occupational level of the colleagues, it is possible that due to the job segregation between men and women, the relative share of women in an organisation does not capture the effect of threat, since threat is expected to be relevant between people who are potential competitors. Because they do not necessarily have comparable jobs, a larger proportion of women therefore does not have to lead to more threat for men. On the other hand, the colleagues with whom one works most closely probably have more comparable jobs. This could form an ad hoc explanation for the reversed effect of having a close colleague of the opposite gender, and also for why the proportion of women did not influence men’s ingroup preferences. Instead of measuring the effect of contact, having at least one female colleague (also?) measured the effect of threat. Further research in which the level and type of occupation of colleagues can be taken into account is necessary to unravel the mechanisms behind these findings.

Besides the effect of the composition of the workforce, other characteristics and opinions were also taken into account. Because the data made it possible to research both men’s and women’s preferences (in contrast to the studies on ethnic preferences, which could only take into account the preferences of native Dutch people), different expectations for the preferences of lower- and higher-status groups could be formulated. Based on men’s higher labour market status, it was expected that men would have stronger ingroup preferences compared to women. This was found to be true even though, again as expected, men identified significantly less with their gender ingroup than women did. Identifying with one’s own gender ingroup did, however, affect the ingroup preferences in general and for male employees positively, although for women no effect was found. The reason behind this last finding remains unclear. Based on men’s higher status, different effects of perceived labour market status legitimacy were also expected and found. Women who considered men’s labour market position to be illegitimate showed a stronger ingroup preference, whereas for men no effects of perceived status illegitimacy were found.
Men and women with more traditional attitudes towards gender roles more often dismissed female employees rather than male employees. Traditional gender roles were expected to cause a larger perceived incongruence between women and paid labour, which caused respondents who believed in traditional gender roles to more often fire the female employee in the vignette study.

Although these results shed light on what causes gender preferences to differ, the question is what these results can reveal about the possible effects on gender preferences in real dismissal situations. Of course, the vignettes used in this study do not reflect all types of dismissal situations. For example, they were restricted to full-time working men and women and only included two types of jobs. Furthermore, the respondents were not necessarily managers, but employees in general. Respondents had to choose between two employees, which makes the differences bigger than they necessarily are in real life. However, although no definite answers can be given, some indicators can be used as a warning sign in real dismissal situations. For example, personal beliefs about gender roles were found to influence gender preferences in the vignette study. If this reflects actual behaviour at the workplace, the decision-maker’s belief in traditional gender roles could bias dismissals based on gender.
CHAPTER 7

Support for preferential treatment of women
Formal equal rights between men and women took centuries to achieve. These rights have their basis in a humanist tradition in which individual rights are central and individuals are seen as independent of each other (Voet, 1995). According to Voet, formal equal rights are central to passive citizenship, but form only the preconditions for active citizenship. In the Netherlands, differences between men and women are found in their participation level, and not in their possession of formal rights (Voet, 1995). The aim of affirmative action is to combat those differences between men and women, especially in higher-level positions (Balafoutas and Sutter, 2012). Affirmative action measures are largely debated from a principal point of view (see Chapter 5), but also from a practical point of view. For example, Heilman (Heilman, 1997; Heilman et al., 1992) points out that affirmative action for women in organisations can have negative side effects (increased stereotyping of women).

In the 1970s in the Netherlands, the women’s movement had a broad agenda for change, with a strong emphasis on the need to change gender roles. Important organisations during that time were ‘Dolle Mina’ and the Men–Women Society (MVM). Later, attention shifted to economic independence and political and economic representation. Inspired by American developments, in 1975 the labour party agreed that 25% of their officials and electoral candidates should be women (Bacchi, 1996). This starting point of affirmative action for women was followed by, among others, the Barleaus case in the 1980s (Wiggers, 1991; Verhaar, 1991). This case was widely debated in the national media (Wiggers, 1991).

Relatively recently, the discussion was sparked again by two cases regarding the appointment of female professors at the University of Groningen in 2011 and at Delft University of Technology (TU Delft) in 2012.

---

48 In 1988, the municipality of Amsterdam wanted to recruit women for management positions in the public education system. If no suitable candidates were found, men could also apply. They wanted to use this measure until 40% of the managers were women, because of the underrepresentation of this group (more than 40% of the regular teaching staff were female). When a vacancy occurred for the position of rector, the staff of the Barleaus gymnasium preferred a male internal candidate; however, under pressure from the municipality, a female external candidate was appointed. This led to a conflict that was publicly discussed in the media.

49 Both cases were brought to the Netherlands Institute of Human Rights. In the first case (opinion 2011-198), the institute ruled that the University of Groningen did not conform to the strict requirements for preferential treatment. By not considering male candidates for the extra vacancies, the university did not meet the conditions set by the EU Court of Justice jurisprudence: only when male and female candidates are equally suitable for a position can female candidates be given preference (and by not considering men, it is not possible to compare candidates). In the second case, however (opinion 2012-195), the institute ruled that under exceptional conditions it was not prohibited to reserve university positions exclusively for women. TU Delft could show that there was a serious and persistent lack of female scientists in relation to the available supply, especially for the higher academic positions (whereas the University of Groningen could not show that there lack was persistent ‘enough’; opinion 2011-198 3.25). To resolve this under-representation, the university had already taken numerous measures, including ensuring the female friendliness of recruitment procedures. Based on the lack of female scientists and the unsuccessful previous measures, the reservation of special places for female professors was allowed. According to the institute, this was possible because the condition that men should also be considered is based on the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice of the EU, which creates more opportunities than if the condition were based on the Dutch equality legislation itself. Another argument is that the EU jurisprudence dates from the time that the old directive (article 2 (4) directive 76/207/EEG) was still in place, and this guideline ‘merely’ promotes equal opportunities, whereas the goal of the new one is to ensure full equality.
In the 1980s, resistance to affirmative action came from, among others, male union members. They criticised affirmative action for women because, in their opinion, the measure was not used to achieve more horizontal integration (that is, having more women in men’s jobs); instead, they perceived the movement mostly as elitist with the aim of placing female white-collar workers in positions of high power (Bacchi, 1996). Verhaar (1991) studied the public debate during the late 1980s and concluded that it centred on the concept of quality of a candidate: what quality means (and its relationship with gender), how it can be measured and what kind of role it plays in the recruitment process. Recently, the debate around affirmative action was resumed: the short-lived cabinet of the VVD and CDA\textsuperscript{50} announced that it planned to ban all preferential treatment programmes (Rutte and Verhagen, 2010). Although those plans were not implemented,\textsuperscript{51} the announcement again led to public debate about the desirability of preferential treatment (e.g. Plasterk, 2010; Pietersen, 2012; Pfeiffer, 2010). In addition, the two recent university appointment cases were widely debated. In the Dutch magazine for lawyers, Cremers and Oden (2015) adopt a behavioural realism frame to argue for stronger preferential treatment measures, such as the one used at TU Delft. Resistance to stronger preferential treatment in this case came from, for example, Westerbeek (2014), who criticised the legal argumentation of the Netherlands Institute of Human Rights. However, although the public debate has been analysed before, a representative study has not yet been conducted to understand the general public’s support for preferential treatment of women in the Netherlands.

Chapter 5 investigated the connection between workforce diversity in terms of ethnicity and support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities. In addition to gender workforce diversity, the other explanation for preferential treatment focused on stratification beliefs, as does much of the literature (Kane and Whipkey, 2009).

Understanding support for affirmative action for women receives less attention compared to support for ethnic minorities (Konrad and Hartmann, 2001). Moreover, research into the support for affirmative action for women and ethnic minorities has developed along different lines (Kane and Whipkey, 2009), with the former focusing primarily on gender role attitudes (Kane and Whipkey, 2009).

One expected reason for this focus on gender roles is that the interdependence of men and women and their degree of contact is different from that between the ethnic majority and ethnic minorities. The interconnectedness of men and women creates gender roles, and increases the importance of these roles as a potential source of resistance to women in higher positions and measures that promote this. However, besides gender roles, this chapter also

\textsuperscript{50} After the elections in the autumn of 2010, a coalition was formed between two parties: the Liberals (VVD) and the Christian Democrats (CDA). However, this coalition did not have the majority of seats in parliament and could only rule with the informal support of the PVV (the Party for Freedom, which was discussed earlier). The last-mentioned withdrew its support for the budget plans of 2013, after which the prime minister handed in the resignation of the entire cabinet in April 2012.

\textsuperscript{51} The legal possibilities for employers to implement preferential treatment, for example, remained unchanged.
focuses on the intermediating role of the content of stereotypes. Whereas a negative attitude towards ethnic minorities can consist of solely negative stereotypes,\(^{52}\) stereotypes about women are almost never all negative (Fraser et al., 2015). Women in general are perceived as warm but not particularly competent (Fiske et al., 1999), making it necessary in this study to include measures of stereotype content (which was not necessary to investigate the support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities in Chapter 5) and gender roles to understand the link between workforce diversity and support for preferential treatment.

Besides the differences, there is also some common ground between the gender and the race literature. The concept of modern sexism is based on the concept of modern racism, and distinguishes the denying/not being aware of discrimination, the rejection of the demand for economic and political equality, and the rejection of measures that are aimed at achieving equality (Morrison et al., 1999; Konrad and Hartmann, 2001). Both are expected to negatively affect support for affirmative action for the respective groups. Chapter 5 showed that the perceived prevalence of discrimination is driven not only by race-related opinions, but also by workforce diversity within an organisation. The concept of modern sexism will be investigated in this chapter in a similar manner.

In summary, in this chapter factors that are traditionally used to explain ethnic attitudes (such as contact and threat) are employed in the work context to explain support for preferential treatment of women, bearing in mind that the mechanisms may differ because of the expected complex, ambiguous content of stereotypes of women and prominent position of gender roles. Building on both research traditions, workforce diversity, stratification beliefs, gender roles and stereotype content are taken into account to explain the support for the preferential treatment of women.

The assumption made in this chapter is that resistance to preferential treatment at least partly reflects gender ingroup preferences. Other objections, however, such as the argument that preferential treatment interferes with a judgement based on merit, can also affect support for preferential treatment. To ensure that those types of objections do not alter the factors that are expected to explain the ingroup preference side of preferential treatment, also an additional analysis will be performed to explain the support for equal treatment of men and women. In equal treatment, meritocratic concerns are not relevant. If the same factors that explain support for preferential treatment are relevant to explain support for equal treatment, this would suggest that not taking social justice concerns into account does not alter the effect of other factors. Such a result would also suggest that support for preferential treatment indeed partly reflects ingroup preferences.

\(^{52}\) When people are asked about their stereotypes of immigrants in general, results indicate that those stereotypes are negative on both the warmth and competence dimensions (Cuddy et al., 2008), whereas stereotypes of specific immigrant groups can also be ambiguous, namely either cold and competent or warm and incompetent (see e.g. Brambilla et al., 2012).
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7.1 Threat theory

Section 6.2.1 discussed why the threat theory could also be applicable to gender relations in the workplace. This resulted in the hypothesis that for male employees, a larger share of female employees leads to more competition and increased ingroup preferences. No support for threat effects was found, but ingroup preferences were operationalised in the preference for firing a woman over a man in the vignette study. Also, the outcome variable in the present chapter - support for preferential treatment in hiring - is expected to be more directly related to threat arising from the competition for jobs: first, because preferential treatment of women directly gives women an institutional advantage in the perceived competition; and second, because whereas in the vignettes used in the previous chapter, gender was one of the four varying characteristics, in the issue of preferential treatment gender is central in the questioning.

Based on the reasoning that threat theory is also applicable to the position of women in organisations, the following hypothesis is derived.

Hypothesis 1m: The larger the share of female colleagues, the less male employees support preferential treatment of women.

Section 6.2.1 also argued that threat effects from a minority group are only expected to exist in an organisation if the majority group is the higher status group in society. If the majority group in the organisation has a lower status in society than the minority does, that majority, despite its numbers, is likely not to hold power over valuable resources within the organisation. Therefore, a larger share of male colleagues is not expected to have an effect on female employees.

Hypothesis 1f: The share of male colleagues does not affect female employees’ support for preferential treatment of women.

7.2 Stereotype content

According to the stereotype content model, structural societal positions predict the type of stereotypes that an ingroup attaches to an outgroup. The type of stereotypes in turn predicts the reaction to those outgroups (Caprariello et al., 2009). Both of these steps will be included in the model to explain the support for preferential treatment of women. In addition to the predictions derived directly from the stereotype content model, the chapter will also discuss the effect of contact (as a determinant of stereotype content) and the prescriptive nature of stereotypes (as a consequence of stereotype content). This will be done because contact theory and threat theory do not take into account the content of stereotypes. For women this is especially important because stereotypes about women are often ambivalent.


7.2.1 Determinants of stereotype content

Structural societal factors

The stereotype content model is used to explain the two underlying dimensions of stereotypes by their necessity in assessing people’s expected behaviour. Stereotypes on the warmth dimension are expectations about people’s intentions, whereas the competence stereotypes concern the ability to act upon those intentions (Cuddy et al., 2008). A large body of research underpins the relevance of warmth and competence in person and group perception, but little research investigates the structural factors underlying those stereotypes (Russell and Fiske, 2008). One such study that does look at the underlying structural factors is that by Fiske et al. (2002), who argue that the warmth and competence dimensions are predicted by competition and status. They describe how groups (such as Asians in the USA) that have a high status in society and are also competitive are stereotyped as competent (which is necessary to justify the system in which they have achieved this high status) but cold (a justification for the resentment against the group). At the other end of the spectrum, the authors describe how subordinate, low-status groups that are not competitive are regarded as warm but incompetent to maintain the position of the more privileged groups. Career women fall into the first category, and traditional women into the second. Fiske et al.’s (2002) analysis included respondents’ assessments of competition and status, as well as the warmth and competence of these groups, and their results revealed that the two quadrants were correlated.

In an experimental study, Caprariello et al. (2009) found effects that did not entirely support the above results. However, the two studies differed in their measurement of status and competition. In Caprariello et al.’s (2009) work, status and competition varied in a scenario, whereas in Fiske et al.’s (2002), respondents judged the status and competition of real groups in society. In that respect, the Caprariello study was better set up to test whether the link between societal structure and the content of stereotypes is causal in nature. In Caprariello’s study, groups that were high in status and high in competition scored significantly higher than the three other groups only on the competence dimension. For groups high in status but low in competition, warmth as well as competence scores increased compared to the three other groups. For groups low in status and high in competition, on the other hand, no effects were found. Finally, for groups low in status and low in competition, scores on the warmth dimension increased.

In the present study, status and competition of women are expected to be related. When women have high-status positions in an organisation, this directly affects competition with men in that organisation because of the limited number of attractive jobs. Whether women are seen as low or high in status and competition will depend on the workplace context. When men work in an organisation where women predominately have lower, non-threatening jobs, the first option is expected, whereas the latter is expected when women have higher-ranking jobs. Unfortunately, the used data do not contain direct information about the level of men’s and women’s jobs in their organisation. However, the data do include the sector in which the employees work, which can be used as an indicator of the level of women’s jobs. In the Netherlands, the representation of women in senior positions is on average higher in the public sector than in the private sector (Merens, 2012). Based on the above, the following hypotheses are derived.
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Hypothesis 2m public sector: *The larger the share of female colleagues, the more male employees working in the public sector attach competence-related stereotypes to women.*

Hypothesis 2m private sector: *The larger the share of female colleagues, the more male employees working in the private sector attach warmth-related stereotypes to women.*

Similarities can be found between the indicators of stereotype content model and threat theory. Both assume that competition between groups is an essential factor in the formation of stereotypes. However, threat theory does not predict when positive stereotypes will emerge, whereas the stereotype content model (in the way it has been tested until now) does not take the size of the group into account as a relevant factor for competition, and thus only perception is taken into account. Moreover, although competition and status are regarded in the stereotype content model as structural variables causing stereotypes, the model has not been tested in an empirical setting. Instead, this has been shown by either manipulating the variables (Caprariello et al., 2009, which does not capture real societal groups) or measuring perceived status and competition (as did Fiske et al., 2002, which also could be affected by stereotypes). The effect of real structural characteristics remains unknown in those studies and whether competition has to be real competition or perceived competition is unclear.

*Contact*

Although the effect of contact on stereotypes has been tested many times (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006), this effect on the two dimensions of stereotypes is not well known. Exceptions are recent experiments that investigated the expected positive impact of imagined contact (drawn from contact theory) with groups on stereotyping of groups on the warmth and competence dimensions (e.g. Brambilla et al., 2012). To the best of the author’s knowledge, the impact of contact in a non-experimental setting on the dimensions of the stereotype content model has not been investigated before. The workplace is the most relevant option to study the impact of contact with women on the content of stereotypes.

In the case of gender, informal contact between men and women often occurs daily, with probably no great variation between individuals. However, due to the horizontal segregation of the labour market, the degree of contact of male employees with working women does vary between organisations. To understand the relationship between workforce diversity and the support for preferential treatment of women, the content of stereotypes is investigated as a potential mediating factor in this study. Brambilla’s results show that both imagined contact with envied groups and contact with pitied groups improved stereotypes on the warmth and competence dimensions. Therefore, regardless of the type of female colleagues with whom men work (more career type or housewife-like), contact is expected to improve both warmth and competence stereotypes.
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Hypothesis 3mw: Men who work closely with women attach more warmth-related stereotypes to women compared to men who do not work closely with female colleagues.

Hypothesis 3mc: Men who work closely with women attach more competence-related stereotypes to women compared to men who do not work closely with female colleagues.

In the literature a backlash effect is described for women who climb the organisational ladder. This effect is described as punishment for behaving counter-stereotypically. Coming across as agentic/ competent is necessary to compete with men for higher leadership positions. But prescriptive stereotypes of warmth for women can result in negative reactions (Rudman and Phelan, 2008). However, this behavioural dilemma for women does not imply that increased competence stereotypes due to contact will go hand in hand with decreased warmth stereotypes for women.

7.2.2 Consequences of stereotype content

Predictions from the stereotype content model

According to Cuddy et al. (2008), combinations of warmth and competence stereotypes attached to outgroups lead to distinct emotions that, in turn, predict behaviour. The combination of low-warmth and low-competence stereotypes leads to contempt, low-warmth and high-competence stereotypes to envy, high-warmth and high-competence to admiration, and high-warmth and low-competence to pity. These emotions lead to biased reactions towards those groups. Envied and resented groups (which share their low score on the warmth dimension) are subject to harm, and it is expected that the intention to harm, whether it is active or passive, will lead to less support for preferential treatment of women (which from the male perspective is intended to facilitate the outgroup).

Hypothesis 4mw: The fewer warmth-related stereotypes male employees attach to women, the less they support preferential treatment of women.

Prescriptive nature of stereotypes

Although horizontal segregation by gender in the labour market still exists, affirmative action for women seems to mostly target higher positions (in which it challenges vertical discrimination). Some authors even explicitly define the goal of affirmative action for women as increasing the number of women in management or other top positions (e.g. Balafoutas and Sutter, 2012). The most recent publicly discussed cases of affirmative action for women in the Netherlands also concerned higher positions. Therefore, it is assumed that people associate preferential treatment in the Netherlands for women with higher and leadership positions. For those types of jobs, the emphasis is on agentic qualities (Rudman and Phelan, 2008).
As described earlier, in an experimental study, Rudman and Glick (2001) found that women suffered more than men when a role conflict occurred between personality and type of job. Agentic women were less often hired than agentic men for jobs that required both social skills and strong competence. Those skills are required for the type of job that affirmative action in the Netherlands seems to target, namely the higher leadership positions. Thus, there was a backlash effect for women who did not fit the female gender role. A strong predictor of this backlash effect of role incongruence was a stronger implicit association (measured via the implicit association test) with women and characteristics that relate to warmth. This shows that gender stereotypes are not only descriptive but also prescriptive (Rudman and Glick, 2001). Other authors, such as Prentice and Carranza (2002) and Heilman (2001), also argue that gender stereotypes are highly prescriptive in nature.

Based on the prescriptive nature of stereotypes and the agentic positions targeted by affirmative action for women, it is expected that both male and female employees who attach warmth-related stereotypes to women will show less support for preferential treatment of women.

**Hypothesis 5w:** The more warmth-related stereotypes employees attach to women, the less they support preferential treatment of women.

Although hypotheses 4m and 5w both propose that warmth stereotypes play a role in the reaction, the two hypotheses are partly (as far as they concern the effect for male employees) contrary. Hypothesis 5w is based on the notion that stereotypes are prescriptive, which does not assume that reactions differ between the ingroup and the outgroup (whereas the mechanism behind 4m is specific to the male outgroup). In this theory, the context is decisive in whether the prescriptive stereotypes that people hold lead to conflict; it defines whether warmth stereotypes lead to positive or negative reactions towards a group. The prescriptive nature of warmth stereotypes stems from role incongruence, which will be discussed in the following section. Despite the shared origin of gender roles and prescriptive stereotypes, it is important to measure both stereotypes as direct opinions about gender roles. Expressions about gender roles are expected to be influenced more by social conventions than warmth stereotypes are. By measuring both at the same time, more insight can be gained into how those stereotypes are formed.

---

53 In the literature there is a discussion about how stereotype content is formed. As described in Section 7.2.1, Fiske et al. argue that warmth and stereotypes are the effect of a groups status and competition in society. Koenig and Eagly (2014) argue that social roles lie at the basis of stereotype content. According to them, it is much harder to gain knowledge about the structural elements of status and competition than to observe social roles, which makes it more plausible that those roles impact stereotypes more than those structural elements. One of the critiques on this element of role theory is that whereas the social roles of women have changed dramatically in recent decades, the content of the stereotypes for women has not (Fiske et al. 2002). Koenig and Eagly (2014) in turn argue that group roles are at the basis of stereotype content, but that not all changes in roles necessarily lead to changed stereotype content. In this chapter, social roles are taken into account not as a predictor of stereotype content but as, for example, a direct predictor of support for preferential treatment.
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7.3 Role incongruence

Preferential treatment of women in the Netherlands is likely to be associated with higher leadership positions (as discussed earlier). For such jobs, the emphasis is on agentic qualities (Rudman and Phelan, 2008). Moreover, the incongruence with the traditional role of women, which emphasises communal qualities (such as kind, warm and gentle), is expected to be largest for these jobs (see Section 6.3). Put simply, people who have traditional attitudes towards the role of women are less likely to support a measure that is intended to put women in top positions.

Hypothesis 6: The more traditional gender stereotypes employees hold, the less they support preferential treatment of women.

7.4 Modern sexism

Both sexism and racism have old-fashioned variants that over time have become socially unacceptable (Swim et al., 1995). To capture the effects of sexism and racism, modern-day variants are needed as old scales no longer measure enough variation (Glick and Fiske, 2011). Swim et al. (1995) drew on the parallels between racism and sexism and built on the earlier developed concept of modern racism to develop a modern sexism scale. According to these authors, modern sexism, like modern racism, is characterised by the denial of continued discrimination, negative reactions towards women’s demands and a lack of support for measures aimed at improving the situation of women. Others agree but define the underlying dimensions of modern sexism differently. For instance, Morrison et al. (1999) only distinguish two underlying dimensions of modern sexism: not being aware of present-day discrimination, and a negative attitude towards measures that promote equality, whereas agreeing that there are similarities between racism and sexism, other authors, such as Glick and Fiske (2011), see some fundamental differences caused by the different interdependences between men and women and ethnic minorities and majorities. Whereas ethnic prejudices are expressed in the unwillingness to have close relationships (measured by items such as ‘Would you mind having a member of an ethnic minority group as a neighbour or as a son in law?’), such closeness measures are not useful for gender prejudices.

In any case, all scales consider not acknowledging discrimination to be an important part. For this reason, like in Chapter 5, the focus in this chapter is on an item that is comparable and used in both modern sexism and modern racism research: perceived prevalence of discrimination (in the labour market). Other authors (e.g. Konrad and Hartman, 2001) also consider or treat not being aware of or denying gender discrimination as a separate item to explain attitudes towards affirmative action. This is logical, because recognising that a group is discriminated against structurally is a necessary condition to engage in collective measures (Ellemers and Barreto, 2009).

Hypothesis 7: The more discrimination against women an employee perceives in the labour market, the more that employee supports preferential treatment of women.
The results in Chapter 5 indicated that native Dutch employees who believe that ethnic minorities are not discriminated against (relative to the ethnic majority) are not only influenced by ethnic prejudices, but also seem to take their own working environment into account as a proxy for the labour market as a whole. Native Dutch employees who worked with a larger share of ethnic minority colleagues more often indicated that there was no hiring discrimination against ethnic minorities, even when controlled for other racial prejudices. This raises the question whether male employees who indicate that discrimination against women in the labour market is no longer an issue are driven only by their modern sexist beliefs, or are they also influenced by their working environment? The expectation is that men working in an organisation with a larger percentage of female colleagues will more often indicate that discrimination is no longer an issue, based on the hypothesis that those employees will use their own working environment as a proxy for the labour market in general.

**Hypothesis 8m:** The larger the share of female colleagues, the less discrimination against women male employees perceive in the labour market.

To control for the possibility that a potential positive relationship between the share of employees and the perceived discrimination indicates threat (rather than reflecting a proxy function), an indirect path from the share to perceived prevalence of discrimination in the labour market via gender roles has been added in this study. Controlling for traditional gender roles, the study investigates whether there is still a relationship between the share of women in the workforce and male employees’ perceived prevalence of gender discrimination. For the indirect effect via gender roles, two types of predictions are possible. The first is the threat scenario, in which more female colleagues will lead to experienced threat that will be expressed via falling back on traditional role patterns (this would be the parallel of the mechanism described in Chapter 5 explaining the relationship between the share of ethnic minority colleagues and opinions about ethnic minorities). The second possible mechanism behind the share of women and traditional gender roles is that meeting more working women will lead to a disconfirmation of traditional stereotypes. By working with women, male employees experience the latter in a non-traditional role; experiencing a larger share of female colleagues will therefore lead to having fewer traditional gender patterns.

The second step of the indirect connection between share and perceived labour market discrimination is from traditional gender roles to the perception of labour market discrimination against women. Logically, holding more traditional gender roles does not necessarily imply that one’s perception of discrimination is influenced. However, holding more traditional stereotypes does imply that women are placed in a special role, which is part of benevolent sexism. Benevolent sexism implies, for example, the belief that women have special qualities and roles. This sexism is expected to be related to other measures of modern sexism, such as not acknowledging discrimination. This leads to the expectation that those who hold more traditional values will less often perceive labour market discrimination against women.
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7.5 Self-interest/identifying with one’s gender
A shortcoming in explaining support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities (Chapter 5) was the lack of respondents from an ethnic minority background, which meant that only the support from native Dutch people was taken into account. Not investigating the perspective of ethnic minorities in such research leads to the underestimation of group interests (Bobo, 1998). Fortunately, to understand the preferential treatment of women, it is possible to consider support from both sides. It is expected that women support such measures more often than men do because the former’s ingroup potentially gains from such measures.

Hypothesis 9: Male employees show less support for preferential treatment of women in the workplace compared to female employees.

Supporting a measure that is or is not in the interest of one’s ingroup is expected to be affected by the degree of identification with one’s own ingroup, as described in Section 5.2.4. Therefore, the following is expected for male and female employees.

Hypothesis 10m: The more male employees identify with their gender, the less support for preferential treatment of women in the workplace they show.

Hypothesis 10f: The more female employees identify with their gender, the more support for preferential treatment of women in the workplace they show.

All hypotheses are summarised in the figure below. An ‘f’ indicates that the hypotheses are specific to female employees and an ‘m’ that they are specific to male employees; the + or – indicates the expected direction of the relationship.
Figure 14 Summary of hypotheses regarding support for preferential treatment

Chapter 7 - Support for preferential treatment of women
7.6 Method

To disentangle the expected direct and indirect effects, structural equation modelling (SEM) is the preferred method, as was the case in Chapter 6. As shown in Figure 14, not all of the hypotheses refer to all of the respondents. Separate analyses were needed for all respondents, female respondents and male respondents. Next to a general analysis for men, two SEM analyses were conducted for men working in the private sector and those in the public sector.54,55

7.6.1 Dependent variables

Support for preferential treatment of women. Respondents indicated on a five-point scale whether they totally disagreed (1) or totally agreed (5) with the following statement: ‘Because of the worse position of women in the labour market, I find it acceptable when employers choose to hire a female candidate when two equally qualified candidates apply for a job’. For the frequencies, see Table 17 below.

Table 17 Support for preferential treatment of women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male employees (N=544)</th>
<th>Male employees in the public sector (N=189)</th>
<th>Male employees in the private sector (N=355)</th>
<th>Female employees (N=463)</th>
<th>All respondents (N=1007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally disagree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54 The categorisation of male respondents working in the public or private sector was done by asking them which sector would best describe their organisation. Respondents could choose from 16 options and a 17th open answer category. The 16 categories and the open answers were recoded into public or private sector.

55 Two analyses were performed to get a clear picture of the potential differences between public and private sector. An alternative approach was also used, by adding an interaction effect (sector by share of women) with a path towards competence and warmth. The results of this analysis mimicked the direction of the effects found in the two separate analyses but effects between public and private were not significantly different.
Support for equal treatment based on gender. This dependent variable is used in the additional analysis instead of support for preferential treatment (as described in the introduction). Respondents indicated on a five-point scale whether they totally disagreed (1) or totally agreed (5) with the following statement: ‘I think it is important that men and women are treated equally at work’. This item was less controversial among the respondents than preferential treatment: 94% agreed or totally agreed with this statement (see Table 18) versus 34% who agreed or totally agreed with the statement about preferential treatment (see Table 17). The level of support for equal treatment based on gender is also higher compared to the percentage that agreed with the statement that equal treatment on the grounds of ethnicity is important: 94%⁵⁶ (see Table 18) vs 87% (see Table 9 and Section 5.3.1).

Table 18 Support for equal treatment men and women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support equal treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=544)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prevalence of discrimination. Two questions were asked: ‘What do you think is the probability nowadays that a woman will not secure a job or promotion because a man who is equally or less qualified will be given it instead?’ and ‘What do you think is the probability nowadays that a man will not secure a job or promotion because a woman who is equally or less qualified will be given it instead?’ Both were rated with the following categories: a small chance, a reasonable chance and a large chance (values ranged from 1 to 3). Combining the two questions shows whether respondents thought that women had a lesser chance of being hired. Subtracting those questions results in a scale ranging from -2 to 2.

⁵⁶ Or 91% in the case of the male respondents. In Chapter 5 the support for preferential/equal treatment of ethnic minorities/ethnicity is studied from the perspective of native Dutch people. As this is the group that is considered to benefit less from the measures, in order to compare support for those measures with those aimed at women/gender, it is logical to look at the support from men.
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A positive number indicates that the respondents thought that women have a smaller chance of securing the job or promotion (see Table 19).

**Table 19** Perception of chances of being hired with the same qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male (N=544)</th>
<th>Female (N=463)</th>
<th>All respondents (N=1007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women with the same capabilities as men have higher chances of being hired. Values -2 and -1.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same chance. Value 0.</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men with the same capabilities as women have higher chances of being hired. Values 2 and 1.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Warmth and competence stereotypes.** Directly asking people which stereotypes they hold about groups is likely to result in socially desirable answers. A commonly used solution to this problem is to instead ask people how others view those groups (Fiske et al., 2002). These answers have been found to reveal much about people’s personally held stereotypes. Studies testing the stereotype content model often differ in the number and the specific items that measure the underlying dimensions of competence and warmth. For instance, Fiske et al. (2002) use five items for competence (competent, confident, independent, competitive and intelligent) and four for the warmth scale (warm, tolerant, good natured and sincere). In contrast, Oldmeadow and Fiske (2012) use different items: smart, capable, intelligent and efficient for competence; and likeable, trustworthy, friendly and sincere for warmth. Furthermore, Durante et al. (2013) only use two items per dimension: competent and capable for competence, and warm and sincere for warmth. To avoid a lengthy questionnaire, a relatively limited set of items for both dimensions was also used in this study. Two items were related to competence - capable and intelligent – and three items to warmth, namely sincere, friendly and likeable. In both cases, participants were instructed to rate the items using five-point scales (ranging from 1 = not at all, to 5 = extremely).

Men and women did not differ in their score on the warmth stereotypes for women, both scoring 3.5. To check whether male and female employees attach different warmth stereotypes to women, the scores of all three variables were added and divided by 3. A 1 represents very cold stereotypes, a 5 very warm ones. A t-test showed that men’s and women’s scores were not significantly different.
7.6.2 Independent variables

**Gender identity.** Gender identity was measured for male respondents using the following eight items: 'I feel a bond with other men'; 'I feel solidarity with other men'; 'I’m glad to be a man'; 'I think that men have much to be proud of'; 'The fact that I’m a man is an important part of how I see myself'; 'I have a lot in common with the average male'; 'Men have much in common'; and 'Women have much in common'. The female respondents replied to the same items, but with the word ‘woman/women’ replacing ‘man/men’, and vice versa. The items reflect the way ethnic identity was constructed (see Section 4.4.2). This was made into one scale using the factor weights of the first factor: All items had a factor loading of more than 0.57 (loadings >0.4; Hornburg and Giering 1996). The variance explained by the selected factors was 47% (although it should be more than 50%; Peterson, 2000). The reliability of the scale is 84 (Cronbach’s alpha > 0.7; Churchill 1979). As expected, men scored significantly lower on gender identification than women did (men scored on average -.19 and women .31).

**Composition of the workforce: male/female employees.** Using a five-point scale, respondents indicated whether their organisation predominantly consisted of male or female employees. The categories ranged from 1, 'Only male employees, to 5, 'Only female employees (see Table 12, although for that chapter the categories are recoded as ingroup and outgroup gender for men and women).

**Gender of the three closest colleagues.** Respondents were asked to state the age, gender and ethnicity of the colleague with whom they worked the most often, the second most often and the third most often. Dummy variables were created to describe whether at least one of these three colleagues was from the gender outgroup (1) or whether all were from the gender ingroup (0). A large minority of male employees (43%) had at least one (out of the three closest colleagues) female colleague, whereas 43% had none.

**More traditional role patterns relating to men and women.** As explained in Section 5.3.2, several scales and methods have been used to measure individuals’ levels of support for a division of paid work and family responsibilities, called both gender roles and gender ideology (Davis and Greenstein, 2009). In this study, the following items were used: 1) ‘The government wants more women to participate in paid labour. What is your opinion about this goal in general?’ 2) ‘The government should provide facilities so that parents can combine their work outside the home with the care of their children properly.’ 3) ‘Men and women have to share childcare tasks equally’. All items were measured on a five-point scale from totally disagree (1) to totally agree (5). All items were reversely scored, so that a higher score reflected more traditional attitudes towards gender roles. The three items were combined into one standardised scale via factor analysis. Male and female respondents scored significantly differently (tested using an independent t-test) on this variable: the mean score for men was .13, and for women -.17.
7.7 Results

Analyses were conducted for five separate groups: all respondents (Table 20 and Figure 17), male respondents (Table 21 and Figure 18), male respondents working in the public sector (Table 32), male respondents working in the private sector (Table 33) and female respondents (Table 34). To improve readability, the last three analyses, which are relevant for only one or two of the hypotheses, are provided in the appendix. A summary of the relevant results of the three analyses in the appendix is given in Table 23. The results of the analysis for the support for equal treatment are shown in the appendix in Table 35 for male and female respondents and in Table 36 for male respondents.

In contrast to expectations based on threat theory, the share of female colleagues did not directly affect the male employees’ support for preferential treatment of women (hypothesis 1m, Table 21). Based on the stereotype content model, it was further expected that the share would also impact stereotypes of warmth and competence for male employees, depending on the job level of their female colleagues. The results support two expectations in this regard: first, that for men working in the public sector, an increased share of female colleagues would lead to increased competence stereotypes (hypothesis 2m public sector; Table 23; full analysis in Table 32); and second, that for men in the private sector, this would lead to increased warmth stereotypes (hypothesis 2m public sector; Table 23; full analysis in Table 33; for an impression of both effects see Figure 15).\(^5\) No support was found for the effect of close contact on the stereotype content: having women as close colleagues did not affect the content of the stereotypes that men held about women (hypotheses 3mc and 3mw, Table 21).

---

\(^5\) Although the two separate analyses for the public and private sector show in which sector significant relationships exist between the gender composition and the warmth and competence stereotypes about women, those analyses do not provide a test for the question whether the relationship between the composition and stereotypes differs between sectors. Therefore, in an analysis for the male respondents a dummy for private/public sector and an interaction term (composition * public/private) were added as independent variables explaining female warmth and competence stereotypes. For both types of stereotypes, neither the dummy nor the interaction term was significant, showing that respondents working in the public sector do not hold significantly different stereotypes about women and also the effect of composition is not different between both sectors.
Two theories were used to predict the effects of stereotype content on support for preferential treatment. Male employees who held more warmth-related stereotypes about women were expected, based on the stereotype content model, to support preferential treatment more often. However, no effects were found in this regard (hypothesis 4m, Table 21). Moreover, based on the prescriptive nature of stereotypes and the agentic positions at which affirmative action for women is directed, it was expected that both male and female employees who held warmth-related stereotypes about women would show less support for affirmative action. Support was for this was found (hypothesis 5w). As expected based on the social role theory, employees who held more traditional gender roles showed less support for affirmative action for women (hypothesis 6, Table 20).

When affirmative action was seen as a way to combat discrimination, it was expected that people who perceived that labour market discrimination against women exists would more often support preferential treatment of women. Indeed, the more respondents indicated that discrimination against women exists (relative to discrimination against men), the more they were in favour of preferential treatment of women in the labour market (hypothesis 7, Table 20).

59 In both the public sector and the private sector, fewer than 10 male respondents were working only with female colleagues. In the public sector, there were also fewer than 10 male respondents working only with male colleagues.
For male respondents, no direct relation was found between the share of women in the workforce and the perception of discrimination. However, an indirect relationship was found: the share of female colleagues had a significant negative effect on traditional gender roles, which in turn had a negative effect on the perceived prevalence of discrimination in the labour market (hypothesis 8, Table 21).

Controlled for all other factors, women supported preferential treatment of women more often than men did, which confirms the hypothesis that group interests play a role in explaining preferential treatment (hypothesis 9, Table 20). Because of different group interests, gender identification was expected, based on social identity theory, to have a different effect for men than for women. Both hypotheses were supported (hypothesis 10m, Table 21; hypothesis 10f, Table 34). Identifying to a larger extent with their gender ingroup leads men to show less and women to show more support for preferential treatment of women (for an impression of this effect, see Figure 16). For a summary of the hypotheses and their results, see Table 24.

![Figure 16](image)

**Figure 16** Mean support for preferential treatment of women, by identification with own gender

A comparison of the results from the analysis explaining support for preferential treatment (as described earlier) with the results from the analysis explaining equal treatment (as shown in Table 35 and Table 36 in the appendix) shows that although the percentages in favour of equal treatment are much higher than those in favour of preferential treatment

---

60 The standardised continuous variable identification with respondents gender, as described in this chapter, is for visualisation purposes divided into seven categories that contain approximately an equal number of respondents.
(see Table 17 and Table 18), underlying patterns of both phenomena are in some respects similar (the negative effect of traditional gender roles, no direct effect of the share of women, etc.). Gender identification for male respondents and gender (female respondents support preferential treatment more often than men) are significant predictors of preferential treatment but not of equal treatment.

Another interesting difference between support for equal treatment based on gender and support for preferential treatment of women is that respondents who assess women as being warmer, are less often in favour of preferential treatment but more often in favour of equal treatment. Also higher educated men are less often in favour and higher educated women are more often in favour of preferential treatment, but education does not affect the support of male respondents for equal treatment.
Table 20 Support for preferential treatment. Male and female respondents. Unstandardised, standardised and significance levels for structural model in Figure 17 (standard errors in parentheses) N=1007.\(^61\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter estimate</th>
<th>Unstandardised</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.031 (.044)</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Warmth</td>
<td>.050* (.025)</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Competence</td>
<td>.045* (.027)</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Warmth</td>
<td>.017 (.051)</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Competence</td>
<td>-.078 (.050)</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5w. Warmth → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.168** (.060)</td>
<td>-.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.091 (.070)</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Traditional gender roles → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.217*** (.034)</td>
<td>-.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labourmarket → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.101** (.040)</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-.109*** (.027)</td>
<td>-.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>.063** (.027)</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Traditional gender roles</td>
<td>-.112 *** (.031)</td>
<td>-.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Female respondents → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.560*** (.081)</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification gender → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.017 (.035)</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.009 (.023)</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size organisation → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual warmth</td>
<td>.352*** (.022)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual competence</td>
<td>.200* (.089)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual traditional gender roles</td>
<td>.956*** (.043)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>.690*** (.031)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>1.115*** (.050)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001
Note: CMIN/df=9.5, RMSEA=.092, GFI=.938; CFI=.868

\(^61\) The relationships in the model printed in bold test the hypotheses that are relevant for all the respondents.
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Table 21 Support for preferential treatment. Male respondents. Unstandardised, standardised and significance levels for structural model in Figure 18 (standard errors in parentheses) N=544.\(^{62}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter estimate</th>
<th>Unstandardised</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1m: Share of female colleagues → Support for preferential treatment</strong></td>
<td>-.036(.056)</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Warmth</td>
<td>.072* (.039)</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Competence</td>
<td>.077* (.039)</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3mw: At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Warmth</strong></td>
<td>.042(.069)</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3mc: At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Competence</strong></td>
<td>.034 (.063)</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4m: Warmth → Support for preferential treatment</strong></td>
<td>-.102 (.077)</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.091(.096)</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.239***(.046)</td>
<td>-.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.118*(.058)</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8: Traditional gender roles → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</strong></td>
<td>-.079*(.034)</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8: Share of female colleagues → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</strong></td>
<td>-.006 (.039)</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8: Share of female colleagues → Traditional gender roles</strong></td>
<td>-.083*(.050)</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10m: Identification gender → Support for preferential treatment</strong></td>
<td>-.124*(.049)</td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.060*(.031)</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of organisation → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual warmth error 9</td>
<td>.406***(.033)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual competence error 10</td>
<td>.302*** (.098)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual traditional gender roles error 1</td>
<td>1.012*** (.061)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market error 2</td>
<td>.633*** (.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual support for preferential treatment error 8</td>
<td>1.173***(.071)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\)=p<.05 \(^**\)=p<.01, \(^***\)=p<.001 Note: CMIN/df=5.0, RMSEA=.086, GFI=.942; CFI=.874

\(^{62}\)The relationships in the model printed in bold test the hypotheses relevant for male respondents.
Table 22  Total effects of workforce composition on support for preferential treatment; see analysis Table 21.
Male respondents. N=544

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardised total effect on support for preferential treatment</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One of three closest colleagues is female</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23  Support for preferential treatment for women. Summary of Table 32, Table 33 and Table 34.
Male respondents working in public sector: Unstandardised, standardised and significance levels for structural model (standard errors in parentheses). N=189

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents/N</th>
<th>Tested hypotheses</th>
<th>Unstandardised</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male respondents working in public sector N=189 Table 32</td>
<td>2m public: Share of female colleagues → Competence</td>
<td>.141* (.069)</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male respondents working in private sector N=355 Table 33</td>
<td>2m private: Share of female colleagues → Warmth</td>
<td>.108* (.050)</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female respondents N=463 Table 34</td>
<td>1f: Share of female colleagues → Support preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.022(.051)</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female respondents N=463 Table 34</td>
<td>10f: Identification with gender → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.133**(.050)</td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001
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Figure 17 Support for preferential treatment. Male and female respondents (N=1007)
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Figure 18 Support for preferential treatment. Male respondents (N=544).
To give a better impression of how those factors predict the values of the support for preferential treatment, both are described for two real respondents (coefficients are based on the analysis presented in Table 21). The two respondents are included in the database (to provide a realistic scenario), although of course their names are fictitious. Armin has one of the lower predicted scores on preferential treatment: 1.45 on the scale of support for preferential treatment of women (scale ranges from 1 to 5). He has a Bachelor's degree and works in healthcare based on a permanent contract. Most of his colleagues are women, as is at least one of the three colleagues he works with most often. Armin's identification with his gender is about average (.01 standard deviation), whereas his values are more traditional than average (2.8 standard deviation). His competence and warmth assessments of women are, respectively, 3.5 and 3.7 (both scales range from 1 to 5). He believes that in the labour market there is much more discrimination against women than against men.

Maxwell has a predicted score of 3.56 on the scale of support for preferential treatment. He works in the service industry along with approximately 30 other employees, who are predominantly male (as are the three colleagues he works with most often). He finished one of the lowest levels of preparatory secondary vocational education (VMBO kader). His competence and warmth assessments of women are, respectively, 2.0 and 2.0 (both scales range from 1 to 5). His values concerning the gender roles are less traditional than average (-2.18 standard deviation). He identifies less with his gender than average (-1.67 standard deviation). He believes that in the labour market women are a little more often discriminated against in the recruitment process than men. If Maxwell had worked with all women and had had at least one colleague who is female, his predicted score would have been not 3.56 but 3.51.
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Table 24 Summary of the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>hypothesis supported?</th>
<th>Relevant analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1m: The larger the share of female colleagues, the less male employees support preferential treatment of women.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Table 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f: The share of male colleagues does not affect female employees’ support for preferential treatment of women.</td>
<td>Yes, but 63</td>
<td>Table 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m public sector: The larger the share of female colleagues, the more male employees working in the public sector attach competence-related stereotypes to women.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m private sector: The larger the share of female colleagues, the more male employees working in the private sector attach warmth-related stereotypes to women</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m: Men who work closely with women attach more warmth-related stereotypes to women compared to men who do not work closely with female colleagues.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Table 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mc: Men who work closely with women attach more competence-related stereotypes to women compared to men who do not work closely with female colleagues.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Table 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4m: The fewer warmth-related stereotypes male employees attach to women, the less they support preferential treatment of women.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Table 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5w: The more warmth-related stereotypes employees attach to women, the less they support preferential treatment of women.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: The more traditional gender stereotypes employees hold, the less they support preferential treatment of women.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: The more discrimination against women an employee perceives there to be in the labour market, the more that employee supports preferential treatment of women.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8m: The larger the share of female colleagues, the less discrimination against women male employees perceive in the labour market.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Table 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect via traditional gender role</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Male employees show less support for preferential treatment of women in the workplace compared to female employees.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10m: The more male employees identify with their gender, the less support for preferential treatment of women in the workplace they show.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10f: The more female employees identify with their gender, the more support for preferential treatment of women in the workplace they show.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Table 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63 In the SEM analysis it was tested whether a significant relationship between the share of male employees and the support for preferential treatment was found for female employee. Finding no support is not the same as finding support that no relationship exists (this would mean a lower threshold for confirming the hypothesis). A test of equivalence is necessary, but not possible in a SEM context, which means that not enough support was found to consider the hypothesis as confirmed.
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7.8 Conclusion and discussion

The different mechanisms behind the support for preferential treatment of women were disentangled using SEM. No support was found that factors traditionally used to explain ethnic attitudes (such as contact and threat) directly explain this support. However, based on stereotype content model, the share of women in the workforce was expected to indirectly affect support for preferential treatment. Based on the stereotype content model, it was predicted that, in the situation of a high status of and high competition from women, a larger share of women would lead to increased competence stereotypes. This situation was expected to occur especially in the public sector, where women on average hold higher-level jobs than in the private sector. Based on the same theory, it was expected that males working with a larger share of women in the situation of low status of and competition from women would show increased warmth stereotypes (which was expected to occur more often in the private sector). Both hypotheses were supported.

However, despite these interesting results, which indicate that structural factors in the work environment can affect how people perceive groups in general, the public and private sector are not a prime indicator of women’s job level. To explore this path further, data are needed that more directly include the level of occupation by gender in an organisation. These data would preferably be longitudinal to control for potential selection effects caused by the occupational gender segregation, as well as by the direct preference for working or not working with women. If it indeed turns out to be partly causal in nature, this would underline the importance of the workplace for the formation of stereotypes: it is effecting stereotypes about groups that have regular contact in every sphere of life. Either way, the finding that the share of women, causal or not, is positively correlated with the content of the stereotypes in the public and the private sector is interesting in itself. It shows that group relations not only in society but also in the more micro setting of an organisation are related to the underlying two dimensions of stereotypes.

Male and female respondents who attached more warmth-related stereotypes to women less often supported preferential treatment of women. This result suggests that stereotypes are not only descriptive but can also be prescriptive in nature. The significant relationship holds even when controlled for traditional gender roles (which also had a significant negative effect), although the expected negative effects are based on the same mechanism, namely role incongruence. As Rudman and Glick (2001) describe, women are less inclined than men to conform to sexist attitudes, but they do not differ in the way in which they implicitly attach warmth-related stereotypes to men. In this study, although it did not measure all aspects of sexism, differences between men and women were indeed found in traditional gender roles that were not found in the warmth stereotypes explicitly attached to women. Rudman and Glick (2001) measured warmth stereotypes at an implicit rather than an explicit level, as was done in this study. Despite the similarities in outcome, it would be interesting to check whether using implicit measures would lead to the same results in a follow-up to the present study.

Besides effects on stereotype content, the share of female colleagues also had a negative effect on traditional gender roles held by male respondents. This confirms the expectation that seeing more women in a working role disconfirms traditional female gender roles. On
the other hand, another explanation for the result is that more traditional men choose jobs that have a smaller share of women, or directly choose a working environment with fewer women. Either way, the result does not support the idea that more women pose a threat to male employees and that threat causes them to have more traditional gender roles. In turn, holding traditional gender roles does affect support for preferential treatment directly as well as indirectly via the perceived prevalence of discrimination against women in the labour market. Both effects are in the expected direction.

The parallel drawn with the explanation for the support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities only holds to a certain extent. In particular, the link that was found between the share of minorities in the workforce and the perceived prevalence of discrimination against them was not found for women. To assess discrimination in the labour market in general, the own organisation is not taken as a proxy. Even in the public sector, where it is expected that male employees will be confronted with women in higher positions, no effects were found of the share of women on the perceived prevalence of discrimination against women in the labour market. A possible explanation could be that everyday contact between men and women is much more common than contact between ethnic minorities and the ethnic majority, and therefore that the workplace does not function as a proxy as it does for ethnic minorities. Via this common contact, women's information, personal experiences and opinions about discrimination are readily available to men, thus influencing their perspective on the existence of discrimination in the labour market against women.

Finally, female employees were expected to support preferential treatment of women more than male employees would due to their different group interest in the measure. Identifying more with their gender had a significant negative effect on support for men, and a significant positive effect for women. This indicates that identifying more with one's gender increases the experienced effect of group interests. Supporting this line of thought is the result that the gender identification of male respondents and gender itself do not affect support for equal treatment, in which the group interests are less at stake compared to preferential treatment of women, which ensures that support for preferential treatment indeed, at least partly, reflects ingroup preferences.

Other interesting differences between support for equal treatment based on gender and support for preferential treatment of women is that respondents who assessed women as being warmer, were less often in favour of preferential treatment but more often in favour of equal treatment. As explained in the theory, the expected negative effect of warmth was based on the expected mismatch between the prescriptive nature of warmth stereotypes and the higher-level management jobs that preferential treatment of women is often directed at. For equal treatment, such a mismatch does not occur; it is not directed at a specific type of job, whereas having a job at all for women is generally accepted. Another difference between the analyses of equal treatment and preferential treatment that supports this explanation, is that higher educated men are less often in favour of preferential treatment, whereas education does not impact the support of male respondents for equal treatment. Higher educated men especially can experience that their interests are at stake, because the type of jobs that preferential treatment of women is directed at are in the same higher segment in which higher educated men more often compete.
CHAPTER 8

Conclusions and recommendations
This dissertation investigated gender and ethnic ingroup preferences with a focus on the use of threat theory and contact theory. Both these theories assume that ethnic ingroup preferences depend on the ethnic composition of one’s social circles. Although both were originally designed to explain ethnic preferences, the present study investigated whether the theories could also be applied to explain gender ingroup preferences within the workplace. Whereas threat theory and contact theory have been tested against each other many times, one of the novelties of this study is that it did so in the context of workforce diversity. The empirical aim was to verify whether the theories hold in another context, one in which some of the selection effects that are encountered elsewhere could be reduced. This reduction was based on the assumption that ethnic and gender preferences play a smaller role in selecting a workplace than in selecting in one’s inner circle. Another novel point is that in this dissertation it was possible to test whether contact and threat mechanisms could act simultaneously, and are complementary rather than oppositional. Evidence from the employed vignette study into ethnic preferences in relation to dismissals suggests that both threat and contact can have an effect at the same time. It was therefore a fruitful approach (if possible in the investigated context) to operationalise contact by the absolute number of minority members and threat by the relative group size.

Ingroup preferences were operationalised by using two phenomena related to labour market distribution issues: the degree in which in a vignette situation an outgroup rather than an ingroup member is dismissed, and the support for tiebreak preferential treatment in the recruitment process. Vignettes provide more insight into the relative importance of ethnicity and gender – relative both to each other, and to the other presented characteristics. Vignettes can also be designed to reduce the risk of obtaining socially desirable responses. In the case of preferential treatment, social desirability is less likely since answering the questions does not directly reveal preferences about the ingroup, as resistance could also stem from principle objections.

Both phenomena were expected to reflect ingroup preferences. However, they are phenomena in and of themselves. Which differ from each other in several ways. Thus, it is not always certain what caused underlying factors to differ. A first explanation may be that people can disapprove of preferential treatment because of meritocratic arguments (not only out of ethnic preference), whereas the choice to dismiss somebody from another ethnic background more directly points to ethnic preferences. A second explanation is that ingroup preferences are of different strengths in the last phase of employment cycle compared to the first phases. The vignette studies described a dismissal situation, whereas the studied preferential treatment measures in this study were related to the recruitment phase. A third difference is related to the method with which the phenomena were studied. Dismissals were studied using a vignette design, whereas the study of preferential treatment was conducted with direct questioning. The study of ethnic preferences in relation to dismissals investigated the effect of contact with and threat from two specific minorities, namely Polish and Moroccan colleagues. In contrast, the study of ethnic preferences in the support for preferential treatment investigated the effect of threat from and contact with ethnic minorities in general.
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The two vignette studies of dismissals were analysed using a multilevel analysis. This was necessary because the vignettes were not independent observations: every respondent was provided with seven vignettes. Conversely, the two studies of the support for tiebreak preferential treatment made use of structural equation modelling. The results indicated that contact and threat mechanisms were indeed applicable to the workplace to explain ethnic ingroup preferences in labour market issues. In contrast, for gender ingroup preferences, the results showed that the share of women affected ingroup preferences only indirectly but not directly. The mechanisms behind these results are not completely clear. All the results and conclusions, including the results that were expected based on theories other than contact theory and threat theory, are described in more detail in the following sections.

Threat effects – composition workforce

To study the effect of workforce diversity, vignettes were used to investigate how the presence of Polish and Moroccan colleagues influenced the preferences of native Dutch employees regarding these immigrant groups. The results of this study showed that a larger share of employees from a Moroccan background in the workforce of the respondents’ company reduced preferences for Moroccan employees relative to native Dutch employees, hence supporting threat theory.

The investigation of ethnic preferences via the support for preferential treatment showed, that whereas the share of the ethnic outgroup had no direct effect, it did have an indirect effect: a higher share of colleagues from an immigrant background led, via a lower perceived level of discrimination, to less support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities. This relationship is explained by two mechanisms: the threat that a larger minority group poses, and the proxy function of one’s own working environment for the assessment of labour market discrimination. Even when extra paths were added (between the share, the experienced threat and the perceived prevalence of discrimination) to control for various kinds of experienced threat, both mechanisms seemed to hold.

The share of women in the workforce did not directly affect men’s ingroup preferences. A possible explanation is that although women pose a potential economic threat, they are not considered a threat to values. This means that a larger share of women in the workforce is only threatening when on the same occupational level as men. The data used did not specify the occupational level of the respondents’ colleagues. Thus, it is possible that due to the job segregation between men and women, the relative share of women in an organisation does not capture the potential threat effect, since threat is expected to be relevant between people who are potential competitors. Support for this idea was found in the result that having at least one female colleague (out of the three colleagues with whom men most often work) resulted in stronger ingroup preferences for men (measured by the dismissal vignettes). Rather than (or in addition to) measuring the effect of contact, having at least one female colleague measured the effect of threat. Further research in which the level and type of occupation of colleagues are taken into account is necessary to unravel the mechanisms behind these findings.

Finally, the last compositional effect (not necessarily threat effect) that was investigated to explain gender preferences in relation to dismissals was whether respondents had a token
position. No significant effect was found of being a token, although effect sizes were reason-
able large (in comparison to other effects that were significant) and in the expected opposite
direction for men and women. Women in a token position showed weaker ingroup preferences
compared to other women, whereas token men had stronger ingroup preferences compared
to other men. A possibility is that the lack of significance was caused by the small number
of respondents who were in a gender token position. Thus, this relation should be further
investigated with more suitable data.

Threat effects that were found for ethnic minorities differed from those for women. A first
explanation for this could be that ethnic minorities and the ethnic majority are less vertically
segregated than men and women, making the share of ethnic minorities a better indicator
of economic competition between ethnic groups than the share of women is for competition
between men and women. However, no supporting external evidence for this ad hoc
explanation was found (e.g. in the CBS data). Another possible explanation for the different
results for women and ethnic minorities is that ingroup preferences are triggered when a
larger minority group also potentially poses a value threat. Thus, a larger group of ethnic
minorities can pose a threat even when they mainly hold jobs that are no threat to the position
of the majority. In contrast, only a potential economic threat is posed when the share of
women in the workforce increases. Moreover, the type of function is important, as the threat
must be job-related. To verify whether this explanation is valid, a study is needed with a
comparable set-up, but including the ethnic and the gender composition of the workforce
specific to every profession.

**Threat effects – experienced threat**

Experienced threat (to values and to employment in the Netherlands) increased the proba-
bility that native Dutch respondents dismissed Moroccan or Polish employees rather than
Dutch employees in the vignette study. Specific threats were shown to affect particular
immigrant groups to a larger extent: the fear that ethnic minorities’ values were a threat to
values in the Netherlands did not influence the preference for firing Polish employees, but
did for Moroccan ones. Moreover, experienced economic threat from ethnic minorities
increased the chance that Dutch employees would be preferred to Moroccan and Polish
employees. This is in line with the public debate around those groups and how they are
perceived by the general public (as shown in public opinion research).

Experienced threat also affected the support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities,
both directly and indirectly via the perceived prevalence of labour market discrimination.
The indirect effect shows that the perceived prevalence of discrimination against ethnic
minorities in the labour market is partly explained by ethnic prejudices. This perceived
prevalence of labour market discrimination is also affected by workforce diversity.
Together, the two paths , the one from the threat to the assessment of labour market discrimi-
nation, and the one from the composition of the labour market to this assessment) support
the idea that indicating that discrimination does not exist is part of modern racism. But they
also nuance the perception of this directly reflecting such racism. The perceived prevalence
of labour market discrimination is also affected by the use of workforce diversity as a proxy
for discrimination in the labour market.
It was not possible to use similar threat measures for women. However, an indication that experienced threat did affect support for preferential treatment of women (for this group, the measure is primarily intended to put women in higher positions) is that men with higher education tended to support this measure less. Whereas a higher level of education is often found to lead to weaker ingroup preferences, this specific measure threatened men’s position. For women, the opposite effect of education was observed, whereas for support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities, no such relationship was found (although preferential treatment of ethnic minorities is not explicitly directed at higher positions).

Contact
Support for contact theory was found as well: a higher combined absolute number of Moroccan and Polish colleagues increased the chance that Moroccan or Polish rather than Dutch employees would be fired, even when controlling for the share of ethnic minorities in general. Furthermore, a higher number of Polish colleagues increased the chance that these employees would be preferred to Moroccan employees. The opposite effect did not hold: a higher number of Moroccan colleagues did not increase the probability that a Polish rather than a Moroccan employee was dismissed. This is an indication that, as expected, stereotypes are more ingrained for some ethnic groups, causing contact to have less effect on ingroup preferences. Moreover, based on an extension of contact theory, it was expected that experiences with Moroccan employees or other contact with members of this group would affect the respondents’ choice less than experiences with Polish employees, because stereotypes about Moroccans are more deeply ingrained. The results of the ethnic dismissal study generally supported this hypothesis. Furthermore, the type of contact, superficial or daily, was also expected to play a role. Indeed, having a close colleague of Polish or Moroccan descent had an effect additional to the effect of the number of Polish and Moroccan colleagues in general. Unexpectedly, on the other hand, contact did not have the expected effect on support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities. This may have to do with the operationalisation: the study of preferential treatment investigated contact with ethnic minorities in general, rather than contact with specific ethnic minorities. Pettigrew (2009) theorised (and found) that the positive effect of contact with an outgroup not only affects the attitudes concerning that particular outgroup, but also leads to a more positive picture of other outgroups (the secondary transfer effect of contact), though to a lesser degree.

In addition, the contact measures did not significantly affect the ingroup preferences for the two measures of gender ingroup preferences for men. However, the share of women did have a positive effect on male respondents’ perceived female stereotypes.

Identification
The degree of identification with one’s own gender or ethnicity was the most stable predictor of ingroup preferences across all the measures. The native Dutch respondents who identified with their own ethnicity fired the ethnic outgroup most often and supported affirmative action for ethnic minorities less often. For men and women, identifying with their own gender increased their probability that they fired an outgroup member. Moreover, according to their respective group interests, it increased the chance of women supporting preferential treatment for women, and decreased this chance for male respondents. All results support the social identification theory.
Stereotype content and traditional gender roles
The predictors that were expected to be relevant for both ethnic minorities and women were central to this study. For women, also the content of stereotypes and gender roles was taken into account. The share of women in the composition of the workforce indirectly affected the support for preferential treatment via the content of stereotypes. Working with a larger share of women led to more competence- and warmth-related stereotypes of women. Respondents who held higher warmth-related stereotypes about women less often supported preferential treatment for women.

Regarding the support for preferential treatment, a negative effect of warmth related stereotypes on the chance that measures would be supported was expected and found. Intuitively, one could expect that the more positive a description of a group sounds, the more people will support measures that benefit that group. However, stereotypes are not only descriptive, but also prescriptive in nature. Preferential treatment of women is often meant to put them in higher positions, which are associated not so much with warmth as with competence stereotypes. This leads to conflicting roles. This also explains why in the Dutch context (in which it is generally accepted that women work), the support for equal treatment of women and men in labour-related issues (a law not specifically aimed at higher positions) has a positive relation with warmth-related stereotypes.

Education
In this study, education had either no role or only a minor one in predicting ethnic and gender preferences in relation to dismissals (in the overall analyses in which other factors were controlled for). In the bivariate analyses, however, it was often a relevant predictor of ethnic preferences regarding dismissals. As expected, education did not have a significant effect on support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities. On the other hand, it did affect support for preferential treatment of women. For men, as indicated, education had a negative effect on their support for preferential treatment of women, whereas women with a higher education supported the measure more often than women with a lower education. This does not necessarily disqualify the effect found by other studies that people who are more highly educated are more likely to give socially desirable answers; instead, it may indicate that more highly educated men have a higher stake in preferential treatment of women. This treatment mostly concerns higher-level jobs, thereby probably threatening the interests of men with a higher education more than those of men with a lower education.

All in all, these results paint a picture of workforce diversity as a relevant predictor of people’s ingroup preferences in labour market issues in general. This predictor is both direct - as shown in the dismissals study to explain ethnic preference – and indirect, as shown in the support for preferential treatment of both ethnic minorities and women. This study provides extra information to determine under which conditions or in which situations more ethnic and gender diversity leads to stronger or weaker ingroup preferences. It also shows that contact theory and threat theory do not necessarily contradict one other, but that meeting and competing can take simultaneously and in the same workplace.
8.1 Limitations of the study

Although this study provides evidence for the assumption that the composition of the workforce influences ingroup preferences. The main focus of this dissertation was ingroup preferences at the labour market in general. As explained below, its conclusions have limitations caused by the chosen methodology (vignettes in general and the specific scenario in the vignettes, as opposed to field studies which are infeasible), the group of respondents, and the type of data. Also, when the results do indeed reflect real-life cases, it is unclear whether they are representative of ethnic and gender preferences in phases of the employment cycle other than recruitment and dismissal.

Using vignettes has many advantages; however, they always form fictitious scenarios in which it is not known whether scenario accurately reflects the studied real-life phenomenon sufficiently. In this vignette study, respondents were asked to dismiss one of two employees who were presented with a limited set of characteristics. This simplified design for dismissals potentially inflates the importance of the characteristics used compared to their effect in real-life dismissal situations. In real life, non-included characteristics may affect the size of the effect of the used characteristics. Furthermore, by requiring a choice between two candidates, the study did not take into account possible alternative scenarios that reduce the effect of ethnic and gender preferences (such as searching for a relevant factor on which to base the decision). By omitting the intermediate step between ingroup preferences and action, the effect of ingroup preferences could have been overestimated. However, using other methods to study dismissals may have led to other serious shortcomings (as is described in Section 3.1).

The respondents in this study were all employees, whereas dismissal decisions and the decision to implement preferential treatment are usually made by managers/directors and HRM professionals. The question then is whether employees’ preferences are a good indicator of the preferences of the latter group. Previous studies suggest that this is indeed the case. For example, Schaafsma (2006) found that personnel managers were approximately equally often opposed to tiebreak preferential treatment (80.0%) in the organisation than employees (85.5%). Although the groups had different interests within the organisation, this led to marginally different opinions concerning relevant measures.

Studies that investigated other phases of the employment cycle show that group preferences can differ depending on, for example, the type of profession. For instance, field experiments related to gender preferences in the recruitment process show mixed results. The present study showed that on average, respondents had no preference for dismissing a male or a female employee. There is a possibility that in the context of dismissals, as in the recruitment

---

64 Field experiments investigating women's hiring chances show that women are not always in a disadvantaged position compared to men. For example, Booth and Leigh (2010) show that women have higher hiring chances in entry-level jobs. On the other hand, Neumark et al. (1996) investigated the chances of being hired in higher paying high-quality restaurants. They found that women had less chance of being hired than men, but in other scenarios chances were equal or reversed. Petit (2007) showed that for high skilled commercial jobs, young women (25 years) had a disadvantage compared to men of the same age. But older women (37 years or older) had about the same chances as men.
stage, this also differs depending on the type of profession/organisation. Studying different professions using the same method is necessary to firmly establish the degree to which the results are generalisable to dismissals in general.

Other limitations of this study concern the lack of data on workforce diversity by occupational level, and potential causality problems. Future research addressing these issues will be discussed in the following section, along with other potential future research directions section.

8.2 Future research
The results and limitations of this study provide several avenues for new research.

Diversity of the workforce by level of occupation
This study did not take into account the organisational structure with respect to the distribution of people over different occupations. Whereas it could be argued that for threat originating from competition, the share of outgroup members at one’s own level of occupation is the most relevant, also outgroup members with whom one has to compete for a higher position are of interest. There is no common-sense argument for why value threat would be specific to the share of minorities within an occupational level. Especially for women, for whom value threat probably does not play a role (in contrast to the effect of the experienced value threat of ethnic minorities on native Dutch people’s ingroup preferences), the specific distribution of men and women over an occupational level is probably an important factor. One indicator of the difference in importance of the threat mechanisms between men and women, and native Dutch and ethnic minorities, is that men who work with at least one female colleague have increased ingroup preferences compared to men who do not work with women. This result is in contrast to with expectations based on contact theory. Furthermore, opposite effects were also found for contact with close ethnic minority colleagues in the dismissal study. Further research investigating the diversity of the workforce on the occupational level should reveal whether the suggested explanations (i.e. that the value threat is not tied to the specific distribution over function groups, whereas competition is) hold for the different results found for working closely with women and ethnic minorities.

Causality and potential self-selection effects
Multiple arguments were provided to explain why studying the effects of diversity in an organisational setting is less vulnerable to selection effects (compared to e.g. schools or personal contacts). It is still possible that native Dutch people with strong ethnic ingroup preferences will more often choose a workplace where most colleagues have the same ethnic background. In the dismissal study, it was possible to control for ethnic contact outside the workplace, and the effect of contacts at work still held. However, a longitudinal study is necessary to obtain more certainty about the direction of the identified relations.

The effect of workforce diversity on the ingroup preferences of ethnic minorities
Another possible direction for future research is to focus on how workforce diversity influences the ethnic preferences of minority groups. The ethnic preferences of lower-status minority groups are known to be influenced by ingroup–outgroup mechanisms that are
different from those of majority groups (Dasgupta, 2004). How these mechanisms apply to ethnic minorities in the workplace was not ascertained due to limitations in the data in this study (which mainly concerned native Dutch employees). Furthermore, evidence from the two chapters on gender preferences indicates that the effects of workforce diversity tends to differ between men and women.

**Being a token in an organisation**

Only a small number of respondents could be identified as a token woman or man in their organisation. No significant effect of being a token was found, although effect sizes were reasonably large and in the expected opposite direction for men and women. Token women had decreased ingroup preferences compared to other women, whereas the reverse was true for token men. It is likely that the insignificance of the results was caused by the small number of respondents who were in a gender token position; hence, this should be investigated further with more suitable data. For instance, other research into token positions, such as that by Derks et al. (2011), especially invested the tokens among the top positions in an organisation. Further research could also aim to distinguish potentially different effects between being a token in the organisation and being a token in a higher position.

**The effect of inter-ethnic contact**

Whereas contact decreased the effect of ethnic ingroup preferences in the dismissal study, it did not affect support for preferential treatment in hiring or support for equal treatment. However, indicators of contact in this study were specific to two ethnic minorities (namely Polish and Moroccan). Furthermore, the outcome measure was specific to those groups. The results showed that contact measures for ethnic minorities in general did not predict dismissals as well as specific contact with Polish and Moroccan people did. However, it is possible that not all ethnic minorities affect ethnic preferences in the same way, which weakens the potential relation regarding ethnic minorities in general. Making the contact and threat measures for the workplace and the measure of preferential treatment specific to an ethnic minority group one could identify whether the explanation for the different results presented in both chapters holds.

**8.3 Policy implications**

*Advice 1: Objectify procedures regarding decisions on dismissals and on the extension of temporary contracts to avoid unequal treatment*

The indicators that explained ingroup preferences in the dismissal studies can be used as warning signals in real dismissal situations. For example, personal beliefs about gender roles were found to influence gender preferences in the vignette studies. If this reflects actual behaviour in the workplace, the decision maker’s belief in traditional gender roles could bias dismissals based on gender. Moreover, the vignette study of the effect of ethnicity on dismissals showed that Polish and Moroccan employees had on average a significantly higher chance of getting fired. No studies seem to exist that have investigated the effect of measures to combat this issue in dismissal situations. Objectifying the procedures is a way to limit the effect of ingroup preferences at least in the recruitment process (Cook, 2016). In that phase, merely being aware of potential biases is not sufficient; objectifying the procedure limits the effect of those biases. Furthermore, parallel measures to objective dismissal procedures are
also advisable. Legally, a set of reasons can legitimise a dismissal. However, these are individual reasons that do not require a comparison with other employees (who may, according to the same criteria, qualify for firing). Moreover, and probably more importantly, the number of people with a temporary contract is growing. The decision process in that context is probably also affected by the aforementioned biases. Potential measures to limit the effect of these biases are the following:

- Formulate a set of criteria before a specific case occurs. This prevents ad hoc arguments from being used to legitimize dismissing a certain employee.
- Limit the set of criteria on which the dismissal decision is based. This prevents the possibility of shifting the importance of the criteria according to the preferred candidate.
- Explain the intended decisions to an objective outsider who is consulted to assist in the dismissal procedure. This serves two purposes: the outsider can point out when decisions are not in line with the set criteria, and the decision makers know that they can be held accountable for their decision, which motivates them to make stricter use of the criteria.
- In a large organisation where many people have temporary contracts, the decisions about who is eligible for a new contract should be made by a diverse group of people. In this way, different ingroup preferences could cancel each other out. In recruitment processes, the first phases are sometimes made anonymous to prevent the effect of ingroup bias (instead of trusting that different ingroup biases cancel each other out). However, for selections made within the organization, an anonymous procedure is difficult to implement, especially for smaller organizations where employees are easy to recognize.

Further research should investigate whether organisations that implement these measures indeed show a less biased pattern than comparable organisations.

**Advise II: Encourage contact between different ethnicities to reduce ingroup preferences and the resulting unequal treatment**

As the study on the effect of ethnicity on dismissals showed, a diverse workforce could lead to increased ingroup preferences. However, working with colleagues from another ethnic background may also decrease this effect. Especially in organisations were the percentage of people from different ethnic backgrounds increases, it is advisable to create a working situation in which all people naturally come into contact with each other. For example, this could be done by ensuring that projects are done by both old and new employees. This offers a natural way to bring together people from different ethnic backgrounds. Recent research (Subaşi, 2017) shows that ethnic minorities are given on average less access to information when cooperating in teams with members with an higher ethnic status. However, no differences were found between team members when the teams performed in a setting where they were observed. Therefore, it is advised that especially in organizations with many diverse teams also the cooperation within teams should be monitored.

Mentoring outgroup minority members is another, well-researched, option. Mentoring potentially not only reduces the ingroup preferences of the mentor, but also gives the mentee access to the advanced experience and knowledge of the mentor (Bozeman and Feeney, 2007).
Advice III: Increase the support for preferential treatment: involve employees in demonstrating backlog minority groups

This study investigated the support for preferential treatment in general, and not preferential treatment specific to the organisation of the surveyed employee. Respondents were asked whether it was an acceptable measure for an employer to use, not whether it was desirable. Both formulations probably increased the support for the measure. Nevertheless, support was sparse: only a total of 34% agreed or totally agreed that preferential treatment of women was acceptable, and the figure for ethnic minorities was even smaller (23%). Furthermore, other studies have shown that the measure has a limited effect as regards increasing ethnic diversity. If employers want to increase the diversity of the workforce, other measures are probably more suitable and effective.

It should be recognised that resistance to preferential treatment of ethnic minorities is explained by ingroup preferences but also by the sincere perceived prevalence of discrimination and position in the labour market (see Chapter 5). Employees who were convinced that discrimination in the labour market occurs, supported the measure more often. It is advised to discuss with employees the degree in which (and why) ethnic minorities are underrepresented. In the type of position for which the measure is implemented this could potentially increase the support. Being able to show underrepresentation of women or ethnic minorities is also a legal requirement for the implementation of tiebreak preferential treatment, but it would be advisable to discuss this in the organisation.

Advice IV: Offer a perspective on diversity management broader than only hiring policies

Many organisations in the Netherlands strive for a more diverse workforce (see such initiatives as Diversiteit in Bedrijf ('Diversity in Business')). When those efforts only concern the influx of minority groups, the chances are that threat effects (causing stronger ingroup preferences among the majority groups) will not be compensated for by the effects of contact. This might explain why some case studies have found that employees from an ethnic minority background leave an organisation sooner, and more often out of discontent. For example, Hofhuis et al. (2008) found that ethnic minority colleagues left the Dutch central government more often out of, among others, discontent with their relationship with colleagues and managers. Some of the conflicts they experienced had to do with their ethnic background. The present study provides an explanation for why a diverse organisation does not automatically lead to positive intergroup relations. The results support the advice that the Sociaal-Economische Raad (SER; Social and Economic Council of the Netherlands), for instance, already provided in 2009 (SER, 2009), namely to use a broad approach towards creating a more diverse workforce.
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CHAPTER 9

Summary
**Introduction and motivation**

Work has always played a central role in the lives of many people. Quite some hours are spent at the workplace each week, ‘and the type of work is a main aspect of someone’s social status’. The workplace is a place where people cooperate, either to establish a common goal or out of some self-interest, but it is also where people compete for scarce resources such as career openings, promotions, bonuses, and even for better offices or equipment or other types of privileges. Thus, organisations require continual political behaviour from their employees.

Over the past decades, this behaviour has gained an interesting new dimension. Due to the increased participation of women as well as due to immigration, the workforce in the Netherlands has become more diversified, which is a trend that is likely to continue. It is not farfetched to assume that the diversity of an employee’s working environment, in terms of gender and ethnicity, influences their preferences and corresponding choices in situations where workplace cooperation and competition are involved. These influences regarding gender and ethnicity are the main focus of this dissertation.

**Central ideas and three innovative aspects**

This dissertation investigates how so-called contact theory and threat theory, discussed in Chapter 2, can be used to quantify gender and ethnic influences on ingroup preferences. Contact and threat theory have been tested against each other many times in the context of someone’s social circles, but until now they have not been tested at the workplace nor with respect to gender. This dissertation thus fills a research gap by combining two novel empirical aims: first, to verify whether and to what extent these theories hold in a context that is different but of considerable importance to many people: the workplace; and second, to verify whether these theories are applicable to explain gender ingroup preferences in addition to ethnicity.

It can be argued that these particular research choices reduce some of the usually encountered selection effects. In addition, these choices also enable testing whether contact and threat mechanisms can act simultaneously, as well as whether they are complementary rather than oppositional. Indeed, as a third innovative aspect, this dissertation makes a subtle distinction between absolute and relative numbers. It is hypothesised and observed that the percentage of employees at a workplace belonging to an ethnic minority group has an effect on Dutch employee’s ingroup preferences. In addition, for a given fixed percentage, the absolute number of people from this group has an effect as well. Although modest, both effects are statistically significant and are hypothesised to be derived from threat theory and contact theory, as an increasing percentage of outgroup members is, in fact, seen as a threat (which increases ingroup preferences), whereas if merely the absolute number increases, this actually decreases the ingroup preferences.

**Measuring ingroup preferences at the workplace**

The ingroup preferences are operationalised using the two inherently workplace-related processes of dismissal and recruitment. To be explicit, it is assessed how the composition of the workforce, in terms of (1) ethnicity and (2) gender, influences:

(A) someone’s preference to dismiss an outgroup member rather than an ingroup member;
(B) someone’s support for tiebreak preferential treatment in the recruitment process.
The above two subdivisions result in four studies which are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Ethnicity</th>
<th>2 Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process A</td>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process B</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>Chapter 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapters 4 and 6 make use of a vignette study, while Chapters 5 and 7 use direct questioning as the method to acquire data from the respondents.

The dataset underlying this dissertation is derived from a survey conducted among employees from various organisations. Chapter 3 explains which relevant part of this dataset was selected, resulting in a group of 1007 respondents—all of which are native Dutch as there were insufficient data available to reliably test the ingroup preferences of non-native Dutch. For gender-related questions however, responses of both men and women could be taken into account.

**Ethnic and gender ingroup preferences in a dismissal situation**

The influences of gender and ethnicity on ingroup preferences in dismissal situations are operationalised through conducting a vignette study. Each of this study’s 1007 respondents received seven pairs of equally well-performing (fictive) employees and had to choose which pair to fire. For each employee, only the following four characteristics were presented:

(a) sex (male or female)

(b) ethnicity (Dutch or Polish or Moroccan)

(c) children (none or two)

(d) type of job (finance or laboratory)

Only 216 pairs out of the total 576 (24x24) that differed in at least two of the characteristics (a, b, c, d) were used in order to ensure sufficient variability and to reduce the chance of respondents providing socially desirable answers.

The choice to fire an employee of the respondent’s outgroup is considered to be an indicator of ingroup preference. The 1007 native Dutch respondents preferred to fire a Polish or Moroccan over a Dutch colleague in 58 percent of all corresponding pairs of vignettes. A higher percentage of Polish and/or Moroccan colleagues increased the preference for the ingroup, whereas the respondents with a higher absolute number of Polish and/or Moroccan colleagues exhibit a lower ingroup preference. More details can be found in Chapter 4.

Notably, the gender of the employee in the vignettes on average did not affect the choice of male and female respondents. However substantial differences between respondents’
gender ingroup preferences were found. Such differences may be partially explained by the following factors: by being a so-called gender token, by status legitimacy, by gender identification, and by gender roles.

Although the effect of being a gender token is not significant (there were not many people in a token position), the size of the effect is reasonably large. As hypothesised, token men had stronger ingroup preferences compared to other men, whereas opposite effects were found for token women. Based on their higher status in the labour market, it is both hypothesised and confirmed that men have stronger gender ingroup preferences than women. Women who consider the higher status of men in the labour market to be illegitimate, exhibit a higher ingroup preference than those who do not. For men, such effects regarding perceived status illegitimacy are not found. Finally, both men and women with more traditional attitudes towards gender roles more frequently dismiss the female than the male employee in the vignettes. See Chapter 6 for details.

**Ethnic and gender ingroup preferences in the support of preferential treatment**

As in Chapters 4 and 6, the aim in Chapters 5 and 7 is to assess the influence of the workforce’s gender and ethnicity composition on ingroup preferences. Following examination of the preference to dismiss a specific employee, these chapters investigate the support for so-called tiebreak preferential treatment. Tiebreak preferential treatment refers to the practice of offering a member of an ethnic minority or a woman to fill a position instead of any equally qualified applicant. Under certain conditions, tiebreak preferential treatment is a legal practice in the Netherlands.

In addition to the vignette studies in Chapters 4 and 6, both Chapters 5 and 7 use direct questioning to obtain relevant data from the same respondents. Of these 1007 respondents, 46 percent either disagree or totally disagree with the statement that it is acceptable when an employer applies tiebreak preferential treatment in favour of a candidate from an ethnic minority. Remarkably, the ethnic composition of the workforce only indirectly affects support for preferential treatment via the assessment of discrimination in the labour market. On average, the larger the share of people from an ethnic minority in a respondent’s workforce, the less likely he or she is to indicate that ethnic minorities experience discrimination. Indeed, if one has many colleagues from an ethnic minority, this could feed the opinion that discrimination of these minorities during recruitment (and selection processes in general) is not an issue, which results in low support for preferential treatment. Evidence for an alternative mechanism is found as well, in that respondents who express that ethnic minorities are a threat are more likely to indicate that they do not believe that discrimination of ethnic minorities occurs, again resulting in less support for preferential treatment. In the Dutch racism debate, the fact that someone does not acknowledge racism is sometimes seen as an expression of racism. The above mechanisms introduce more nuance into this debate by representing alternative explanations for someone’s perception that racism occurs less frequently.

At first glance, support for preferential treatment of women is higher than support for preferential treatment of ethnic minorities, as 36 percent of all 1007 respondents disagree or totally disagree, compared to the 46 percent figure above. Concerning all male respondents,
this percentage is also 46 percent for preferential treatment of women and 53 percent of ethnic minorities. Neither men nor native Dutch respondents experience direct personal benefit from preferential treatment. The share of women in the workforce affects support for preferential treatment of women indirectly via the stereotypes of warmth and competence. Both male and female respondents who attribute more warmth-related stereotypes to women support preferential treatment of women less frequently. This suggests that stereotypes are not only descriptive but also prescriptive in nature. The significance even holds when controlling for the influence of traditional gender roles (which by themselves also have a significantly negative effect), even though the expected negative effects are based on the same mechanism of role incongruence.

**Final remarks**

Chapters 4 to 7 show that the ethnic and gender composition of the workforce indeed influences workplace-related ingroup preferences. However, these influences cannot be attributed in every case to mechanisms resulting from threat theory and contact theory. For instance, the share of women in the workforce did not directly affect men’s ingroup preferences (see Chapters 4 and 6).

Studying ingroup preferences in the context of the workplace provides the opportunity to examine the effects of being in a minority position on the ingroup preferences of employees who generally have a higher social status. Although men on average are more frequently employed than women, with in an individual organisation they can be the minority group. Being in a minority position, together with other investigated factors, affects men differently than women. This suggests that the societal position of an employee’s ingroup is relevant regarding the effect of certain social and social-psychological conditions.

In summary, this dissertation furthers the understanding of ingroup preferences regarding dismissals and preferential treatment. Based on the results, advice is formulated for employers who wish to objectify their dismissal procedures in order to minimise the effect of ingroup preferences and for employers who wish to implement preferential treatment.
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CHAPTER 10

Samenvatting
**INTRODUCTIE EN ONDERBOUWING**

Werk speelt een centrale rol in het leven van veel mensen. Elke week worden behoorlijk wat uren op het werk doorgebracht en het soort werk is een belangrijk aspect van iemands sociale status. Het is een plek waar mensen samenwerken om een gemeenschappelijk doel te bereiken, maar ook een plek waar mensen soms moeten concurreren om schaarse middelen zoals promoties, bonussen en zelfs voor betere werkplekken of apparatuur. Het werken binnen een organisatie vereist dus politiek gedrag van werknemers.

In de afgelopen decennia heeft dit gedrag een interessante nieuwe dimensie gekregen. Door de toegenomen arbeidsparticipatie van vrouwen, maar ook door immigratie is de arbeidsmarkt in Nederland steeds diverser geworden: een trend die zich waarschijnlijk zal voortzetten. Het is geen gekke gedachte dat deze diversiteit in situaties waar er sprake is van samenwerking en concurrentie, zoals in de werkomgeving, invloed heeft op groepsvoorkeuren.

De invloeden van diversiteit op het werk op de voorkeur voor de eigen gender en etnische groep (ingroup) staan centraal in dit proefschrift.

**Centrale ideeën en drie innovatieve aspecten**

Dit proefschrift onderzoekt in hoeverre de zogeheten contacttheorie en dreigingstheorie, zoals besproken in hoofdstuk 2, gebruikt kunnen worden om het effect van gender- en etnische diversiteit op de voorkeur voor de eigen groep te kwantificeren. Vanuit de contact- en dreigingstheorie kunnen tegengestelde verwachtingen afgeleid worden over deze invloed.

Tot op heden is dit noch met betrekking tot diversiteit op het werk, noch met betrekking tot gender diversiteit gedaan. Dit proefschrift levert een belangrijke bijdrage aan het toetsen van de toepasbaarheid van deze theorieën. Ten eerste door na te gaan of en in hoeverre deze theorieën van toepassing zijn op de werkomgeving, een omgeving die voor veel mensen van aanzienlijk belang is. Ten tweede door te onderzoeken of deze theorieën naast voorkeuren op basis van etniciteit ook gendervoorkeuren kunnen verklaren.

Hoewel de invloed van diversiteit op groepsvoorkeuren centraal staat in dit proefschrift, kunnen mensen omgekeerd ook een bepaalde omgeving op basis van de verwachte diversiteit selecteren vanwege hun groepsvoorkeuren. Omdat er zoveel andere factoren een rol spelen bij de keuze om te solliciteren bij een bepaalde organisatie, is de verwachting dat dit mogelijke selectie-effect kleiner is in de werkomgeving dan in andere contexten. In een overzichtelijke omgeving zoals een vestiging van een organisatie, is het mogelijk om te testen of contact- en dreigingsmechanismen gelijktijdig kunnen werken, en of ze complementair zijn in plaats van oppositieonel. Daarnaast wordt in dit proefschrift een subtiel onderscheid gemaakt tussen absolute en relatieve grootte van de outgroup (de groep waar men zelf niet toe behoort). De verwachting (die ook bevestigd wordt) was dat het percentage werknemers op een werkplek dat tot een andere etnische groep behoort, een effect heeft op de voorkeuren van Nederlandse werknemers. Bovendien heeft voor een gegeven vast percentage, ook het absolute aantal mensen uit de outgroup een effect, maar tegengesteld. Beide effecten, hoewel bescheiden, zijn statistisch significant en worden als ondersteuning gezien voor de relevantie voor de dreigingstheorie en de contacttheorie in de werkcontext. Dit omdat een toenemend percentage outgroupleden in feite als een bedreiging wordt gezien (die de voorkeuren voor de eigen groep verhoogt), terwijl als alleen het absolute aantal stijgt, dit de voorkeur voor de ingroup verkleint.
Het meten van groepsvoorkeuren op de werkplek

De voorkeuren voor ingroup worden geoperationaliseerd door te kijken naar twee fasen in de werkcyclus, namelijk enerzijds ontslag, en anderzijds werving en selectie. Er wordt, om precies te zijn, beoordeeld hoe (1) etnische diversiteit en (2) gender diversiteit, invloed hebben op:
(A) iemands voorkeur om een outgroup-lid te ontslaan in plaats van een lid van de ingroup;
(B) iemands ondersteuning voor voorkeursbehandeling in het proces van werving en selectie.

Op basis van deze twee onderverdelingen zijn vier empirische studies verricht:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 etniciteit</th>
<th>2 gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ontslag</td>
<td>Hoofdstuk 4</td>
<td>Hoofdstuk 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B voorkeursbeleid</td>
<td>Hoofdstuk 5</td>
<td>Hoofdstuk 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voorkeuren rondom ontslag (hoofdstukken 4 en 6) worden gemeten door middel van een vignettenstudie, opinies rondom voorkeursbeleid (hoofdstuk 5 en 7) worden in kaart gebracht door directe vragen te stellen aan respondenten.

De dataset die aan dit proefschrift ten grondslag ligt, is afkomstig uit een enquête onder medewerkers van verschillende organisaties. Hoofdstuk 3 legt uit welk deel van deze dataset is geselecteerd. De 1007 in dit proefschrift betrokken respondenten hebben allemaal een Nederlandse achtergrond. Hiervoor is gekozen omdat er onvoldoende gegevens beschikbaar waren om de ingroup-voorkeuren van Nederlanders met een migratie-achtergrond op een betrouwbare manier te onderzoeken. In de twee hoofdstukken rondom gendervoorkeuren is het wel mogelijk om zowel het perspectief van mannen als vrouwen te belichten.

Etnische en gender voorkeuren bij ontslag

De invloeden van diversiteit op het werk op gender en etnische voorkeuren in ontslagsituaties worden geoperationaliseerd door middel van een vignettenonderzoek. Elk van de 1007 respondenten kreeg zeven paren van (fictieve) werknemers voorgelegd. De respondent gaf daarbij telkens aan welke werknemer van het koppel hij het snelst zou ontslaan (in een noodsituatie). Van elke medewerker werden alleen de volgende vier kenmerken gepresenteerd:
(a) geslacht (man of vrouw)
(b) etniciteit (Nederlands of Pools of Marokkaans)
(c) kinderen (geen of twee)
(d) soort baan (financiën of laboratorium)

Alleen de 216 paar van de in totaal 576 (24x24) mogelijke paren, die verschillen in ten minste twee van de kenmerken (a, b, c, d) werden voorgelegd aan de respondenten. Dit vermindert de kans op sociaal wenselijke antwoorden.
Het vaker ontslaan van een medewerker uit de outgroup wordt beschouwd als een indicator voor een voorkeur voor de eigen groep. Gemiddeld gaven de respondenten in 58% van de vignettenparen waarin een keuze was tussen een Poolse of Marokkaanse werknemer en een Nederlandse werknemer aan dat ze de Pools/ Marokkaanse werknemer zouden ontslaan. Een hoger percentage Poolse en / of Marokkaanse collega’s verhoogde deze kans, terwijl de respondenten met een hoger absolut aantal Poolse en / of Marokkaanse collega’s een lagere voorkeur voor de ingroup vertoonden (en dus relatief vaker de Nederlands werknemer ontsloegen). Meer details zijn te vinden in hoofdstuk 4.

Voor de gemiddelde ontslagkans maakte het niet uit of de werknemer in de vignette man of vrouw was. Echter, tussen respondenten zijn de verschillen in voorkeur substantieel. Deze verschillen kunnen gedeeltelijk worden verklaard door de volgende factoren: de respondent is een zogeheten gendertoken (de respondent was de enige man of vrouw op de vestiging); door de statuslegitimiteit (hoe wordt de arbeidsmarktpositie van man en vrouw gepercipieerd); door genderidentificatie; en door ideeën over de rolverdeling tussen mannen en vrouwen. Het effect van in een token positie zitten is niet significant (weinig respondenten zaten in deze positie). Echter, de grootte van het effect is aanzienlijk. Zoals verwacht hadden token mannen juist sterkere voorkeuren voor de eigen ingroup in vergelijking met andere mannen, terwijl tegenovergestelde effecten werden gevonden voor token vrouwen. Op basis van de hogere status van mannen op de arbeidsmarkt was de verwachting (en deze werd bevestigd) dat mannen een sterkere voorkeur hebben voor de ingroup dan vrouwen. Vrouwen die de hogere status van mannen op de arbeidsmarkt niet als legitiem beschouwen, hebben een sterkere voorkeur voor de ingroup dan andere vrouwen. Voor mannen worden dergelijke effecten van gepercipieerde legitimiteit van status zoals verwacht niet gevonden. Tot slot, zowel mannen als vrouwen met meer traditionele ideeën over de rolverdeling tussen mannen en vrouwen, ontslaan vaker de vrouwelijke werknemer dan de mannelijke werknemer in de vignetten. Zie hoofdstuk 6 voor details.

**Ondersteuning van voorkeursbeleid gericht op vrouwen en etnische minderheden**

Net als in de hoofdstukken 4 en 6 is het doel van de hoofdstukken 5 en 7 om de invloed van gender en etnische diversiteit op de voorkeur voor de eigen groep te onderzoeken. Na ontslagvoorkeuren, wordt in hoofdstuk 5 en 7 de steun voor tiebreak-voorkeursbeleid bij de werving en selectie onderzocht. Tiebreak-voorkeursbeleid verwijst naar de praktijk om een lid van een etnische minderheid of een vrouw aan te nemen voor een functie, in het geval dat er een gelijk gekwalificeerde sollicitant met een Nederlandse achtergrond / man solliciteert. Onder bepaalde voorwaarden is tiebreak-voorkeursbeleid wettelijk toegestaan in Nederland.

De steun voor voorkeursbeleid in hoofdstuk 5 en 7 is gemeten door directe vragen te stellen. Van de 1007 respondenten is 46 procent het (helemaal) niet eens met de stelling dat het acceptabel is als een werkgever tiebreak-voorkeursbeleid toepast ten gunste van een kandidaat uit een etnische minderheid. Opmerkelijk is dat diversiteit op de werkvloer deze steun wel beïnvloedt, maar alleen indirect; namelijk via de perceptie op discriminatie op de arbeidsmarkt. Hoe diverser de werkomgeving van de respondent is, hoe kleiner de kans dat een respondent van mening is dat discriminatie van etnische minderheden op de arbeidsmarkt voorkomt. Wanneer mensen deze mening zijn toegedaan is de steun voor voorkeursbeleid ook kleiner. Aan de ene kant zou de etnische diversiteit op het eigen werk de indruk kunnen geven dat discriminatie van deze minderheden breder op de arbeidsmarkt geen probleem
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Gemiddeld genomen is de steun voor tiebreak-voorkeursbeleid van vrouwen hoger dan voor die gericht op etnische minderheden, aangezien 36 procent van alle 1007 respondenten het (helemaal) oneens is met de stelling hierover, ten opzichte van de 46 procent die het oneens is met voorkeursbeleid voor etnische minderheden. Noch mannen, noch autochtone respondenten ervaren direct persoonlijk voordeel van een voorkeursbeleid. Wanneer alleen gekeken wordt naar de mannelijke respondenten, is het percentage dat het helemaal oneens is met voorkeursbehandeling gericht op vrouwen 46 procent, en 53 procent is helemaal oneens met voorkeursbeleid gericht op etnische minderheden. De mate van gender diversiteit op het werk beïnvloedt deze steun indirect, namelijk via stereotypen van warmte en competentie. Zowel mannelijke als vrouwelijke respondenten die meer warmte-gerelateerde stereotypen aan vrouwen toeschrijven ondersteunen de voorkeursbehandeling van vrouwen minder vaak. Dit suggereert dat stereotypen niet alleen descriptief, maar ook prescriptief van aard zijn. Dit verband blijft significant wanneer gecontroleerd wordt voor de invloed van traditionele rolpatronen (die zelf ook een significant negatief effect hebben), ook al zijn de verwachte negatieve effecten gebaseerd op hetzelfde mechanisme van rolincongruentie.

Tot slot

Hoofdstukken 4 tot 7 laten zien dat de etnische en gender diversiteit van het personeelsbestand inderdaad van invloed is op groepsvoorkeuren. Deze invloeden kunnen echter niet in alle gevallen worden toegeschreven aan mechanismen die voortkomen uit de dreigingstheorie en de contacttheorie. Het aandeel van vrouwen in het personeelsbestand heeft bijvoorbeeld geen directe invloed op de voorkeuren van de mannelijke respondenten (zie hoofdstuk 4 en 6).

Hoewel de beroepsbevolking uit meer mannen dan vrouwen bestaat, kunnen mannen in een individuele organisatie in de minderheid zijn. Het bestuderen van groepsvoorkeuren in de individuele werkomgeving biedt de mogelijkheid te onderzoeken of het uitmaakt voor werknemers met een hogere sociale status of zij een minderheidspositie hebben. Het hebben van een minderheidspositie, samen met andere onderzochte factoren, beïnvloedt mannen anders dan vrouwen. Dit suggereert dat de maatschappelijke positie van de ingroup van een werknemer relevant is voor het effect van bepaalde sociale en psychologische factoren.

Samengevat, dit proefschrift bevordert het begrip van voorkeuren voor de ingroup met betrekking tot ontslagen en tiebreak-voorkeursbeleid. Op basis van de resultaten worden aanbevelingen gegeven aan werkgevers die hun ontslagprocedures willen objectiveren om de voorkeur voor de ingroup te minimaliseren en voor werkgevers die overwegen om voorkeursbeleid in te voeren.
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**Table 25** Does the organisation where you work have multiple branches?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 1 other branch</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 2–5 other branches</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, more than 5 other branches</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 26** How many people work at the branch where you work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data used in this dissertation</th>
<th>EBB data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–4 employees</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9 employees</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19 employees</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–49 employees</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–99 employees</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100–249 employees</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250–499 employees</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 or more employees</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27  Do most of the colleagues with whom you work have a Dutch or an immigrant background?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only native Dutch</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly native Dutch</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half native Dutch, half ethnic minorities</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly ethnic minorities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only ethnic minorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28  Are most of the colleagues with whom you work female or male?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly female</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately half female, half male</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly male</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29 What educational level is required for your job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Data used in this dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vmbo (Preparatory secondary vocational education)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havo (General secondary education)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VWO (General secondary education)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBO (senior secondary vocational education)</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBO (higher professional education)</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO (Research-oriented education)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30  Dependent variable: preferences for firing employees based on their ethnicity. Logistic multilevel model. Moroccan rather than Polish employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Firing Moroccan rather than Polish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents N=904 N=1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(intercept)</td>
<td>-.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A: Share of colleagues from a Moroccan background</td>
<td>-1.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A: Share of colleagues from a Polish background</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B: The norms and values of ethnic minorities are a threat</td>
<td>.117*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B: The norms and values of ethnic minorities are a threat</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 1 (higher threat average than</td>
<td>-.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 1 (higher threat average than</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 2 (equal threat average as</td>
<td>-.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 2 (equal threat average as</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 3 (lower threat average than</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 3 (lower threat average than</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy norms and values 3 (lower threat average than</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 1 (higher threat average than</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 1 (higher threat average than</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 2 (equal threat average as</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 2 (equal threat average as</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 3 (lower threat average than</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 3 (lower threat average than</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy employment 3 (lower threat average than</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D: Personal labour market uncertainty</td>
<td>.060**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A: Number of colleagues from a Moroccan background</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A: Number of colleagues from a Polish background</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B: At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues has a Polish</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B: At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues has a Moroccan</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B: At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues has an immigrant</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C: Ethnic identification</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C: Ethnic identification * at least 1 of 3 closest colleagues</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C: Ethnic identification * at least 1 of 3 closest colleagues</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C: Ethnic identification * at least 1 of 3 closest colleagues</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works mostly with colleagues of non-Dutch descent</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows at least one Moroccan person by name other than</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows at least one Polish person by name other than</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows at least one Polish person by name other than</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows at least one Moroccan person by name other than</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education attained</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees in the workplace</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>1725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001
To meet or to compete? The effect of the ethnic and gender workforce diversity on ingroup preferences in the workplace

Table 31 Support for equal treatment based on ethnicity in the labour market. Native Dutch respondents. Unstandardised, standardised and significance levels for structural equation model (standard errors in parentheses) N=1007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter estimate</th>
<th>Unstandardised</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of ethnic minority colleagues → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>0.020(0.037)</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ethnic minority colleagues → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>-0.001(0.001)</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>0.066(0.023)**</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of ethnic minority colleagues → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-0.103(0.043)**</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of ethnic minority colleagues → Perceived threat from ethnic minorities</td>
<td>-0.102(0.041)**</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived threat from ethnic minorities → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-0.187(0.039)**</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived threat from ethnic minorities → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>-0.383(0.030)**</td>
<td>-0.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with ethnicity → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>0.058(0.023)**</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>0.010(0.011)</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of three closest colleagues ethnic minority → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>0.093(0.067)</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction closest colleague * identification ethnicity → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>-0.057(0.066)</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>0.049(0.043)</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>0.013(0.014)</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of organisation → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>0.000(0.000)</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>0.823(0.037)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual support for equal treatment</td>
<td>0.432(0.020)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001
Note: CMIN/df4.685, RMSEA=.061, GFI=.971; CFI=.922
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Table 32 Support for preferential treatment for women. Male respondents working in public sector.
Unstandardised, standardised and significance levels for structural model (standard errors in parentheses) N=189

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter estimate</th>
<th>Unstandardised</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.021 (.093)</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Warmth</td>
<td>.016 (.066)</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m public: Share of female colleagues → Competence</td>
<td>.141* (.069)</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Warmth</td>
<td>.010 (.117)</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Competence</td>
<td>-.032 (.115)</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.110 (.123)</td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.045 (.142)</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.334*** (.073)</td>
<td>-.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.098 (.093)</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-.123* (.057)</td>
<td>-.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>.016 (.071)</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Traditional gender roles</td>
<td>-.092 (.090)</td>
<td>-.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with gender → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.099 (.085)</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.101* (.051)</td>
<td>-.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of organisation → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual warmth</td>
<td>.419*** (.053)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual competence</td>
<td>358*** (.140)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual traditional gender roles</td>
<td>1.129*** (.116)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>.684*** (.071)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>1.101*** (.114)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001
Note: CMIN/df=2.6, RMSEA=.092, GFI=.917; CFI=.875
### Table 33 Support for preferential treatment for women. Male respondents working in private sector.
Unstandardised, standardised and significance levels Structural equation modelling (standard errors in parentheses) N=355

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter estimate</th>
<th>Unstandardised</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.098(.074)</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m private sector: Share of female colleagues → Warmth</td>
<td>.108* (.050)</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Competence</td>
<td>-.049 (.047)</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Warmth</td>
<td>.061(.086)</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Competence</td>
<td>.199*(.092)</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.038 (.098)</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.010(.047)</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.166**(.060)</td>
<td>-.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.115(.074)</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-.053(.043)</td>
<td>-.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-.014 (.051)</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Traditional gender roles</td>
<td>-.019(.063)</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with gender → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.118*(.060)</td>
<td>-.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.046(.040)</td>
<td>-.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of organisation → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual warmth</td>
<td>.395*** (.041)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual competence</td>
<td>3.341*** (13701)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual traditional gender roles</td>
<td>.932***(.070)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>.603*** (.045)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>1.184***(.089)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p<.05   ** = p<.01,   *** = p<.001
Note: CMIN/df=3.7, RMSEA=.087, GFI=.935=8; CFI=.858
Table 34: Support for preferential treatment for women. Female respondents. Unstandardised, standardised and significance levels. Structural equation model (standard errors in parentheses) N=463

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter estimate</th>
<th>Unstandardised</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1f: Share of female colleagues → Support for preferential treatment</strong></td>
<td>-.022(.051)</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Warmth</td>
<td>.039 (.032)</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Competence</td>
<td>.096* (.039)</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Warmth</td>
<td>-.043(.090)</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Competence</td>
<td>-.113 (.089)</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.371*** (.089)</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.226*(.097)</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>-.160***(.049)</td>
<td>-.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.077(.056)</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-.098*(.041)</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-.041 (.042)</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Traditional gender roles</td>
<td>-.031 (.048)</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10f: Identification with gender → Support for preferential treatment</strong></td>
<td>.133**(.050)</td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.109***(.032)</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of organisation → Support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual warmth</td>
<td>.288*** (.028)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual competence</td>
<td>.248*** (.057)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual traditional gender roles</td>
<td>.822*** (.058)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>.685*** (.045)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual support for preferential treatment</td>
<td>.973***(.064)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001
Note: CMIN/df=4.9, RMSEA=.092, GFI=.934; CFI=.853
Table 35 Support for equal treatment of men and women in the labour market. Male and female respondents. Unstandardised, standardised and significance levels structural equation model (standard errors in parentheses) N=1007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter estimate</th>
<th>Unstandardised</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.014(.022)</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Warmth</td>
<td>.050* (.025)</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Competence</td>
<td>.036 (.026)</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Warmth</td>
<td>.017(.052)</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 out of 3 closest colleagues is female → Competence</td>
<td>-.068 (.050)</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.155*** (.035)</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>-.052(.040)</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>-.150***(.020)</td>
<td>-.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived prevalence of discrimination in the labour market → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.015(.023)</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in the labour market</td>
<td>-.109***(.027)</td>
<td>-.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in the labour market</td>
<td>.063** (.027)</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Traditional gender roles</td>
<td>-.112 ***(.031)</td>
<td>-.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female respondents → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>-.013 (047)</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification gender → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.028 (.021)</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.031 (.013)</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of organisation → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual warmth</td>
<td>.357*** (.022)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual competence</td>
<td>.167 (.092)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual traditional gender roles</td>
<td>.956*** (.043)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual perception of prevalence of discrimination in the labour market</td>
<td>.690*** (.031)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual support for equal treatment error 8</td>
<td>.380***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001

Note: CMIN/df=9.4, RMSEA=.091, GFI=.937; CFI=.867
Table 36 Support for equal treatment of men and women in the labour market. Male respondents. Unstandardised, standardised and significance levels for structural model (standard errors in parentheses) N=544

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter estimate</th>
<th>Unstandardised</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>-.011(.034)</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Warmth</td>
<td>.073* (.039)</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Competence</td>
<td>.074* (.039)</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 of 3 closest colleagues is female → Warmth</td>
<td>.042(.069)</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 of 3 closest colleagues is female → Competence</td>
<td>.025 (.059)</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.167*** (.046)</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.027(.058)</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>-.151***(.028)</td>
<td>-.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.009*(.035)</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender roles → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-.079*(.034)</td>
<td>-.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>-.006 (.039)</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of female colleagues → Traditional gender roles</td>
<td>-.083* (.050)</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification gender → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>-.014 (.029)</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.049**(.019)</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of organisation → Support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual warmth</td>
<td>.410***(.033)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual competence</td>
<td>.273***(.095)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual traditional gender roles</td>
<td>1.012***(.061)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual perception of prevalence of discrimination in labour market</td>
<td>.633***(.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual support for equal treatment</td>
<td>.418***(.025)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.05 **=p<.01, ***=p<.001 Note: CMIN/df=5.0, RMSEA=.086, GFI=.942; CFI=.876
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Het schrijven van een proefschrift begint met het idee om te gaan promoveren. In het geval van dit proefschrift kwam dit van Marjolijn Olde Monnikhof. Marjolijn (en later ook Bart), bedankt voor deze stimulans en de mogelijkheid die jullie boden om te promoveren naast mijn werk bij het College voor de Rechten van de Mens.

Ik heb ontzettend geluk gehad met mijn promotoren Paul de Beer en Ferry Koster. Hoewel ik natuurlijk blij ben dat mijn proefschrift af is, zal ik de inspirerende gesprekken met jullie gaan missen. Paul, dank voor het vertrouwen dat altijd hebt getoond in dit project. Je gaf nooit blijf van twijfel over de succesvolle afronding ervan. Niet in het begin, toen ik met een half A4’tje met je kwam praten, en ook niet tijdens de uitvoering, terwijl toen ook nog eens mijn drie kinderen geboren werden. Het is voor mij een voorbeeld hoe jij maatschappelijke betrokkenheid combineert met een analytische en objectieve blik. Ferry, naast goede ideeën en een praktische inslag zorgde je gevoel voor humor ervoor dat gesprekken nooit saai werden. Het was alleen een beetje teleurstellend dat zelfs het ‘ambachtelijk kaasmaker’ op je twitterprofiel niet serieus was. Paul en Ferry, heel erg bedankt!


Als zogeheten buitenpromovendus had ik geen vaste collega’s om mee van gedachten te wisselen over mijn onderzoek. Het was dan ook erg prettig om dit wel te kunnen doen met Frank en Odile. Frank, bedankt voor je kritische blik en het inhoudelijke gesprek. Odile: bedankt voor je gezelligheid, onuitputtelijke steun en stapels leesvoer. Met erg veel plezier heb ik naast de vele nuttige literatuur ook de wat meer obscuurere geschriften gelezen.

Collega’s, dank voor jullie gezelligheid, woorden van steun en borreltjes. Vrienden, dank dat jullie met leuke vakanties, etentjes en goede gesprekken de afgelopen jaren voor fijne afleiding hebben gezorgd. Een aantal van jullie wil ik specifieker noemen. Te beginnen bij Florien. Floor: ik ken je het langst van al mijn vrienden en ik ben heel blij dat ondanks dat onze levens zo anders zijn ingericht we elkaar altijd blijven vinden. Marlies, wat fijn om als puber in jou een gelijkgestemde te vinden. Ook al ben ik nu ook heel blij met je journalistieke blik, soms zijn die pubers niet heel ver weg.’ Jeroen: ik ben blij met je onconventionele directe inslag, bij jou is een ‘dus als je proefschrift afgekeurd wordt ben je heel veel tijd kwijt en als het goedgekeurd wordt ben je heel veel geld kwijt?’ alleen maar grappig. Edwin, fijn om met je te praten van persoonlijke onderwerpen tot discussies over internetsubculturen. Afke, wat fijn om alle werk-zorg issues zonder enige pretentie met je te kunnen delen. Lieve sociologen, (Anne, Alex, Dorothea, Jan, Joris, Jornt, Marieke, Marloes, Noortje) bijzonder dat we elkaar individueel en als groep nog steeds weten te vinden. Ik hoop dat we over dertig jaar nog steeds jubileumreizen naar Japan of welk land dan ook maken. Bij dat eerste feest in de introductieperiode (Marieke en Noor: ik heb een heel specifiek moment voor ogen) wist ik meteen dat het goed zat. En Jan, ook al ben je als socioloog een bijna gepromoveerd techniek filosoof die gebruik maakt van psychologische methoden, ik geniet toch ook van de minder hoogdravende gesprekken. Fijn dat je beiden biedt.
Gabrielle, je ongekende intelligentie en talent gaan samen met een even grote bescheidenheid, het is altijd gezellig bij jullie.

Er zijn weinig mensen die nog steeds elk jaar met hun ouderlijk gezin op vakantie gaan: een tekenend voorbeeld van hoe we met zijn allen van het goede leven kunnen genieten.
Lieve Willemien en Annemarie, het is heel fijn om twee zulke lieve en leuke zussen te hebben. Annemarie, je hebt altijd wijze raad en bent vreselijk attent. Willemien, ondanks je drukke bestaan maak je altijd even tijd vrij om langs te komen voor een borrel en vrolijk goed gesprek. Ik hoop dat er nog veel zussenetentjes volgen. Lieve pap en mam, jullie hebben me altijd gestimuleerd om er uit te halen wat er in zit. Dank jullie wel dat jullie nog steeds voor mij ildaar staan. Stijn, Giel, Melle en Arnoud, ik ben heel blij met zulke leuke neven en zwager!

Lieve Tanca en mama, ik ben blij dat jullie mijn paranimfen willen zijn. Tanca, altijd inspirerend hoe nuchter en vol humor je naar dingen kijkt. Fijn dat we na de gezellige jaren op die beruchte J.S. de Rijkstraat nog steeds zo goed contact hebben. Lieve mam, dit proefschrift gaat ook over de gelijkwaardigheid van mannen en vrouwen. Een ideaal wat je altijd hebt voorgeleefd.

Lieve Kevin, dank voor alle keren dat je mij even vrijspeelde van gezinstaken zodat ik aan dit proefschrift kon werken. Ik ben heel blij met je en je onvoorwaardelijke vertrouwen in mijn kunnen. Lieve Isaac, Ella en Leander, jullie laten zien waar het op het eind van de dag daadwerkelijk om draait. Daarom is dit boekje aan jullie opgedragen.
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