



## Are Adewale and Ngochi more employable than Jamal and Lakeisha? The influence of nationality and ethnicity cues on employment-related evaluations of Blacks in the United States

Simon Howard & Alex M. Borgella

To cite this article: Simon Howard & Alex M. Borgella (2019): Are Adewale and Ngochi more employable than Jamal and Lakeisha? The influence of nationality and ethnicity cues on employment-related evaluations of Blacks in the United States, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, DOI: [10.1080/00224545.2019.1687415](https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2019.1687415)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2019.1687415>



Published online: 01 Nov 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 44



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



# Are Adewale and Ngochi more employable than Jamal and Lakeisha? The influence of nationality and ethnicity cues on employment-related evaluations of Blacks in the United States

Simon Howard<sup>a</sup> and Alex M. Borgella<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Psychology, Marquette University, Milwaukee, USA; <sup>b</sup>Department of Psychology, Fort Lewis College, Durango, USA

## ABSTRACT

Previous research has consistently shown that racial bias can influence employers' perceptions and evaluations of Black individuals in hiring and promotion decisions. However, within-race differences (e.g., skin tone, Afrocentric features) can lead to variation in these decisions. In addition to phenotypical variation, ethnicity cues (e.g., perceived country of origin, name) may be important within-race factors influencing the perception and evaluations of Black job applicants. Using a resume evaluation paradigm, participants evaluated one of three resumes in which the target applicant's name provided cues about ethnicity (either Black American, Black African, or White American). Results suggest that Black Americans may experience more discrimination in hiring and are generally perceived less positively across several employment-related domains than both White and Black African applicants. Specifically, we find that Black Americans are less likely to be selected for an interview or offered a job and are evaluated more negatively overall relative to Black Africans.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 15 April 2019

Accepted 12 October 2019

## KEYWORDS

Anti-Black bias; resumes; within-race variation; Black Americans; Africans

“There are whites and elites and people in power who do see a distinction. They may not necessarily understand the distinction, but they are seeing Caribbeans as immigrants, who may necessarily work harder, or Africans as immigrants who have greater aspirations than this ‘last-place’ category of Black Americans.”

- Christina Greer (2013)

Despite clear signs of racial progress in wages, income and employment since the 1960's Civil Rights movement, racial disparities between Black Americans and their White counterparts still persist (Anderson, 1994; Oliver & Shapiro, 2006). For example, there has been little change in racial gaps in unemployment since 1980 and the gap in labor force participation rates among young White and Black men actually increased during this time (Wilson & Rogers, 2016). Furthermore, a recent meta-analysis on field experiments shows that there has been no change in anti-Black hiring discrimination since 1989 (Quillian, Pager, Hexel, & Midtbøen, 2017). Research in social psychology and other behavioral sciences provide compelling evidence that these racial disparities are due, at least in part, to implicit anti-Black biases held by individuals socialized in environments that reinforce ideological White supremacy (i.e., the belief that biological and cultural Whiteness is superior, whereas biological and cultural Blackness is inferior; Adams, Biernat, Branscombe, Crandall, & Wrightsman, 2008; Feagin, 2013; Salter & Haugen, 2017). And although expressions of explicit racial prejudice in the United States have declined over time, cultural associations between Blackness and negative attributes (e.g., aggression, criminality, laziness, unintelligence, etc.) are pervasive and have remained relatively consistent for decades (Devine, 1989; Devine & Elliot, 1995; Richeson & Sommers, 2016). These types of automatic associations often render members of stigmatized groups at a relative disadvantage compared to non-stigmatized groups in the arena of employment.

Because these associations are automatic, they often influence employers' perceptions and evaluations of Black individuals leading to unconscious racial bias in hiring decisions (Quillian et al., 2017), promotion decisions (Powell & Butterfield, 2002), and salary decisions (Hernandez, Avery, Volpone, & Kaiser, 2018). Racial bias of this sort can occur even prior to employers ever having *seen* a job applicant (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Quillian et al., 2017). For example, Bertrand & Mullainathan, (2004) sent over 5,000 resumes to employment ads for available sales, clerical, administrative, and management positions and found that applicants with stereotypically Black names (e.g., Jamal and Lakeisha) were approximately 50% less likely to receive a call back for an interview relative to applicants with stereotypically White names (e.g., Emily and Greg), despite the resumes being identical. Using a laboratory design, King, Mendoza, Madera, Hebl, and Knight (2006) replicated Bertrand and Mullainathan's findings and found that Black and Hispanic applicants faced the most job discrimination relative to Asian and White applicants, providing further evidence that one's race, made salient only by name, can have a detrimental effect on an individual's employment outcomes.

The extant literature demonstrates that Black individuals face employment discrimination due to race. Although these disparities are far-reaching, focusing exclusively on intergroup disparities (e.g., between Black and White Americans) ignores the fact that some members of the Black community may be more susceptible to bias in the labor domain than other Black individuals. In other words, there are within-race differences that impact Black individuals differently when it comes to employment related outcomes. For example, Black individuals with darker skin tones are more likely to experience negative employment related outcomes and discrimination (e.g., lower wages, lower selection for jobs, higher unemployment rates, and lower occupational prestige) relative to Black individuals with lighter skin tones (Devaraj, Quigley, & Patel, 2018; Goldsmith, Hamilton, & Darity, 2007; Harrison & Thomas, 2009; Hochschild & Weaver, 2007; Maddox, 2004). However, studies exploring the influence of within-race variables other than skin tone on Black individuals' employment outcomes are scarce.

As alluded to in the opening quote, ethnicity may be another important within-race variable that can influence the perceptions and evaluations of Black job seekers. Indeed, data from Integrated Public Use of Microdata Series suggests that Black immigrants are more active in the labor force than native-born Blacks (Ruggles, Genadek, Goeken, Grover, & Sobek, 2017). Given that the Black population in the U.S. is currently comprised of approximately 36% foreign-born Black African immigrants and it has been projected that one out of every six Blacks in the US will be foreign-born by the year 2060 (Nielson, 2015) it is imperative to explore how Black nationality/ethnicity cues may lead to different patterns of racial bias for Black individuals. Thus, the aim of the present research is to empirically investigate whether perceived nationality or ethnicity influences evaluations of potential Black job seekers using a national sample and a resume evaluation paradigm (King et al., 2006).

### ***Stereotypes of native-born Black Americans vs Black Africans***

Although Black Africans and native-born Black Americans are perceived to be members of the same racial group and are at times stereotyped similarly, Black Africans in the United States are often positively subtyped (i.e., viewed as members of a target group who disconfirm their group's stereotypes and are "referenced" in a separate subcategory apart from members who confirm the stereotype; Allport, 1954; Richards & Hewstone, 2001). Black Africans are often categorized as being culturally superior compared to native-born Black Americans resulting in dramatic differences in the ways in which both groups are perceived, particularly in the domains of labor and education (Greer, 2013). For example, native-born Black Americans are often stereotyped as having lower qualification and ability in academic and occupational contexts than White Americans (e.g., Allport, 1954; Devine, 1989; Richeson & Sommers, 2016). Black Africans on the other hand, are viewed as more hard-working and less entitled than native-born Black Americans (Greer, 2013) and have been referred to as a "hidden model minority" in reference to their unacknowledged academic achievement (Ukpokodu, 2017).

Although the *acknowledgement* of Black Africans' success may be "invisible," the *awareness* of their success and the belief that they are cultural superior relative to Black Americans is not. Indeed, famed

economist Thomas Sowell once pointed to the positive earnings gap between Black immigrants and native-born Black Americans as evidence that Black American's "cultural traditions" impeded their economic progress resulting in higher earnings for Black immigrants at that time (Butcher, 1994). Other social scientists have also suggested that the educational and employment differences that exist between native-born Black Americans and Black Africans may be due to native-born Black Americans ascribing to an "oppositional culture" (i.e., the rejection of conformity to society's prevailing norms and values, a trait commonly used to explain racial disparities in educational achievement between White and Black Americans), while Black immigrants have superior work ethic and an unwavering optimism that native-born Blacks do not have (Bennett & Lutz, 2009). Decades later, these cultural superiority ideas still persist among social scientists and laypeople alike. For example, recent work has shown that White Americans, Black Americans, and Black Africans all shared similar beliefs and stereotypes about the superior work ethic of Black Africans relative to that of native-born Black Americans (Greer, 2013).

Given the belief that Black Africans have more ambition and work harder than native-born Black Americans, it is possible that Black individuals who apply for jobs with native-born Black American group identification (e.g., stereotypical Black American names) are evaluated more negatively (e.g., less ambitious) and face more racial discrimination (e.g., less likely to receive an interview) relative to Blacks who apply with Black African group identification. Although not in the labor market domain, recent research examining preferences for Black Africans over native-born Black Americans in elite college admission decisions supports this reasoning. McCleary-Gaddy & Miller, (2018) found individuals preferred to admit second-generation African immigrants to an elite university over native-born Black Americans, even though they were similarly qualified.

In the present study, participants were asked to evaluate resumes of individuals presumably seeking employment. Names on resumes were manipulated to be either a name stereotypically associated as Black African, Black American, or White American. We hypothesized that native-born Black American job seekers, relative to Black African and White American job seekers, would have worse (1) employment-related outcomes (e.g., interview offer, job offer); (2) lower salary recommendations; and (3) be evaluated more negatively overall (e.g., ambition, intelligence, motivation).

## Current study

### Method

#### Participants and design

Three hundred and twenty-one participants were recruited online via Amazon's Mechanical Turk and paid \$0.25 for their participation. Seventy-two participants failed to complete the study in its entirety resulting in a final sample of 249<sup>1</sup> ( $M_{age} = 35.11$ ,  $SD = 11.65$ ; 65.1% women). Ethnically, 77.1% of our sample identified as White, 6.8% as Black/African American, 5.6% East Asian, 4.0% as South Asian, 2.4 as Latino, 3.2% as Pacific Islander and 0.8% Bi/Multiracial. Educationally, 37.8% of our sample had a college degree (i.e., Bachelor of Arts/Science), 28.9% reported that had some college but did not finish, 20.1% had an advanced degree (i.e., Masters, Ph.D., or professional degree) and the remaining 13.2% had a high school diploma (or equivalent) or an associate's degree. Thirty-nine percent reported having a career in management or professional service. A between subject design was used for this experiment, in which participants were randomly assigned to one of three resume conditions (name: stereotypically Black American, traditional African, stereotypically White American).

### Materials

#### Applicant resumes

A total of six resumes were created for the experiment. Two had names that are stereotypically associated with White American men and women (i.e., James Miller or Amanda Miller), another two had names stereotypical associated with Black American men and women (e.g., Jamal Mosely or

Lakeisha Mosely), and the last two that had names that were traditional Black African male and female names (i.e., [Nigerian], Adewale Ademola or Ngochi Ademola). The stereotypically White and Black American names were selected because they are names that have been stereotypically associated with White or Black people and used in previous resume studies (e.g., King et al., 2006). Nigerian names were selected for the Black African names because Nigeria has more migrants in the United States than any other African country (Anderson & Lopez, 2018). In addition to the applicant's full name, each resume included the target's education, employment history and experience and activities. The activities section included information that strengthened the manipulation. For example, for resumes with traditional Black African names the target was a member of the Nigerian Student Union in college, whereas resumes with names stereotypically associated with native-born Black Americans the target was a member of the African-American Student Union. The resumes were designed for an individual seeking an administrative assistant position and were ambiguous in regard to quality (e.g., the applicant's employment history and experience; Jurcevic, Shapiro, Trawalter, & Unzueta, 2019).

## **Measures**

### ***Employment-related outcomes***

To assess participants' evaluations of the target applicant's general employability, we asked participants to indicate how they might evaluate the applicant on a variety of stages in the employment process (e.g., granting the applicant an interview offer, giving the applicant a job offer). We also asked participants to predict how this applicant, if hired, would perform at the job (e.g., whether the applicant would receive a first-year bonus, second salary increase, or promotion).

### ***Interpersonal outcomes***

To assess participants' interpersonal evaluations of the target applicant in the employment context, we asked participants how they would feel both working under and with the target applicant.

### ***Starting salary***

Using a slide scale starting at \$30,000 and ending at \$43,000, participants were asked to determine what salary they would offer the target applicant. The scale was in \$1,000 increments.

### ***Overall evaluation***

To assess participants' overall evaluation of the target by responding to six questions about the applicant using a 7-point Likert scale. Sample items include "How ambitious do you think this individual is?", "Is this person is qualified for the administrative position assistant position?" (for a full listing of questions see Supplemental material). Following procedures of King et al. (2006), we conducted a principal components analysis which revealed one meaningful factor with an eigenvalue of 3.40 that accounted for 56.72% of the variance. The internal consistency reliability for these items was .85.

### ***Manipulation check***

Participants were asked to look at a list of eight names, six being the target names used for the study, and to determine the racial/ethnic group that the name is most commonly associated with. Participants were given five choices (i.e., White/Caucasian, Latino/Hispanic, African American, Asian, or Continental Africans [from Africa]).

## **Procedure**

Participants were recruited using Amazon's Mechanical Turk under the impression that they were participating in an experiment that aimed to help people improve the quality of their resumes by exploring which factors impact their evaluations. Participants were then asked to read a job description from an education company seeking to hire an individual for an

administrative assistant position (see Supplemental Materials). After being randomly assigned to one of three resume conditions (name: stereotypically Black American, traditional Black African, stereotypically White American) participants were asked to make several trait evaluations of the target individual. Next, participants were then instructed to select the starting salary they would give the individual whose resume they received. Participants then completed the manipulation check which was followed demographic information before being debriefed.

## Results

### *Manipulation check*

Participants generally associated James Miller and Amanda Miller as White/Caucasian names (97.2% and 93.9% respectively), Jamal Mosely and Lakeisha Mosley as Black American names (98% and 97.6% respectively) and Adewale Ademola and Ngochi Ademola as Black African names (87.4% and 85.6%).

One-way between-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were used to explore the influence of target name (Black American, Black African, White American) on participants' evaluations of personal employment related outcomes, interpersonal employment outcomes, salary recommendations, and overall evaluation. We found no significant differences in these outcomes across conditions for target gender (e.g., Black female names did not differ from Black male names on these evaluations). Therefore, we collapsed gender groups across conditions and report these findings below.

### *Employment-related outcomes*

A significant main effect of target name on participants decision to offer the applicant an interview for the administrative assistant position emerged,  $F(2, 244) = 6.24, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .049$  (see Table 1 for cell means). Planned contrasts indicated that a target with a stereotypical Black American name ( $M = 4.90, SD = 1.45$ ) was significantly less likely to be offered a job interview than a target with a stereotypically White American name ( $M = 5.57, SD = 1.27$ ),  $t(244) = 3.20, p = .002, d = .49$  or a traditional Black African name ( $M = 5.51, SD = 1.32$ ),  $t(244) = 2.90, p = .004, d = .44$ . No other significant pairwise comparisons emerged.

There was also a significant main effect of target name on participants likelihood of offering a job to the target  $F(2, 244) = 9.14, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .070$  (see Table 1 for cell means). Planned contrasts indicated that a target with a stereotypical Black American name ( $M = 4.42, SD = 1.30$ ) was less likely to be offered the administrative assistant job compared to a target with a stereotypically White American name ( $M = 5.22, SD = 1.28$ ),  $t(244) = 4.13, p < .001, d = .63$  or a target with a traditional Black African name ( $M = 5.02, SD = 1.19$ ),  $t(244) = 3.12, p = .002, d = .49$ . No other significant pairwise comparisons emerged.

There was a marginal effect of target name on participants beliefs on the likelihood the target would receive an employment-related bonus within his or her first year if hired,  $F(2, 244) = 2.30, p = .055, \eta^2_p = .023$ . Planned contrasts indicated that a target with a stereotypical Black American name ( $M = 4.20, SD = 1.26$ ) was believed to be less likely to receive a first year bonus than a target with a stereotypically White American name ( $M = 4.65, SD = 1.34$ ),  $t(244) = 2.29, p = .022, d = .34$  or a target with a traditional Black African name ( $M = 4.56, SD = 1.23$ ),  $t(244) = 1.82, p = .071, d = .29$ . No other significant pairwise comparisons emerged.

No main effects emerged on target name on participants beliefs that the target would receive a salary increase within the first year,  $F(2, 244) = .647, p = .524, \eta^2_p = .005$ , or a promotion within the first year,  $F(2, 244) = 2.06, p = .129, \eta^2_p = .017$  (see Table 1 for cell means).

**Table 1.** Mean scores (and standard deviations) for all employment related outcomes, interpersonal outcomes, salary recommendations and overall evaluations by condition.

	Black American Name	Black African Name	White American Name
Interview	4.90 (1.44) <sub>a</sub>	5.51 (1.32) <sub>b</sub>	5.57 (1.27) <sub>b</sub>
Job Offer	4.41 (1.28) <sub>a</sub>	5.02 (1.19) <sub>b</sub>	5.22 (1.29) <sub>b</sub>
First Year Bonus	4.20 (1.26)	4.56 (1.23)	4.65 (1.34)
First Year Salary Increase	4.26 (1.37)	4.49 (1.08)	4.33 (1.45)
First Year Promotion	3.99 (1.29)	4.26 (1.10)	4.38 (1.40)
Work With	4.84 (1.35)	4.99 (1.06)	4.98 (1.26)
Work Under	3.07 (1.45) <sub>a</sub>	3.40 (1.40) <sub>a</sub>	3.95 (1.52) <sub>b</sub>
Recommended Salary (in thousands)	33.83 (3.04) <sub>a</sub>	34.91 (2.71) <sub>b</sub>	36.29 (3.14) <sub>c</sub>
Overall Evaluation	4.38 (0.83) <sub>a</sub>	4.70 (.70) <sub>b</sub>	4.76 (.80) <sub>b</sub>

Different subscript letters within rows indicate statistically significant differences (a/b/c;  $p < .05$ ).

### Interpersonal outcomes

Results indicated there was no main effect of target name on the likelihood participants saw themselves working with the applicant whose resume they read,  $F(2, 244) = .368$ ,  $p = .692$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .003$ . However, a significant main effect of target name on the likelihood participants viewed themselves working under the applicant at any point in the future emerged,  $F(2, 244) = 7.66$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = -.059$  (see Table 1 for cell means). Planned contrasts indicated that participants were more likely to see themselves working under a target with a stereotypical White American name ( $M = 3.95$ ,  $SD = 1.52$ ) than either a target with a stereotypically Black American name ( $M = 3.07$ ,  $SD = 1.45$ ),  $t(244) = 3.87$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = .38$  or traditional Black African name ( $M = 3.40$ ,  $SD = 1.40$ ),  $t(244) = 2.30$ ,  $p = .016$ ,  $d = .59$ . No other significant pairwise comparisons emerged.

### Salary recommendations

There was a significant main effect of target name on participants salary recommendations  $F(2, 243) = 124.928$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .101$ . Planned contrasts indicated that a target with a stereotypical White American name ( $M = 36.29$ ,  $SD = 3.14$ ) was significantly more likely to be recommended a higher salary than a target with either a stereotypically Black American name ( $M = 33.83$ ,  $SD = 3.04$ ),  $t(243) = 5.31$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = .79$  or a traditional Black African name ( $M = 34.91$ ,  $SD = 2.71$ ),  $t(243) = 2.97$ ,  $p = .003$ ,  $d = .47$  (see Table 1 for cell means). Planned contrasts also indicated that a target with a traditional Black African name was significantly more likely to be recommended a higher salary than a target with a Black American name  $t(243) = 2.37$ ,  $p = .020$ ,  $d = .37$ . No other significant pairwise comparisons emerged.

### Overall evaluation

Results indicated significant main effect of target name on the overall evaluation of the target  $F(2, 239) = 5.40$ ,  $p = .004$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .044$  (see Table 1 for cell means). Planned contrasts indicated that a target with a stereotypical Black American name ( $M = 4.38$ ,  $SD = 0.83$ ) was evaluated less favorably overall relative to a target with a stereotypically White American name ( $M = 4.76$ ,  $SD = 0.80$ ),  $t(239) = 3.14$ ,  $p = .002$ ,  $d = .47$  or a target with a traditional Black African name ( $M = 4.70$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ),  $t(239) = 2.30$ ,  $p = .012$ ,  $d = .41$ . No other significant pairwise comparisons emerged.

### Discussion

Previous research has indicated that employers favor prospective job applicants with names that are stereotypically White over applicants with names that are stereotypically Black. The present study

not only replicates past work illustrating racial bias toward Black American applicants relative to White applicants, it also extends it by demonstrating that native-born Black American applicants (i.e., individuals with stereotypically Black American names) may also be treated differently than Black African applicants (i.e., individuals with traditional Black African names). The present findings suggest that native-born Black Americans may be at a greater disadvantage in the labor domain and may be perceived more negatively than both White and Black African applicants. These findings provide some initial empirical support for arguments made by social scientists suggesting that Black Africans are often viewed as culturally superior relative to native-born Black Americans (Greer, 2013). Specifically, we find that native-born Black Americans are less likely to be selected for an interview and less likely to be offered a job. Additionally, we found that native-born Black Americans are evaluated overall more negatively than both White Americans and Black Africans. This work may help explain why native-born Black Americans have higher rates of unemployment than their Black African counterparts, even when controlling for factors related to employment outcome such as education and age (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018; Rauh, 2014).

However, we caution those who may interpret our results as suggesting that Black Africans are buffered against any anti-Black bias in the labor domain relative to native-born Black Americans. Instead, the present research demonstrates the ways in which within-race differences, in this case nationality or ethnicity, can lead to some Black individuals either experiencing more or less racial bias in certain contexts. Whereas Black Africans may have not faced anti-Black bias in terms of interview prospects and perceptions of hireability, they still may face bias similar to native-born Black Americans in other ways. For example, we found participants in our sample were less likely to see themselves working under *both* native-born Black American and Black African applicants in the future, relative to White American applicants. In other words, our participants could not see themselves being supervised by a Black individual regardless if they were Black American or Black African. In addition, we also found that individuals offered both Black American and Black African applicants significantly lower starting salaries (i.e., roughly \$2,000 less) than White American applicants.

This may be explained by the Racial Position Model (Zou & Cheryan, 2017), which posits that a racial or ethnic group's perceived positional arrangement in American society is relative to other racial and ethnic groups. This racial positioning is based on two distinct dimensions: inferiority (i.e., their perceived intellectual, economic, and occupational prestige relative to groups with higher status) and cultural foreignness (i.e., perceived Americanness). Whereas Black Africans are perceived as relatively superior to Black Americans (e.g., Greer, 2013; Ukpokodu, 2017), they may still be viewed as relatively inferior to White Americans. This disparity may explain why participants in the present investigation self-reported higher overall evaluations of Black Africans relative to Black Americans, but also self-reported they could not see themselves working under a Black African or Black American. Alternatively, Black Africans may be perceived as more culturally foreign than both White Americans and Black Americans, which may also influence evaluations of Black Africans from both dominant advantaged racial groups (e.g., Whites; Craig & Richeson, 2014; Danbold & Huo, 2015) and other racial/ethnic minorities (e.g., Asian Americans; Craig & Richeson, 2018; McClain et al., 2006; Waldinger, 1997). Future research in this area utilizing the two-dimensional Racial Position Model is necessary to address these questions.

### **Limitations and future directions**

The present study is not without limitations. First, although the sample was a non-college, community sample, most of our participants self-identified as White Americans. As such, we do not know whether these findings generalize to other racial groups. The extant literature investigating the role of stereotypes in judgments and decision making suggests that these findings would generalize to other non-Black racial and ethnic groups (e.g., Devine, 1989). Less clear is how Black Americans specifically would evaluate members of their own group relative to Black Africans. Two competing hypotheses could explain these evaluations. On one hand, native-born Black Americans may demonstrate an ingroup bias



(i.e., more favorable evaluations for other native-born Black Americans relative to Black Africans). This hypothesis assumes that native-born Black Americans do not perceive Black Africans as being a part of the ingroup as native-born Black Americans. On the other hand, even though native-born Black Americans may see Black Africans as members of a distinct subgroup outside of the ingroup, they may be just as likely as White individuals to evaluate Black Africans more positively relative to native-born Black Americans, and more likely to hire them as well (see Dasgupta, 2004; Jost, 2001). As mentioned earlier, Black Americans, White Americans, and Black Africans all shared similar beliefs and stereotypes about the superior work ethic of Black Africans relative to that of native-born Black Americans (Greer, 2013). To answer these questions, future research should explore the influence of these stereotypes in labor contexts with Black samples.

Another limitation of the current study is participants only reviewed one job applicant's resume at a time, whereas human resource managers may review dozens, if not hundreds, of resumes of prospective job applicants in a single setting. As such, our methodological design may bring up concerns about the generalizability of our results. However, we believe that concerns about the generalizability of findings are actually minimized by our methodological design. In the real-world, human resource (HR) managers often find themselves in dynamic, fast-paced environments requiring a great expenditure of cognitive energy (e.g., Stone & Daedrick, 2015). Research shows that under this type of cognitive load, individuals are more likely to rely on automatic processing (e.g., stereotyping) which often leads to biased decision making (e.g., Macrae, Hewstone, & Griffiths, 1993; Sherman & Frost, 2000; Wigboldus, Sherman, Franzese, & Knippenberg, 2004). Reviewing multiple resumes in a single setting is more cognitively taxing than evaluating one, and therefore having participants evaluate one resume at a time versus multiple can be seen as a conservative test of our hypothesis. Participants in our study would have more cognitive resources available to them than participants who would have had to evaluate multiple resumes. Yet, despite only evaluating one resume at a time, we still found evidence of bias among participants in the present investigation.

Lastly, it is more important to note that Africa is a continent made up of 54 diverse countries, and the names used in our study originate from one of those countries (i.e., Nigeria). We used Nigerian names because there are more Nigerians in the United States labor force and higher education system than any other African ethnic/nationality group (Anderson & Lopez, 2018), which means there is a greater likelihood that participants in our study, on average, had more familiarity and exposure to Nigerians relative to individuals from other countries. Thus, it is possible these results do not generalize to *all* Africans, and that there may be different outcomes for different ethnic groups. Future research is necessary to explore these possibilities.

## Conclusion

Given recent immigration trends of Black Africans to the United States in the past decade, it is likely that current race relations will be altered. As non-explicit forms of racial prejudice toward Black people in general have remained pervasive in US society (e.g., Devine, 1989; Richeson & Sommers, 2016), understanding how these subtle forms of prejudice operate within racial groups is paramount to navigating this incoming shift. Additionally, these non-explicit forms of racial bias have been shown to affect the decision-making process between high- and low-status racial groups in hiring, retention, and promotion (e.g., Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004), and therefore will require more attention to within-race variability as racial groups in the US become more internally diverse. With these changes in mind, researchers focused on mitigating employment bias need to complicate the ways anti-Black bias is considered in these contexts.

## Note

1. The participants who were dropped from the study completed less than half of the study (very likely due to low pay rate).

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Data availability statement

The data described in this article are openly available in the Open Science Framework at [10.17605/OSF.IO/P8CSR](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/P8CSR)

## Open Scholarship



This article has earned the Center for Open science badges for Open Materials through Open Practices Disclosure. The materials are openly accessible at [10.17605/OSF.IO/P8CSR](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/P8CSR)

## Notes on contributors

**Dr. Simon Howard** is an Assistant Professor of Psychology and Director of the Psychological Social Inquiry (PSI) Lab at Marquette University. He completed his undergraduate degree at San Jose State University and went on to earn his M.A. and Ph.D. in Social Psychology at Tufts University. His research examines how race or sociocultural ideas associated with race (i.e., stereotypes) influence the psychological processes of both racially marginalized and non-marginalized group members.

**Dr. Alex M. Borgella** is an Assistant Professor of Psychology at Fort Lewis College. He received his B.A. in Psychology from the University of West Florida, his M.A. in Psychological Sciences from James Madison University, and his Ph.D. in Social Psychology from Tufts University. Concentrating on the psychological underpinnings of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination, his current research interests involve disparagement humor and its effects on members of stigmatized social groups, within-group differences in racial stereotyping, and stereotype threat.

## References

- Adams, G., Biernat, M., Branscombe, N., Crandall, C., & Wrightsman, L. (2008). Beyond prejudice: Toward a sociocultural psychology of racism and oppression. In G. Adams, M. Biernat, N. R. Branscombe, C. S. Crandall, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Commemorating Brown: The social psychology of racism and discrimination* (pp. 215–246). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Anderson, C. (1994). *Black labor, White wealth: The search for power and economic justice*. Bethesda, MD: Powernomics Corporation of America.
- Anderson, M., & Lopez, G. (2018, January). *Key facts about black immigrants in the U.S.* Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/01/24/key-facts-about-black-immigrants-in-the-u-s/>
- Bennett, P. R., & Lutz, A. (2009). How African American is the net black advantage? Differences in college attendance among immigrant Blacks, native Blacks, and Whites. *Sociology of Education*, 82(1), 70–100. doi:10.1177/003804070908200104
- Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review*, 94(4), 991–1013. doi:10.1257/0002828042002561
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018, May). *Foreign-born workers: Labor force characteristics [PDF]*. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/forbrn.pdf>
- Butcher, K. F. (1994). Black immigrants in the United States: A comparison with native blacks and other immigrants. *ILR Review*, 47(2), 265–284. doi:10.1177/001979399404700207
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2014). On the precipice of a “majority minority” America: Perceived status threat from the racial demographic shift affects White Americans’ political ideology. *Psychological Science*, 25, 1189–1197. doi:10.1177/0956797614527113
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2018). Hispanic population growth engenders conservative shift among non-Hispanic racial minorities. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9(4), 383–392. doi:10.1177/1948550617712029
- Danbold, F., & Huo, Y. J. (2015). No longer “All-American”? Whites’ defensive reactions to their numerical decline. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 6(2), 210–218.

- Dasgupta, N. (2004). Implicit ingroup favoritism, outgroup favoritism, and their behavioral manifestations. *Social Justice Research, 17*, 143–169. doi:10.1023/B:SORE.0000027407.70241.15
- Devaraj, S., Quigley, N. R., & Patel, P. C. (2018). The effects of skin tone, height, and gender on earnings. *PLoS One, 13* (1), e0190640. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0190640
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*(1), 5–18. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.56.1.5
- Devine, P. G., & Elliot, A. J. (1995). Are racial stereotypes really fading? The Princeton trilogy revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*(11), 1139–1150. doi:10.1177/01461672952111002
- Feagin, J. R. (2013). *The white racial frame: Centuries of racial framing and counter-framing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Goldsmith, A. H., Hamilton, D., & Darity, W. (2007). From dark to light: Skin color and wages among African-Americans. *Journal of Human Resources, 42*(4), 701–738. doi:10.3368/jhr.XLII.4.701
- Greer, C. M. (2013). *Black ethnics: Race, immigration, and the pursuit of the American dream*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, M. S., & Thomas, K. M. (2009). The hidden prejudice in selection: A research investigation on skin color bias. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(1), 134–168. doi:10.1111/jasp.2009.39.issue-1
- Hernandez, M., Avery, D. R., Volpone, S. D., & Kaiser, C. R. (2018). Bargaining while Black: The role of race in salary negotiations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 104*(4), 581–592.
- Hochschild, J. L., & Weaver, V. (2007). The skin color paradox and the American racial order. *Social Forces, 86*(2), 643–670. doi:10.1093/sf/86.2.643
- Jost, J. T. (2001). Outgroup favoritism and the theory of system justification: An experimental paradigm for investigating the effects of socioeconomic success on stereotype content. In G. Moskowitz (Ed.), *Cognitive social psychology: The Princeton symposium on the legacy and future of social cognition* (pp. 89–102). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Jurcevic, I., Shapiro, J. R., Trawalter, S., & Unzueta, M. M. (2019). *He said it not me: Whites use of minorities' negative evaluations to justify prejudice (Unpublished Manuscript)*.
- King, E. B., Mendoza, S. A., Madera, J. M., Hebl, M. R., & Knight, J. L. (2006). What's in a name? A multiracial investigation of the role of occupational stereotypes in selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36* (5), 1145–1159. doi:10.1111/jasp.2006.36.issue-5
- Macrae, C. N., Hewstone, M., & Griffiths, R. J. (1993). Processing load and memory for stereotype-based information. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 23*(1). doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420230107
- Maddox, K. B. (2004). Perspectives on racial phenotypicity bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 8*(4), 383–401. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0804\_4
- McClain, P. D., Carter, N. M., DeFrancesco Soto, V. M., Lyle, M. L., Grynawski, J. D., Nunnally, S. C., ... Cotton, K. D. (2006). Racial distancing in a southern city: Latino immigrants' views of Black Americans. *The Journal of Politics, 68*, 571–584. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00446.x
- McCleary-Gaddy, A. T., & Miller, C. T. (2018). Preference for second-generation African immigrants over native-born Black Americans: A college admission simulation. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 40*(1), 6–17. doi:10.1080/01973533.2017.1390751
- Nielson. (2015, September). *African-Americans are increasingly affluent, educated and diverse*. Retrieved from <https://www.nielson.com/us/en/insights/news/2015/african-americans-are-increasingly-affluent-educated-and-diverse.print.html>
- Oliver, M., & Shapiro, T. (2006). *Black wealth/white wealth: A new perspective on racial inequality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. (2002). Exploring the influence of decision makers' ethnicity and gender on actual promotions to top management. *Personnel Psychology, 55*, 397–419. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00115.x
- Quillian, L., Pager, D., Hexel, O., & Midtbøen, A. H. (2017). Meta-analysis of field experiments shows no change in racial discrimination in hiring over time. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114*(41), 10870–10875. doi:10.1073/pnas.1706255114
- Rauh, A. J. (2014). *Idleness convergence between Black Immigrants and Black Natives across and within generations (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL
- Richards, Z., & Hewstone, M. (2001). Subtyping and subgrouping: Processes for the prevention and promotion of stereotype change. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*(1), 52–73. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0501\_4
- Richeson, J. A., & Sommers, S. R. (2016). Toward a social psychology of race and race relations in the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology, 67*, 439–463. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115115
- Ruggles, S., Genadek, K., Goeken, R., Grover, J., & Sobek, M. (2017). *Integrated public use microdata series: Version 7.0*. Retrieved from <https://www.ipums.org/doi/D010.V7.0.shtml>
- Salter, P. S., & Haugen, A. D. (2017). Critical race studies in psychology. In G. Brendan (Ed.), *The Palgrave handbook of critical social psychology* (pp. 123–145). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sherman, J. W., & Frost, L. A. (2000). On the encoding of stereotype-relevant information under cognitive load. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(1), 26–34. doi:10.1177/0146167200261003
- Stone, D. L., & Daedrick, D. L. (2015). Challenges and opportunities affecting human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review, 25*, 139–145. doi:10.1016/j.hrmmr.2015.01.003

- Ukpokodu, O. N. (2017). African immigrants, the “new model minority”: Examining the reality in U.S. k-12 schools. *The Urban Review, 50*, 1–28.
- Waldinger, R. (1997). Black/immigrant competition re-assessed: New evidence from Los Angeles. *Sociological Perspectives, 40*, 365–386. doi:10.2307/1389448
- Wigboldus, D. H., Sherman, J. W., Franzese, H. L., & Knippenberg, A. V. (2004). Capacity and comprehension: Spontaneous stereotyping under cognitive load. *Social Cognition, 22*(3), 292–309. doi:10.1521/soco.22.3.292.35967
- Wilson, V., & Rogers, W. R. (2016, September). *Economic policy institute: Black-white wage gaps expand with rising wage inequality [PDF]*. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/files/pdf/101972.pdf>
- Zou, L. X., & Cheryan, S. (2017). Two axes of subordination:: A new model of racial position. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 112*(5), 696–717. doi:10.1037/pspa0000080