

# ANTI-SEMITISM IN ORGANIZATIONS AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES: Towards A Theory of Discrimination in Work Settings

---

Abraham K. Korman  
*Baruch College, CUNY*

Discriminatory actions in work settings on the basis of sex, race religion, ethnic group, age, and physical disability have come under great condemnation during the past two decades. Individually and collectively, publicly and privately, we have engaged in major efforts to eliminate discrimination in employment-related decisions. Yet, despite such efforts and such concerns, discrimination continues to remain a major dilemma for our society and efforts aimed at its elimination need to continue.

Within this context it would appear that one necessary step towards the development of meaningful theories of work-related discrimination and effective discrimination-reducing interventions is a clearer understanding of those conditions under which discrimination is noticed, attended to, and made part of conscious everyday life, individually and collectively. Unnoticed acts are far less likely to be responded to, whether these acts involve discrimination or other forms of significant human activity. Our concern in this paper, therefore, is to contribute to a greater theoretical understanding of the conditions under which discrimination in work settings might be attended to and, conversely, the conditions under which such attention might not occur. In developing our framework we use as our case illustration and discuss in Parts I & II the phenomenon of anti-Semitism in work settings, a type of

discrimination which, we will see, appears to be quite common in organizational life but which has rarely been studied by organizational behavioral scientists. In an attempt to understand the reasons for this lack of attention, we propose a number of hypotheses about the conditions under which discrimination comes to be noticed. These hypotheses may be of value in understanding other types of organizational discrimination as well as anti-Semitism.

A second rationale for this paper is to bring to the attention of those in the organizational behavioral sciences evidence suggesting what may be a serious form of discrimination in the work setting, and to encourage further investigation as to the extent of this discrimination, its possible causes, its effects and the fruitfulness of possible attempts at change.

## I. ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE WORK SETTING: A RESEARCH REVIEW

In this section we review research studies relating to workplace anti-Semitism in such areas as recruiting, selection, opportunities for upward mobility, and governmental enforcement of civil-rights legislation.

In this discussion, we will define an act as discrimination if such an act makes it less likely an individual will be hired, if he/she is less likely to be promoted, if he/she is less likely to be rewarded, if he/she is more likely to be laid off, and if he/she is less likely to be provided with the opportunity for upward mobility. Such discrimination is anti-Semitism if a personnel decision takes account of the fact that the person is Jewish in such a way that negative consequences for the individual result. On the other hand, if the reason for any specific personnel action is based on the same factors for a member of the Jewish faith as it is for others, then there is no discrimination. (It is, of course, conceivable that a personnel decision may take account of the individual's Jewishness but in a positive direction. Such patterns are far less common in this country but not unknown. They are no more defensible than anti-Semitism and would best be described by such terms as anti-Catholicism, anti-Protestantism or anti-Moslem, depending on the other individuals involved. Since our focus in this paper is on anti-Semitism, we will not be concerning ourselves any further with the latter types of discrimination except to note their existence and their equal undesirability.)

It may be noted that two types of data are not included in this

review. One set of such data is the rather voluminous amount of anecdotal evidence concerning this topic which exists in journalistic accounts, biographies, reports of personal experiences and the like. While rich in emotional significance, such data are difficult to include in reviews of this nature because of the uncontrolled conditions under which they have been collected and their sometimes questionable reliability. Similarly, also missing here are internal organizational surveys. Due to the sensitive nature of the material, it has been extremely difficult to obtain copies of these reports (to the extent that they exist).

Despite these limitations, however, there is considerable evidence in the published research to justify the conclusion that Jews have been subject to a wide range of employment-related decisions that, while perhaps not always intended, have clearly been anti-Semitic in impact. In the following we review this research.

### *(A) Corporate Recruiting Practices*

There is considerable evidence that corporate recruiting, for at least a decade and perhaps longer, has involved practices that have made it less likely that Jews will be selected for employment. Furthermore, this conclusion also appears warranted even when such possible confounding factors as school size and urban setting are controlled for.

In research conducted on recruiting patterns of large corporations during the 1970's, Slavin and Pradt (1982) provide considerable evidence for this conclusion among a number of industries and companies. The procedure they used was straightforward. Step One was to determine the proportion of Jewish undergraduates in the student body of a college. Step Two was to then ascertain the average number of recruiting visits to each college during the years 1972-1974 by employers. Table One provides a summary and integration of some of their major findings.

The implications of Table One seem clear: as the proportion of Jews in an undergraduate student body increases, the number of recruiting visits goes down. Assuming an equally likely model of selection as far as population characteristics are concerned (which is too optimistic, as we will see), the likelihood of Jews being hired by these employers will be decreased by the proportionate decline in recruiting visits.

Might these results be accounted for by other factors, factors

**Table One: Average No. of Recruiting Visits Compared to Percentage of Jewish Undergraduate Students (1972-1974)**

Type of Employer	% of Jewish Undergrads				
	10	10-19	20-29	30-39	40
Fortune 100	20	22	20	14	4
Fortune 101-500	20	22	16	9	4
Insurance	11	10	8	9	8
Banking	7	6	10	5	4
Utilities-Top 50	2	4	2	1	1

(Source: Slavin and Pradt, 1982)

which are confounded with the proportion of Jewish students? Three possible confounding variables are size, type of school, and the location of the school. Thus, it may be that Jews are more likely to be found at small schools or in liberal-arts institutions and that corporate recruiters prefer large institutions which have business and engineering components. Similarly, it may also be that corporate recruiters prefer to seek applicants from less urban institutions while Jewish students attend schools in more urban settings. Each or all of these possible confounding variables might account for the results of Table One without necessarily attributing anti-Semitic intent to the decision-makers involved.

There is research evidence in the work of Slavin and Pradt and others that none of these factors can account for the findings of Table One. Slavin and Pradt broke down their findings according to college/university size (i.e., below 5,000 students, 5,000-10,000 and 10,000 students or more) and found similar patterns for each. For each type of school, as the proportion of Jews in the student body increased, the number of recruiting visits declined (cf. Tables IIa, IIb, and IIc in Slavin and Pradt (1982)). School size, therefore, cannot account for the findings shown in Table One.

Similarly, neither can the setting of the school account for these results. In their summaries of recruiting visits to colleges in the New York area which were, at the time, more than 30 percent Jewish and those which were less than 30 percent Jewish, data rejecting such a hypothesis were clearly apparent. The contrasts were striking and occurred across different industries, as Table 2 indicates.

There is also evidence that school type cannot account for the

**Table Two: Recruiting Visits of Companies in  
New York Area – 1972-1973**

Type of Company	Schools With Enrollments of:	
	More Than 30% Jewish	Less Than 30% Jewish
Oil	1	52
Oil	1	52
Equipment	1	51
Food	1	44
Space	3	61
Copper	1	35
Technology	1	32
Oil	1	28
Steel	1	28
Construction	0	22
Retailing	2	40
Technology	0	20
Chemical	4	60
Retailing	4	60
Chemical	1	22
Paper	1	19

(Source: Slavin and Pradt, 1982)

findings of Tables One and Two and that similar conclusions to those made by Slavin and Pradt are still warranted a decade later in research conducted by the author during the academic year 1984-1985. In this study, not yet completed, 50 colleges and universities were chosen at random from a list of schools in a college entrance guide and then ranked according to percentage of Jewish undergraduates (B'nai Brith 1985). These were then compared to the number of corporate interviews at these schools during either 1983, 1984, or 1985, depending on the information supplied by the school. Among the results were the following: 1) For two prestigious private Southern universities of similar size and characteristics, the school with close to a majority of Jewish undergraduates reported only a third the number of Fortune 100 corporate recruiters as did institution with a student body that was 5 percent Jewish; 2) A private institution in the Northeast of excellent academic reputation and with a majority of Jewish undergraduates reported recruiting visits from two Fortune 100 companies as compared to 71 such recruiting visits in similar areas

reported by a famous Midwestern institution whose Jewish undergraduates made up less than 1 percent of the student body, and which had lower academic standards; and 3) the latter Midwestern school also reported recruiting visits from the six largest New York commercial banks and the two largest utilities, none of whom visited the geographically closer school in the Northeast with a majority of Jewish undergraduates.

Similar results were found in an examination of the employment practices of the six major oil-industry firms in 1978 by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith (Gissen, 1978). This study is of particular relevance to us here because of the size of the companies involved (they are among our largest employers) and also because a number of questions were examined that we will be referring to elsewhere in this paper. Of particular relevance to us here is that the study found that, unlike the situation for other minority groups, there was not a single instance of recruitment advertising by any oil company in any English-language Jewish newspaper. Similarly, an examination of Jewish employment referral sources revealed only one case of an oil company's attempt at recruitment. These recruiting figures are quite similar to the data gathered for the same industry by Slavin and Pradt, as shown in Table 3.

**Table Three: Recruiting Patterns of Companies  
in Oil and Related Industries  
(1972-74)**

Type of Company	No. of Recruiting Visits Made to Colleges with 30% or more Jewish Undergraduates Compared to Total No. of Visits		
Well and Rigging	0	of	48
Oil	0	of	38
Oil	0	of	25
Oil	0	of	25
Oil	0	of	22
Oil	0	of	14
Oil	0	of	14
Oil	1	of	52
Machinery	1	of	51
Oil	1	of	22

(Source: Slavin and Pradt, 1982)

### *(B) Selection Ratios In Corporate Recruiting*

While recruiting studies provide useful evidence concerning the types of labor pools sought by corporations, such data to leave open the possibility that selection ratios might still be the same for Jewish and non-Jewish applicant groups whatever the relative size of each group. In other words, since there are Jews at schools which have few Jewish students and there are non-Jews at schools which have large numbers of Jewish students, a between-school analysis of the type used in the recruiting studies cited leaves open the possibility that non-discriminatory hiring patterns might still be used by potential employers when visiting each college or university. However, another study reported by Slavin and Pradt (1982) suggests that this has not been the case. Utilizing a study of 67 college alumni newsletters during 1974-1975 and the corporate identifications the alumni therein indicated, and using the same types of industry and corporate breakdowns followed in their recruiting research, these authors reported the following findings: 1) Corporate employment of alumni from colleges with low Jewish enrollments was consistently higher than corporate employment of alumni from colleges with high levels of Jewish enrollment; 2) The discrepancies in levels of employment between the two types of colleges became even greater when non-Jewish alumni from colleges with high levels of Jewish enrollment and Jewish alumni from colleges with high levels of non-Jewish enrollment were eliminated from consideration. The development of "clear non-Jewish" and "clear Jewish" college groups made the lower levels of employment from "Jewish" colleges in the corporate setting even clearer and stronger; 3) Similarly, when Jewish and non-Jewish graduates from the same college were compared, the discrepancies in employment patterns were even greater. For example, in a college which was at the time of the study 47 percent Jewish, it was found that of 30 graduates employed by the top 100 of the Fortune 500 companies, only three were Jewish (instead of the fourteen that might have been expected from an equal-likelihood selection model).

### *(C) Managerial/Executive Selection and Upward Corporate Mobility*

There is considerable evidence to indicate that Jews are less likely to be selected for the higher-levels of American corporations than would be indicated by their general level of education and their

frequency in the population from which managers and executives are normally drawn,—the population of American college graduates. Thus, while Jews constitute approximately 2½–3 percent of the American population, they are almost 10 percent of college-graduates (Cohen, 1983; Slavin and Pradt, 1982). Since managers of larger corporations rarely come from non-college backgrounds, it is this latter figure that should be kept in mind in evaluating the data we shall present from the four studies in the literature of relevance to this question.

(1) A Study of Corporate Officers and Senior Managers—

Using a recent publication entitled *The Corporate 1000* (Calabrese, 1985) which “identifies those who are responsible for leading our nation’s corporations” by listing the names of the corporate officers and senior managers for each company as a data base, the author estimated the absolute number of, and the percentage of, Jewish managers in this “successful” class for each company by categorizing as Jewish those managers whose names clearly indicated Jewish origin. While this approach clearly leaves some possibility for error, there is reason to believe that such effects are minimal given their visibility as distinctive Jewish names. In addition, there is evidence for the construct validity of the technique in that it generates results similar to those obtained with other methods of assessment when these alternatives are available. For example, if we consider the oil industry’s relationships with the Arab world, we would expect few Jews to be among the corporate officers or senior managers in these firms. With the technique used here, it was found that of ten oil firms examined, nine had no Jewish names listed in the corporate officer/senior manager category and the one remaining firm had one. On the other hand, retailing in America has a long tradition of Jewish contribution, a tradition with which our findings are consistent. Of thirteen retailing firms assessed in the *Corporate 1000* (not all Fortune 100), nine had at least three individuals with Jewish names in the corporate officer/senior manager category and some companies had considerably more.

For purposes of this analysis, companies were categorized into 32 industries and the estimated percentage of Jewish managers for each company determined and averaged to provide an industry figure. Of the 32 industries, nine were estimated to have a percentage of Jewish employment of 8 percent or greater. In contrast to this, eighteen industries showed a figure of 5 percent or less, with this latter group comprising by far our larger em-

ployers (petroleum refining, utilities, chemicals, food, commercial banking, etc.). A breakdown of these data is provided in Table 4.

(2) A Study of "Headhunters" –

"Headhunters," or executive recruiters, are at the cutting edge of the employment of top-level managers and executives. Hence Slavin and Pradt (1982)'s report of considerable evidence of anti-Semitism in a survey of "headhunters" is of relevance here. However, we need to note that a major problem with this particular study is that they only obtained 124 responses out of a potential sample of 373. Hence, we do not know the representativeness of the firms that responded. Keeping this weakness of the study in mind, their results were as follows:

1) 18 recruiters (of 124) stated they had received discriminatory orders during the past five years;

2) Eight recruiters said that employers still used coding systems to distinguish between WASPs, Catholics, Jews and Blacks;

3) 16 said they receive job orders specifically requesting a "non-Jew";

4) 20 said they would not send a Jewish applicant to some of the firms they work with, and

5) 27 said Jews were less likely than non-Jews to obtain jobs at banks, 18 said they were less likely to obtain jobs at large industrial companies, and 23 said they were less likely to be hired by firms in the oil industry.

(3) Executive Level Placement and the Possibilities of Upward Mobility in the Oil Industry –

In the study of the oil-industry firms by the ADL cited earlier in this paper, information was also gathered concerning the actual frequency of Jews in executive level positions in the industry and the possibility of future upward mobility among those currently employed. It was found that of the 300 top job-holders in the industry, only five were Jewish (or approximately 1.6 percent). Similarly, interviews with Jewish employees of the oil firms revealed little hope for future promotion (while at the same time company recruitment materials were stressing advancement possibilities for other minorities and women).

(4) A Study of Harvard MBA Graduates –

Although the research lacks quantitative analysis in important areas, a recent study by Zewigenhaft (1982) of Jewish and non-Jewish graduates of the Harvard Business School is of relevance here.

**Table Four**  
**Jewish Employment at the Senior Executive**  
**Level in Major Industries**

Industry	Companies	(Estimated) % of Senior Jewish Executives	
		Ratio	%
PETROLEUM REFINING	9	2/285	.7%
UTILITIES	15	8/353	2.1%
TRANSPORTATION	9	6/259	2.3%
CHEMICALS	9	7/299	2.3%
FOOD	9	9/274	3.3%
GLASS, BUILDING MATERIALS	10	11/310	3.5%
COMMERCIAL BANKING	10	10/284	3.5%
MINING, CRUDE-OIL PRODUCTION	10	9/232	3.9%
TOBACCO	4	5/124	4.0%
TOYS, SPORTING GOODS	4	5/124	4.0%
LIFE INSURANCE	9	14/332	4.2%
PRECISION INSTRUMENTS	10	12/302	4.3%
RUBBER AND PLASTIC	10	9/208	4.3%
BEVERAGES	9	11/254	4.3%
MOTOR VEHICLES AND PARTS	10	14/321	4.4%
METAL MANUFACTURING	10	8/178	4.5%
SHIPBUILDING, RAILROAD AND TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT	6	7/142	4.9%
ELECTRONICS APPLIANCES	10	18/363	5.0%
OFFICE EQUIPMENT AND COM- PUTERS	10	17/332	5.1%
FOREST PRODUCTS	10	16/309	5.2%
METAL PRODUCTS	10	17/303	5.6%
INDUSTRIAL, FARM EQUIPMENT	10	14/216	6.5%
PHARMACEUTICALS	10	10/248	6.5%
AEROSPACE	9	24/304	7.8%
SOAPS, COSMETICS	9	21/266	7.9%
DIVERSIFIED SERVICES	10	22/266	8.3%
DIVERSIFIED FINANCIAL	10	28/321	8.7%
PUBLISHING, PRINTING	10	31/325	9.5%
TEXTILES, VINYL FLOORING	10	19/192	9.9%
RETAILING CHAINS	13	82/412	19.9%
SUPERMARKET CHAINS	10	67/332	20.2%
APPAREL	10	51/191	26.7%

He found, for example, that the only two of 35 non-Jewish male MBA graduates saw evidence of anti-Jewish discrimination in the executive-managerial world while the female non-Jewish graduates saw much more anti-Semitism (although no exact figures are provided in the report). Reactions among the Jewish graduates surveyed were more mixed. Some saw problems and some did not. Most of them had not seen great difficulties thus far but they were still relatively young and some, particularly the Jewish women graduates, felt it would be more of a problem as they advanced in their careers. However, at the same time, the latter group felt that being a women had, thus far been more of a problem for them than being Jewish. There was also a feeling among the Jewish graduates that outward signs of Jewish observance could be a problem (such as wearing a skull-cap). Overall, these Jewish MBA's felt that things had improved for Jews in the corporate world although, at the same time, they were aware that there were still pockets of strong anti-Jewish feeling.

#### *(D) The Lack of Access to Civil-Rights Protection*

Overall, with a few exceptions, Federal, state, or local government policies and practices in the area of employment and, in particular, equal-opportunity employment may have hurt Jews far more than they have helped even though overt discriminatory intent may not have been the goal of such actions. There are two major reasons why such effects may have occurred. The first is that Jews are not now and have not been included in the past as a protected minority group under our EEO laws and directives even though Jews constitute between 2½-3 percent of our population. In addition, most of our governmental agencies, Federal and local (at least until the Reagan administration), and those to whom they have let government contracts, have routinely supported affirmative-action programs without examining their possible impact on Jewish employment. This has occurred despite the evidence that there appears to be considerable discrimination against Jews in large segments of our work environment (as this paper indicates) and even though, legally, according to the provisions of Executive Order 11246 (as amended) and the implementing rules and regulations of this Executive Order as outlined in Chapter 60 of Title 41, Code of Federal Regulations (41CFR 60), government agencies and their contractors are required to supply evidence and develop programs showing non-discriminatory

hiring practices in the case of religion as well as for other minority groups. In the overwhelming majority of cases, however, religious discrimination has been ignored and Jews have continued to be included in the group to be "discriminated against" in an affirmative-action sense, despite the considerable evidence that they are also discriminated against in the real-world employment setting. Thus, as a result of the manner in which affirmative-action (and EEO) policies have been implemented, Jews have found themselves discriminated against not only by large numbers of employers, private and public, but also by the manner in which Federal policies designed to help minorities have been implemented.

Some illustrations of how these policies have been implemented and their impact comes from the ADL study of the oil industry cited earlier. Among their findings were that virtually all the companies studied were able to show considerable increases in their employment of minority and women's groups during the previous decade but no such pattern was discernible for Jews nor were Jews included in their positive action employment programs. Similarly, the research team also found that the government had continually failed to enforce 41CFR60, the Federal regulation that forbids religious discrimination among Federal contractors (which includes virtually all oil companies), a failure admitted to by the head of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (pg. 6).

## SUMMARY

There are several methodological considerations that need to be considered in assessing the significance of the studies reviewed here. One such question has to do with the varying definitions of "Jewish" used by researchers. The data indicate, however, that regardless of the definition used, the results appear to be similar. For example, the studies conducted by Slavin and Pradt (1982) used a number of different methods ranging from name identification to informal contacts with Jewish corporate officers to self-identification to college enrollment data. However, regardless of the method used, the general trend of their results appeared to be the same. Similarly, the results of the author's study of the *Corporate 1000*, which used name identification, and the ADL study of the oil industry, which used interviews, records and on-site inspections, are also consistent with the general trend of the results of the other research reviewed, thus supporting the

lack of any specific method-linked limitation to the findings. To the contrary, the results appear to be similar throughout.

Of importance also (and suggesting directions to future research) is that we have little information about the actual decision-making processes in the research we have cited. Nearly all these studies have focused on quantitative indices such as recruitment patterns, selection likelihood and the level of Jewish employment at higher management levels, with little examination of the decision-making processes involved and the possible role of conscious intent to discriminate. Thus, while we have cited some evidence concerning the lack of viability of several alternative explanations, the possibility must remain open that other factors might have entered into the decisions involved in addition to, or instead of, the anti-Semitism hypothesis being proposed here.

Given such caveats, however, it would appear that the evidence justifies the conclusion that anti-Semitism was involved at least in part in the studies reviewed. Such an explanation would seem to be justified for integrating the similar patterns of results obtained, regardless of researcher, sample characteristics, research and method definitions and types of questions asked. Thus, while we have little knowledge of the processes involved and we cannot at this point attribute conscious intent to the parties involved, we must conclude that employment-related decisions having major anti-Semitic impact have been and continue to play a significant role in a significant number of American work organizations. In other words, the evidence seems to suggest a problem in discrimination. It is a problem which almost certainly does not occur in all settings and it may not even occur in most. However, it does seem to occur at significant levels in some significant areas of the work setting.

## *II. Organizational Behavioral-Science and Anti-Semitism in the Work Setting*

There has been little attention paid to possible anti-Semitic decision-making processes in the literature of organizational behavioral-science and human-resource management. Thus, *there has never been a single article on anti-Semitism in the work setting in any journal normally considered as part of the organizational behavioral-science literature* (e.g. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, Personnel Psychology, Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, The Academy of Management Journal* and

*The Academy of Management Review*). Similarly, the topic has not been discussed at any session at the Conventions of Div. 14 of the American Psychological Association and the Organizational Behavior Division of the Academy of Management. Anti-Semitism in the work setting has been a "non-topic" in the fullest sense of the word since the literature is absent of discussions of factors generating the types of anti-Semitic discriminatory recruiting and hiring patterns reviewed in Part I of this paper, and also absent of research on such topics as anti-Semitism among supervisors, among peers, and among subordinates, and of the possible impact of such attitudes on work behavior and effectiveness. Similarly, nowhere has there been any research study of the negative implications of affirmative-action programs for those who are already suffering from discrimination (although there has, of course, been extensive general discussions of the reverse discrimination aspects of affirmative-action). Also nowhere are there discussions of the negative implications of the "Einstein Syndrome," a term suggested by Slavin and Pradt (1982) for those organizational processes that pressure Jews into "brainy," organizationally powerless staff jobs even though they might want managerial careers. Similarly, there is little discussion of career planning implications when one is confronted with the type of anti-Semitism reviewed here. The topic appears to be non-existent in these contexts and it also has appeared to have been non-existent in the textbooks of organizational behavioral science and human-resource management (including my own) whether written by Jews or not.

There are only two reported studies in the behavioral sciences of factors influencing anti-Semitism in the work setting. Both were completed almost two decades ago and both were published by their respective university presses rather than in the journals of the field. While mainly of historical interest now, they will be described here in some detail in order to illustrate how factors influencing anti-Semitism in the work setting might be identified and to illustrate the possibilities for meaningful work of both a theoretical and administrative nature.

One of the two studies, that by Quinn and his co-workers (1968), is of interest because it supports a general situational hypothesis that anti-Semitic employment acts are a function of both personality factors and the degree of situational support for such acts, regardless of the characteristics of the individuals involved. The study itself is a questionnaire simulation study of

the role of anti-Semitism in the selection of candidates for managerial positions using a sample of managers drawn from a group of companies in the Cleveland-Akron area that enjoyed a reputation of being relatively "open" to Jews at the time. None of those in the study sample were more than two levels below the president and, as a group, they covered all or most of the functional areas of management. The findings of the research were as follows:

(1) Discriminatory attitudes and choices were clearly visible and influential; Depending on the situation presented and the actions requested, discriminatory choices against Jews ranged up to 39 percent of the sample;

(2) Discriminatory acts increased when there was perceived social support for the act (or lack of social or managerial disapproval); thus, discrimination against Jews increased a) if the manager knew few or any of his company's equal opportunity procedures, b) if the manager believed that the company paid only lip-service to equal opportunity policies, c) if the manager believed that others would be uncomfortable should there be too many Jews around and d) if there was any ambiguity at all about company attitudes toward anti-Semitism;

(3) If there was a discriminatory predisposition to begin with, then the effects of social supports for anti-Semitism were even greater in encouraging the anti-Semitic act than simply adding the two dispositions together. In other words, the effect of any social support permitting anti-Semitism was even greater if the individual had discriminatory views to begin with.

In the other study, that by Powell (1969), a questionnaire was administered to 239 executives which attempted to assess the degree to which they believed different types or religious membership helped or hindered one's managerial career. One set of findings illustrated clearly the difficulty of engaging in a managerial career successfully if one is Jewish by showing that between 62 percent and 75 percent of the managers (depending on educational level) felt that being Jewish hinders one in a managerial career while 4 percent to 18 percent said it helped. (As a base of comparison, these figures were almost reversed when the individuals were asked to evaluate the degree to which being Protestant helped or hurt while the results for being Catholic were more positive than negative.) Also important is that these views of the negative implications of being Jewish if one wanted a managerial career were fairly similar across respondents of different religions and age as were the perceived benefits of being Protestant and

(less so) Catholic. However, there were some differences between the different income groups. For example, of those managers with high income for the time (greater than \$25,000 a year), almost 85 percent viewed being Jewish as a hindrance while none viewed it as a help. On the other hand, for those at lower income levels (below \$16,000 a year) almost 67 percent viewed being Jewish as a hindrance while 15 percent viewed it as an aid.

Another important finding concerned the reasons given for the reluctance to hire Jews as managers. These reflected such concerns as the (believed) social unacceptability of Jews and the general mistrust of Jews as an "outgroup." It is interesting to note, therefore, that both the Powell study and Quinn studies suggest processes generating anti-Semitism in the work setting which reflect factors that are situational or social in character. Yet, despite the fact that such situational hypotheses are quite popular in social psychological research, this work has been little used in studying anti-Semitism in the work setting.

### *III. On the Lack of Attention to Discrimination: Suggested Theoretical Processes*

The evidence suggests a significant discrepancy between the degree of anti-Semitism in work organizations and the lack of attention to same by organizational behavioral science. Why has there been a lack of attention? Placed in a more general context, this question suggests that we need to inquire as to the conditions under which any highly educated group with high socio-economic standing and subscribing to generally strong norms against discrimination might be likely to not attend to any particular class of discriminatory actions.

We suggest three factors which may contribute to such lack of attention. These are: A) *"Model" Effects*—One is less likely to pay attention if the "model" to whom one looks for guidance exhibits a lack of attention; B) *Lack of Demand for Attention*—One is less likely to pay attention if the group being discriminated against has not or is not currently demanding that attention be paid to its problems; C) *Perceived Lack of Economic Justification*—One is less likely to pay attention if one believes, whether justified or not, that there is less economic justification to pay attention to that group. In the following we show how each of these factors may have been operative in generating a lack of attention in the fields of Organizational Behavior and Human

Resource Management to anti-Semitism in the work setting and why, given the appropriate conditions, these factors might be similarly important in generating a lack of attention to the discrimination problems of other groups.

(A) Model Effects –

The fields of OB and HRM, like most fields of human endeavor, do not exist in a vacuum independent of the influence of others. They draw their inspiration and their guidance from other fields, fields which provide them with ideas, stimulation and appropriate modes for behavior, for thinking and for research. There is considerable evidence that the sources to whom the fields of OB and HRM turn for guidance and who serve as “models” for them have not attended to the problems of anti-Semitism in the work setting or anywhere else for that matter. One result of this has been the situation we have described in Part II, a situation which is predictable considering the significance which “models” typically have on the behavior of those who attend to them (Brief and Motwidiio, 1985).

One illustration of this “model effect” is the record of psychology, the theoretical discipline which underlies much of the field of organizational behavioral science, which frequently serves as a model in both a conceptual and methodological sense, and which has, since World War II, paid little attention to anti-Semitism either here in the U.S. or elsewhere. To illustrate, a recent paper has shown that analysis or even mention of the Holocaust as an act of aggression and hostility is virtually non-existent in psychological books on these topics (Korman and Locke, 1985). Similarly, discussions of anti-Semitism have for the most part been absent from texts on social psychology, general psychology and from the various publications in the so-called “social problems” area. For example, the *Journal of Social Issues*, the official publication of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (a division of the APA) has had over 80 editions on various areas of social concern during the last two decades. However, there has not been a single issue on anti-Semitism. Further supporting this argument is that there has been no major research program on anti-Semitism in the discipline of psychology since the closing days of World War II, when a group of researchers at the University of California at Berkeley developed the concept of the “Authoritarian Personality” as a mechanism for understanding the growth and acceptance of anti-Semitism. Stimulated, of course, by the Nazi nightmare in Europe, this research has been cited since that

time as an explanation for anti-Semitism both here and in Europe and as also being responsible for the rise of such "isms" as Nazism, Fascism, and, maybe, (depending on the political orientation of the researcher) Communism. Whether a study performed in California in the mid-1940's deserves such attribution is, of course, questionable. Yet, questionable or not, it has remained as the major contribution by the discipline of psychology to the study of anti-Semitism. Considering such a model, it is perhaps not surprising that fields such as the organizational behavioral sciences and human-resource management have not paid attention to the problems of anti-Semitism in the work setting.

Similarly, there have been other illustrations of a lack of attention to anti-Semitism during these decades among others of our major social institutions which we may reasonably infer to have impact on and serve as "models" for the activities of human resource managers and the field of organizational behavioral science. I refer here to such institutions as the mass media and leaders in the civil-rights movement, few of whom have paid significant attention to such matters as the negative implications of affirmative action for Jewish employment, discrimination in various industries and the prevalence of anti-Semitic actions in the U.N. and elsewhere (c.f. Korman, in preparation).

(B) Lack of Demand for Attention—

It is important to realize that there has been a virtually total lack of interest in anti-Semitism by the major civil-rights groups in this country, groups which have during the past two decades succeeded in generating a virtual revolution in increasing the hiring, training and development of the so-called "protected groups" under EEO; Blacks, Hispanics and women. Strengthening this lack of concern even further, there has been the "affirmative-action" controversy, a controversy which has seen most civil-rights groups and their political/legislative/media supporters take a very "pro" affirmative-action stance while some Jewish groups (by no means all) have been virtually alone in their public opposition to affirmative-action quotas or goals.

It also needs to be noted that, with the exception of the affirmative-action controversy, there has been little or no attention paid to work-related anti-Semitism by the various agencies and organizations making up the organized Jewish community. No group now exists which devotes a major effort to dealing with work-related anti-Semitism, there have been no conferences or meetings on the topic, and there have been few publications

devoted to increasing the work opportunities of members of the Jewish community. In addition, some members of the Jewish community also appear to have devoted more of their effort to increasing the work opportunities of members of other groups rather than their own.

*(C) Perceived Lack of Economic Need—*

The significance of this factor stems from the importance of economic or financial measures in our society as mechanisms for self-and-other evaluations and the lack of alternative measures for assessing worth even when one suspects that that the financial measure is unsatisfactory (Korman, 1985). In other words, “why be concerned if the person has money, even it is unfair that he or she is being discriminated against?”

This attitude would appear to have implications on several counts. One clear implication would be that it might lead one who is socially conscious to not attend to direct acts of discrimination since, after all, the acts are being directed against “rich people” and rich people have “so much.” Under such conditions, why be alert to possible acts of discrimination?

It is also conceivable that, perhaps at a less overt level, discriminating acts against the “rich” are less likely to be attended to since, at least in the eyes of some, all such acts do is restore “equity” between the rich and poor. In an ostensibly egalitarian society such as ours, discrepancies in outcomes between people (such as attained income levels) are viewed by some as immoral, unjustified and perhaps the result of illegal, discriminatory, and unfair situations to begin with (even if there is little evidence to justify such views). Hence, discriminatory acts against those supposedly “favored” to begin with are less attended to. One illustration of this line of thinking has been the arguments used to justify affirmative-action goals and quotas by its proponents even though there is recognition by at least some of these individuals that reverse discrimination is intrinsic to the process.

It might be noted, incidentally, that Jews’ supposed lack of economic need is for the most part an inaccurate perception of the actual economic status of American Jews. Recent data indicate that while it is true that American Jews have an average income level above the national norm, large numbers are considerably below the median. For example, 40 percent in Los Angeles earn below \$15,000 a year and 20 percent are below the poverty line

(Waxman, 1983, p. 4. 147) and in the New York City borough of Brooklyn with a large Jewish population, 48 percent are below the national median and 20 percent of the families *below* \$10,000 a year (Ritterband and Cohen, 1984). However, such data tend to be ignored or skipped over (c.f. Silberman, 1985) even though they would help public perceptions to come into line with reality.

#### *IV. Towards A Theoretical Synthesis*

Of theoretical interest and potential value for directing future research is the question of whether each of the three factors that apparently generate a lack of interest in workplace anti-Semitism might themselves be a function of other underlying constructs which might serve as integrating theoretical mechanisms. While such discussion must, of necessity, be speculative at this time since more empirical research is needed as to the value of the three factors we have discussed, the suggestion of potential synthesizing constructs may nevertheless be of value for research directions and for, perhaps, suggesting other work not specifically pointed to here. For these reasons, such proposals will be made here.

One direction for a possible theoretical synthesis is suggested by the Powell (1969) study discussed earlier in this paper and also by the related work of Daniels and Kitano (1970). Both studies focus on the "outsider" status of American Jews and propose such "outsider" status as a rationale for the assignment of lower-level standing to such individuals and groups as being more appropriate to them. It is suggested by the latter that when this assignment is accepted by the majority (or "insider" non-Jewish group members) and also by the "outsider" (or Jewish group members), or at least a significant portion of each, both groups' behavior may reflect a lack of concern with, or attention to, discrimination. Thus, if we assume that individuals will be motivated to attain outcomes for themselves and for others which are consistent with these assigned status levels, we may then derive a number of predictions consistent with the three explanatory factors we have presented earlier as generating a lack of attention to anti-Semitism in the work setting.

Evidence for the latter assumptions may be seen in the research of Kipnis (1972) and Walster and Walster (1979). Thus, the former's studies of power-corruption suggest that the majority, or insider-group, will be uninterested in, and thus less attentive to, information reporting discrimination against minority

groups. The need to respond to such information by helping the minority group might threaten their higher social position. Is it not a perversion of social science methods to attempt to reduce a competing political position into a pathology object of study? On the other hand, the work of Walster and Walster (1979), on equity motivation as a factor influencing positive or negative judgments about others, provides a reason for why those in the minority (or out-group) might be willing to engage in self-deprecating behaviors, including not being attentive to and overlooking actions suggesting discrimination against one's own group.

Consistent with this research, we would suggest that both Jewish and non-Jewish psychologists would show a lack of attention to anti-Semitism in the work setting since to do would upset the belief system proposed by Daniels and Kitano that "outsiders" (or at least those who identify as such) deserve less than "insiders" and the Jewish "outsider" might be already too close to the "insider" in an occupational sense to encourage any further movement or change. It is suggested here that psychology's role as a passageway into a prestigious American occupation might have generated an extreme sense of occupational identification in members of the American Jewish community who were already under strong norms of assimilation and thus generated a reluctance to question (whether rightly or wrongly) the perceived norms in the community concerning appropriate financial/success criterion standings for those in "insider/outsiders" groups. These hypotheses would suggest the lack of interest in anti-Semitism we have noted in the American psychological community, and the reasons it has served as the model that it has.

Similarly, the proposed significance of majority (in-group) and minority (out-group) self-and-other perceptions and the perceived higher status and desirability status of the majority as opposed to the minority group in the views of *both* groups might also suggest why members of both the majority and minority communities might not complain about anti-Semitism in the work setting, again for the reasons suggested by Kipnis and Walster and Walster. Similarly, it might be noted that the same processes might account for the rapid growth in recent years of the "new anti-Semitism" of lack of concern, lack of interest, and lack of acceptance of the rights of Jews as being on an equal basis to that of other groups (Perlmutter and Perlmutter 1982).

In addition, the same theoretical processes proposed by Kipnis and by Walster and Walster may also account for the

overlooking of discrimination in the interest of equity, particularly when such desire for equity is considered in conjunction with the continuing growth in American life in recent years of an overriding belief in egalitarian universalism, which has led to the valuing of equality of outcome for all groups regardless of equality of input (c.f. Korman and Locke, 1985). Thus, if one group has begun to be perceived as having more than other groups with which it is compared in being "outsiders" in American life, (a condition which might describe the situation of Jews, a minority outsider group in the same way that Black or Hispanic Americans might be), then processes may be set in motion which are designed to reduce the financial and/or employment standing of Jews compared to other minority groups and concomittant increases in the rewards of these others. One of the ways to do this, of course, is to overlook discrimination against the group that may already be receiving "too much," according to this way of thinking.

However, despite what appears to be some logic to this attempt at theoretical synthesis and integration, we hasten to add that these proposals must be considered to be nothing more than speculation at this time. Much more research and theory will be needed before we will be able to make assertions of any nature with any degree of empirically based confidence. Perhaps of greatest significance is the need to explain the lack of concern for anti-Semitism in general among members of the psychological community and the overall lack of interest in problem of anti-Semitism in the work setting. Most puzzling of all is that both the psychological community as a whole, both Jewish and non-Jewish, and the general Jewish community as a whole have been noted as greatly concerned with problems of racial, sexual and other forms of discrimination and both have long, proud records in these areas. The synthesis proposed here is one attempt to explain this apparent paradox but its empirical support at this time rests mostly on inferences from experimental laboratory studies which, while useful, are clearly not sufficient. We clearly need more direct research on why groups, whether Jews or any other groups, appear to not attend to their own group needs. The factors and integrative framework suggested here provide one possible direction for further research but more are clearly needed.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brief, A. P. and S. J. Motowidlio (1985). *Prosocial Organizational Behaviors*. Unpublished manuscript, New York University.

- Calabrese, M. (Ed.) (1985). *The Corporate 1000*. Washington, D.C.: Washington Monitor, Inc.
- Cohen, S. M. (1983). *American Modernity and Jewish Identity*. New York: Tavistock Publications.
- Daniels, R. and H. L. Kitano (1970). *American Racism: Explorations on the Nature of Racism*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Ehrlich, H. J. (1973). *The Social Psychology of Prejudice*. New York: Wiley.
- Gissen, J. (1978). Rights: A Study of Jewish Employment Problems in the Big Six Oil Company Headquarters. Vol. 9, No. 1. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith.
- Jewish Life on Campus* (1985). Washington, D.C.: B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation, 1985.
- Kipnis, D. (1972). Does Power Corrupt? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 24, 37-41.
- Korman, A. (1971). *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. Chapt. Five.
- Korman, A. *Anti-Semitism in the Work Setting*. Manuscript in Preparation.
- Korman, A. and E. A. Locke (1985). Dysfunctions of the Benign Model of Motivation: On the Evasion of Evil in Psychological Theory. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Lipstadt, D., R. Pruitt and Woocker, J. (1984). "What They Think." *Moment*, Vol. 9, 13-17.
- Perlmutter, N. and R. A. Perlmutter (1982). *The Real Anti-Semitism in American*. New York: Arbor House.
- Powell, R. M. (1969). *Race, Religion and the Promotion of the American Executive*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press.
- Quinn, R. P., R. K. Kalin, J. M. Tabor and L. K. Gordon (1968). *The Chosen Few: A Study of Discrimination in Executive Selection*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research.
- Ritterband, P. and S. M. Cohen (1983). The Social Characteristics of the New York Area Jewish Community, 1981. In Himmelfarb, M. and D. Singer (Eds.), *American Jewish Yearbook*, 1984, Vol. 84, New York: American Jewish Committee, 1983.
- Silberman, C. (1985). *A Certain People*. New York: Summit Books.
- Slavin, S. L. and M. A. Pradt (1982). *The Einstein Syndrome: Corporate Anti-Semitism in American Today*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Volkman, E. (1982). *A Legacy of Hate: Anti-Semitism in America*. New York: Franklin Watts.
- Walster, E. and G. W. Walster. (1979). Interpersonal Attraction. In Seidenberg, B. and Snadowsky, A. (Eds.) *Social Psychology: An Introduction*. New York: Free Press. 279-308.
- Waxman, C. (1983). *America's Jews in Transition*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple U. Press.