International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 2, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
10.5281/zenodo.3537908

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK ABOUT TOKENISM PHENOMENON IN ORGANIZATIONS

Benan KURT YILMAZ[1]
Olca SÜRGEVİL DALKILIÇ[2]

Received: 13.09.2019, Accepted: 09.11.2019

Abstract

In this study, it is aimed to introduce and examine the tokenism phenomenon. Kanter (1977) argued tokenism as an "artificial appearance" achieved by including a limited number of individuals in the minority group in effective positions within the existing group due to their characteristics (gender, race, religion, age, etc.) accepted as disadvantage or groups' characteristics different from the dominant group. In this context, tokenism is examined conceptually and then the group typologies serving to the tokenism are stated on the basis of proportional distributions. Then dimensions of restrictions and limitations applied by the dominant group to the tokens are addressed, and socio-psychological approaches supporting and providing a basis for the theory of tokenism are explained.

Keywords: *Tokenism, Tokenism theories*

JEL Codes: *M10*

Introduction

Traditional gender identities, roles and stereotypes attributed to women and men lead to some problems in the socialization process of individuals. Gender discrimination against women is one of these problems, thus women have lower status in both social and organizational life. The phenomenon of tokenism, a derivative of gender discrimination, creates the main theme of this study. It is scientist Rosabeth M. Kanter coining the concept of tokenism by examining the experiences of women who are under-represented in organizations in

[1] M.Sc.Dokuz Eylul University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Business Administration Ph.D. Candidate, Izmir. bnnkrt@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1265-7136
[2] Assoc. Prof. Dr., Dokuz Eylul University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business, Izmir. olca.surgevil@deu.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7667-8104

This study is derived from the unpublished doctorate thesis of Benan Kurt Yılmaz under the supervision of Olca Surgevil Dalkılıç titled as "Gender-Based Tokenism: A Qualitative Research on Female-Dominated and Male-Dominated Professions" in 2019.

1977 in her book called "Men and Women in Cooperation". Kanter argued tokenism as an "artificial appearance" achieved by including a limited number of individuals in the minority group in effective positions within the existing group due to their characteristics (gender, race, religion, age, etc.) accepted as disadvantage or groups' characteristics different from the dominant group. Tokenism is examined in terms of its different sub-dimensions, causes and consequences in the international literature. But no conceptual study is prepared to introduce the concept in national literature. So this study aims to examine the phenomenon of tokenism and also to be referenced by future studies to be carried out in the field of tokenism.

Definition of Tokenism

The liberalization process beginning in the 1970s allowed many women and coloured people to participate in the business world dominated by white men. It was not easy to accept these newcomers to the business world in those years when ethnic and gender barriers started to break. Kanter starting her research to determine reasons for this situation directed her studies by carrying out both observation and interview processes with some employees. According to Kanter (1977), the individual's limited participation in the organization s/he works due to his/her social category (gender, ethnicity, etc.) and therefore, his/her limited acceptance in the job and/or occupation means that the individual is accepted as "token". Because the individual is a minority in the group s/he is in and there is a numerical imbalance between s/he and dominant group. Kanter (1977: 966) drew attention to the numerical inequality of token individuals within the group and mentioned four different groups according to their numerical representation ratios:

- Uniform groups: The distribution of gender, race or ethnicity is homogenous in these groups involving only one distinctive social type and typical ratio is 100: 0. In other words, there is not any individual from any different social category, gender, status or ethnicity in uniform groups.
- Skewed groups: There are two groups one of which is a numerically dominant group and another is a numerical minority group. This refers to a structure in which the minority group is under the control of the dominant group. Tokens are considered in skewed groups. Because they are in limited number as the representative of social category to which they belong due to their numerical minority within the structure they are in. The typical ratio of skewed groups is 85:15. However, there are cases where the limited number is much less and

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

even "alone" only with a representative. In skewed groups in which the number of tokens is two or less, it is difficult for the tokens to attain power against the dominant group.

- Tilted groups: These are groups in which the dominant group is majority while the token group is minority. However, it refers to a structure in which the token group has the power to influence the decisions and actions of the dominant group. Therefore, the minority group can create a coalition with the dominant group and influence the structure and culture. The typical ratio of these groups is 65:35.
- Balanced groups: The typical ratio of these groups is either 60:40 or 50:50. This balance is also seen in cultural and interpersonal interaction. Unlike minority and majority groups, there are sub-groups contributing to the group in line with their abilities and skills in balanced groups.

Kanter (1977: 19) primarily defined groups with a representation rate of less than 15% in their work, workplace or management levels as "token", and the dominant group with a number of 85% and above as "tokenist". Kanter emphasized the negative effects of being a part of a small minority (token) being up to 15%. Accordingly, even if the presence of token individuals in the organization is meritocratic, the tokens face various limitations and restrictions due to their numerical inadequacy (Wright, Taylor; 1999: 369). Kanter (1977) developed her theory to explain the effects of token status on women's career development in male-dominated job environments. This has two basic reasons. The first reason is that individuals are in the first place of gender and ethnicity in group definitions (Taylor et al.; 1978: 779). The second reason is that women's token status results in more negative consequences than men's token status (Dion, 1975: 302). What is more, the negative effects of tokenism do not only apply to gender and ethnicity, but also for all individuals who are in minority status due to their age, religion, political preference, and so on. The concept of minority mentioned here is used to describe individuals with different characteristics than the dominant group within the organization but originates from the concept of sociological minority. According to Hughes (1944), the minority is a process in which an individual, included in a group since s/he meets formal requirements (skill, ability, job description), cannot become a full member of the group due to his/her inability to meet secondary and informal acceptances and assumptions (race, gender, ethnicity). According to Podmore and Spencer (1982), the minority refers to a small number of people in the group in which they belong.

While Worchel, Grossman and Cautant (1994) point out that the minority group is relatively weak in terms of power than the group presumed as majority, Riordan (2000) emphasizes the experiences of individuals exposed to negative attitudes and behaviors because they have different demographic characteristics from the group they are in. As a matter of fact, having different characteristics from the dominant group in organizations may originate from gender, ethnicity, belief, age, social status or some other characteristics (Budig, 2002: 258-277).

Laws (1975) defines tokens as marginal status by indicating a person's inability to become a full member of a group, to which s/he was allowed to participate in, but to be a "stranger" or "opposing". Moreover, Cook (1978) argues that token refers to a group of people who are numerically minority in the group in which they belong. On the other hand, Riemer (1979) defines token as the status of a female employee who is employed only because she is a woman, and thus, presented as anti-discrimination evidence, even if her qualifications are not sufficient in a male-dominated profession. There is not any problem as long as women continue to work with low-paid salaries in their occupations (assistantships, secretarial, care services, etc.) deemed appropriate for them, however, in the event that they take part in the occupations dominated by men, they receive the status of token (Floge, Merrill: 1986; Greed,2000; Hammond, Mahoney:1983).

Kanter (1977) urges that all groups being in the position of minority face the experiences of women working in managerial positions. In other words, the negative experiences lived by women in managerial positions are seen in all groups which are less than the dominant group in number. Accordingly, Ott (1989) found out that female police officers lived same negative experiences among male police officers, and Hammond and Mahoney (1983) urged that the same situation applies to female mineworkers among male mine workers, Greed (2000) argued that female construction workers faced same behaviors among male construction workers and finally, Yoder and McDonald (1998) indicated that female firefighters had the same negative experience among male firefighters. However, these negative experiences do not arise from being woman or man but being minority. Coloured people live this experience among white people, a single man among a group of women, a small number of foreigners among natives, and sight-disabled person among healthy individuals. In this regard, Kanter (1977), pointed out not only

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

the dominant groups of men or women but also all asymmetric groups with the concept of token. Kanter (1977) carried out her research based on the finding that "people, who are members of any minority or thought to have a disadvantageous characteristic, are regarded as representative of the categories they belong to in the society or working life apart from their being individuals and these people are stereotyped". By basing on gender discrimination, Kanter urged that being a woman in an institution where men are more dominant, that is more in numbers, leads to a lower possibility of being promoted since they are limited to "quotas reserved for women" and "jobs in which building a career is impossible" or "being ignored for jobs with important high status". Although the existence of women in working life varies proportionally from sector to sector, above-mentioned limitation may be exemplified with the fact that women do not nearly exist in sectors such as mining, petroleum and refinery, but also find more opportunities in areas such as education, arts, social services, social sciences, retail service, office services, advertising, public relations (Kanter, 1977: 17).

Dimensions of Tokenism

Kanter (1977) defines employees experiencing three negative processes identified as performance pressures, boundary heightening and role encapsulation, and being less than 15% numerically in their organizations as token, and the dominant group as tokenists. However, Yoder (2002) pointed out that tokenism has a dimension beyond inadequate numerical representation and there are different dimensions affecting the representation of women in the organization. In this study, these dimensions called occupational non-conformity, status differences and interventionism by Yoder (2002) are also explained below.

Performance Pressure

Kanter found out that women are highly visible within the organization. This visibility takes tokens to lack of privacy. Tokens, who are always supervised by the dominant group, has limited "Backstage" or "secret areas". While the visibility of individual generally creates positive results (promotion, premium, etc.), it is considered as excelling, and thus, preventing individual development and affects the acceptability of tokens that may be included in the institution in the future negatively (Spangler et al., 1978: 161). This visibility causes performance pressure. The performance expected from the tokens is presented as being normalized, although it is actually above the normal and even in the category of "outstanding success". In addition, performance pressure creates anxiety on the token. It is an indication of this concern that a performance that can be performed effortlessly and easily is tried to be performed in a highly detailed and perfectionist manner. This anxiety affects the progress of performance in its natural course. Disappointment may occur when pressure and anxiety override performance (Spangler et al. 1978: 161).

Boundary Heightening

The second barrier created by the dominant group to limit the behavior of the tokens is coined as boundary heightening. The dominant group tries to heighten its boundaries and present its bonds by exaggerating against the desire of "foreigner", who is outsider and included in group, to form a collective culture and structure by changing the culture and bond structure formed by the dominant group (Kanter, 1977: 975). Training programs, meetings, in-company dinners and cocktail organizations play an important role in reinforcing the cultural values and elements of the dominant group. In other words, members of the dominant group display behaviors reminding and reinforcing the difference between tokens and themselves in their collective organizations (Kanter, 1977: 977). Another method is prevention. Tokens considered "foreigner" should not hear any information shared by the dominant group if it is shameful or tarnish the image of dominant group members. Indeed, the issue of trust in tokens is controversial for the dominant group. In such a case, the dominant group tries to keep the tokens away from certain areas, in other words, put them into "quarantine". Tokens are often kept at a borderline in their interaction with the dominant group. Tokens wishing to cross the borderline must gain the trust of the dominant group and prove their loyalty. If token is unable to prove his/her loyalty, s/he is exposed to social isolation. On the other hand, loyalty tests are related to whether tokens use any information that s/he has obtained about the dominant group to gain strength or damage the dominant group (Kanter, 1977: 979).

Role Encapsulation

Tokens are set separate from the dominant group by being compressed into prescribed stereotypes about them, in other words, status levelling is made against tokens. According to Kanter (1977), status levelling is the perception adjustment between the professional role of the token and the basic status to which it belongs. However, since the basic status is considered higher than the professional status, the said status levelling works against women in favor of men (Kanter, 1977:

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

981). Since the dominant group has tendency to preserve generalizations and stereotypes pre-established for tokens, traditional women are accepted unquestioningly (Kanter, 1977: 981-984).

Occupational Inappropriate

Gender typing of occupation includes two dimensions: normative dimension and numerical dimension. Occupational gender typing sets norms related to which profession is appropriate for women, and women making choices beyond expectations face negative consequences (Schachter, 1951). However, this negative experience is not related to the "fear of success" that woman live because of her suitability for her chosen occupation, but to, "her being despised" (Cherry and Deaux, 1978). Reskin and Hartman (1986) argue that gender apartheid is so dominant that 53% of those making occupational choices that are not suitable for gender typing, regardless of men or women, have to change their jobs. This research shows both the power of stereotypes and explains the reflections of these socially formed judgments on professional life.When the occupational groups with occupational gender typing are examined, occupational types considered to be specific to men are as follows: manager (Fairhust and Snavely, 1983), academician (Toren and Kraus, 1987; Young, Mackenzie and Sherif, 1980; Yoder, Crumpton and Zipp, 1989), engineer (Ott , 1978), police officer (Martin, 1980; Ott, 1989), miner (Hammond and Mahoney, 1983), team leader (Crocker and McGraw, 1984), prison manager (Jurick, 1985; Zimmer, 1986, 1988), rapid transfer operator (Swerdlow, 1989), auto industry worker (Gruber and Bjorn, 1982), union representative (Izraeli, 1983), bladesmith (Deaux and Ullman, 1983), physicist (Floge and Merrill, 1985), lawyer (Spangler, Gordon) and Pipkin, 1978; Cook, 1978; Esptein, 1981). Occupational groups thought to be specific to women are nursing (Floge and Merill, 1985; Fottler, 1976; Greenberg and Levine, 1971; Segal, 1962; Ott: 1989), social services (Kadushin, 1976), childcare (Seifert, 1973), office and editorial (Schreber, 1979). The important issue to be mentioned here is that while women choosing occupations that are not suitable for gender typing live negative experiences such as performance pressure, increasing visibility, social isolation and role encapsulation, men do not face these experiences (Ott, 1989).

Status Differences

Social status is the place occupied by the individual in the social structure. What determines this place is the society itself (Tezcan, 1995:

51). Society is hierarchically structured into different social groups connected in terms of power and status relations. While ethnicity, age, gender and occupation are the most common statuses, not every status is of the same value and does not bring the same degree of prestige to the individual since there is a hierarchical structure between social statuses. According to Webster and Driskell (1985), social status is compared and evaluated culturally. For example, while having white skin color, being a man, old and in administrative positions are high prestige sources as social status, being in an ethnic minority, being a woman, young and in non-administrative positions are considered less prestigious.

Gender builds different social structures for men and women. This is a structure created by behaviors, discourses and interaction. In general, culture forms a schema related to this social structure and shapes status information. In this respect, it is discussed whether men included in a group of women strengthen the status of that group. There is also such a discussion in other groups without status equality between each other. These discussions are shaped by to what extent status differences become evident and how they are manipulated (Yoder, 2002: 4).

Intrusiveness

The gender typing and value of occupations are confused with each other. The substitutability and prestige of the job are important in gender typing. Men are mostly employed in highly-paid and prestigious professions where there are a limited number of employees, and this makes that occupation being perceived as more masculine and more suitable for men (Coser, 1981). For this reason, it gets difficult for women to be employed in highly-paid and prestigious occupations where there are a limited number of employees by the social interference of men, and men interfere with these “uninvited guests” (Zimmer, 1986). Because women's being employed in academia, law, physics, policing and engineering dominated by men indicates an increase in status and prestige, this results in field loss for men. Therefore, the majority wishing to remove this threat develops methods of intervention. Some of these interventions are restricted opportunities, wage inequality, job harassment, heightened standards etc.

Socio-Psychological Theories and Approaches Providing Basis for the Theory of Tokenism

The literature on diversity benefits from different theories to explain the effect of diversity types on group processes and outcomes (Joshi, 2011; van Dijk et al., 2012; van Knippenberg et al., 2004). The

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

primary ones of these theories are as follows: Social Identity Theory, Social Dominance Theory, Optimal Distinctiveness Theory, Similarity-Attraction Paradigm, Attraction-Selection-Attrition Model, Information Processing and Problem Solving Approach, Organizational Demography Approach, Relational Demography Approach, Realistic Conflict Theory, Frustration-Aggression Theory, Relative Deprivation Theory. Since the focal point of tokenism is group membership, group processes and inter-group interaction, the theories and approaches that can provide a basis for the concept of tokenism originate from the literature on diversity management in groups. For this reason, tokenism deals with processes that are not related to the duties of group members but affect their relationships through visible and invisible features. Following theories were not included in this study due to the reasons as follows: Information Processing and Problem Solving Approach - focusing on group performance; Organizational Demography Approach - emphasizing collective effects of difference rather than its separate effects; Relational Demography Approach - making explanations based on ethnicity; Realistic Conflict Theory - focusing on competition created by the need for scarce resources; Frustration-Aggression Theory – making explanations through xenophobia; Theory of Relative Deprivation - making explanations through rebellion and collective violence tendencies the people perform in the event that needs of minority groups are not met. Accordingly some brief information about Social Identity Theory, Social Dominance Theory, Optimal Distinctiveness Theory, Similarity-Attraction Paradigm, Attraction-Selection-Attrition Model forming basis for tokenism is provided below.

Social Identity Theory

Henri Tajfel and John Turner, carrying out comprehensive studies related to discrimination and conflict on religion and ethnic groups in prison camps in France and Germany during World War II, developed Social Identity Theory as a result of these studies. According to Tajfel, social identity (1982: 2) "is the part of an individual's self-perception arising from his/her knowledge of his membership in a social group or groups and the emotional value s/he attributes to it." The Social Identity Theory argues that the social groups to which the individual is a member have a significant effect on the individual's emotions, thoughts and behaviors. In other words, social identity develops depending on the groups to which the individual belongs (Tajfel, 1982; Turner, 1978). In this regard, the individual's self-concept and thus, his/her self-esteem depend on his/her social identity. Since people mostly act as members of certain social classes and not as individuals, the task of increasing self-esteem is fulfilled by social identity. Accordingly, it is easier for people to define their own and others' places within a certain social structure (Mlicki & Ellemers, 1996: 98).

Gender, religion, ethnicity and etc. make reference to the social identity of individuals. Individuals make comparisons between their identities (male/female, German/English etc.) and the group they are in and try to gain insight about themselves and others as a result of this comparison. This insight serves the individuals in order to improve and develop their status. Therefore, the Social Identity Theory is important so that individual understands that whether s/he is the subject of tokenism and what s/he can do to improve/develop his/her status. In this regard, social classification, social comparison, social identification, in-group bias and minimal group paradigm establishing the framework of the theory are explained below (Tajfel and Turner, 1979: 35).

Social Categorization

Individuals define and evaluate themselves by taking into account the social group to which they belong (Turner, 1987: 30). Put it differently, when they define themselves by perceiving as a member of a social group, social classification occurs. Gender, ethnicity and age are the basis of social classification (Bilgin, 1996: 46). Whether feelings and demands of people at any moment are acted in order to resemble or differentiate from others, they should first compare themselves with “others”. Individual's characteristics of comparing himself/herself with others is examined under the title of “social comparison” in the field of social psychology (Bilgin, 2007: 110).

Social Comparison

Festinger (1954) developed “Social Comparison Theory” by urging that individuals have a motive to evaluate their opinions and abilities and they compare themselves with other people when they cannot find an objective reference point for assessment. In the studies carried out after Festinger, the researchers suggested that even if the individual has objective standards for comparison, they make comparisons in order to determine their relative positions (Goethals, et al., 1987: 21; Klein, 1997: 763).

One of the most important theoretical developments related to Social Comparison Theory is related to the direction of social

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

comparisons (Buunk, et al.). Many studies have attempted to reveal whether individuals target people similar to them or better or worse than themselves in the comparison process. Wills' (1981) downward comparison theory suggests that individuals can improve their subjective well-being by comparing themselves with those who are less fortunate than them, and individuals with low self-esteem have tendency to make more downward comparisons to increase their self-worth.

Social Identification

Social identification can be defined as “emotional participation of a person to a specific group” (Van Dick et al., 2004: 175). People adopt attitude, behavior and thought patterns of the group they identify with while building their own social identity (Cakinberk, Derin and Demirel, 2011: 92–93). Individual accepts and shares the destiny of social group or class to which s/he belongs as his/her own fate (Kirkbesoglu and Tuzun, 2009: 2–3). Individuals are motivated to identify with groups to create a distinctive and positive social identity for themselves (Lupina-Wegener et al., 2013: 2).

In-Group Bias

In-group and out-group concepts are based on American sociologist William Graham Sumner's concept of “ethnocentrism”. Sumner (1906) stated the concept of ethnocentrism as an individual’s putting the group s/he belongs in the center of everything. Ethnocentrism is a concept referring that individual’s own group is in center and all other groups are evaluated based on this in-group (Brewer and Miller, 1996: 23). The in-group associates with the group in which people share common values and lifestyles, feel himself/herself belong to and affiliated. The in-group is a cognitive class with emotional significance, and “we” feeling is dominant in the in-groups. The out-group is the one competing with own groups of individuals or considered as opposing group. On the basis of the ethnocentric point of view, the out-groups, seen as rivals or opposite by individuals, are referred to as “they”.

Individuals identify with the group they place themselves in, and their social identity is created. Social identities should be defined comparatively. In this regard, a distinction is made between the group belonged and the remaining groups. The in-group and out-group are, thus, formed and a comparison is made between their members. Individual's motive of evaluating his/her social self positively lies behind this comparison process, and this process is experienced at a collective level. In-group members try to favor themselves from the out-group positively in comparison dimensions, and thus, processes such as discrimination between groups and in-group bias occur (Tajfel, 1982: 34). In-group favoritism is defined as individual's perceiving his/her own group by favoring and his/her bias related to underestimating the other group (Doosje and Ellemers, 1997: 70). The study of “Minimal Group Paradigm” carried out by Tajfel and Turner in order to address the scope of in-group favoritism process is discussed below.

Minimal Group Paradigm

Participants were told that they would participate in a decision-making research within the scope this study conducted with high school students by Tajfel et al. The participants were then randomly assigned to two separate groups, but they were explained that they were grouped on the basis of their choices related to the works of painters named Kandinsky and Klee. By doing so, it was aimed to protect the participants from the negative effects of factors such as conflict, individual hatred and hostility, and interdependence related to past. Each subject was taken to a room alone and was asked to distribute some amount of money to subject pairs (one from his/her group and the other from another group) in which s/he was not involved. Therefore, the motive of individual interest and economic gain was removed (Tajfel, 1978: 10). The results showed that participants favored their own groups to a large extent. Although these groups were created according to a criterion that could be considered insignificant, they had not any past and any possible future, and the subjects did not see and know other members, they displayed in-group favoritism even if they are not included in the ones receiving award, that is, they do not have an individual interest as prize recipients while the award is being distributed (Tajfel, 1978: 11).

Social Dominance Theory

The human rights reform made in Europe and America in the 1960s and 1970s could not prevent racism and discrimination emerging before these dates. For this reason, the concept of stereotypes, prejudices, racism and nationalism causing intergroup conflicts drew the attention of social scientists and a field of research was developed by the 1990s. The Social Dominance Theory urged by Sidanius and Pratto (1999) is important in this respect. The Social Dominance Theory argues that all human groups are organized in a hierarchy and some groups have power over others (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999). What is more, the Social Dominance Theory underlined both individual and structural reasons for

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

intergroup pressure (intergroup discrimination, racism, ethnocentrism, classism, sexism) (Sidanis et al.).

The Social Dominance Theory addresses the question of why individuals organize society with group-based hierarchical structures. In this regard, social dominance orientation suggested by Sidanius and Pratto (1999) was defined as a personality trait investigated by examining whether an individual supports the dominance of certain groups in line with race, gender, nationality, religion and similar factors (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999, p.61). Stated in other words, the social dominance orientation is a personal tendency covering desires of individuals for the existence and maintenance of a group-based hierarchy (Sidanius et al. 1999: 39, 48). This orientation may become towards adopting hierarchy-enhancing discourse causing to maintain intergroup inequalities as well as adopting hierarchy-decreasing discourse supporting intergroup inequalities. While the statements of “An ideal society requires that some groups become at the top and others at the bottom” and “It is unfair to try to make groups equal” are hierarchy-enhancing discourses, statements of “Subgroups are as valuable as supergroups” and “No one should be dominant in society” are examples of hierarchy-decreasing discourses.

It depends on the social dominance orientation of individuals that which discourse they accept and support. According to the Social Dominance Theory (Sidanius et al., 1999: 39), as individuals' social dominance orientation levels increase, their level of accepting and supporting hierarchical-enhancing discourses will increase, thus group-based hierarchies will be maintained. On the other hand, the understanding of social identity suggested that the causes of negative attitudes created by the social dominance orientation are not personality traits, but the reflection of individual's attitudes towards certain social groups (Schmitt et al., 2003). For this reason, social dominance attitudes may decrease and increase, fluctuate and change continuously according to different social structures (Huang and Liu, 2005; Lehmiller and Schmitt, 2007).

Tokenism and Social Dominance Theory intersect at this point. Accordingly, people with a high social dominance orientation show a tendency to believe that women and men are naturally different and should have different workplace roles and thus, they serve the process of tokenism. In addition to this, people with a high social dominance orientation tend to accept racial superiority theories and believe that their country is naturally better than other countries. On the other hand, people with low social dominance orientation show tendency to have social attitudes related to equalitarianism, and perform an egalitarian perspective on the roles of women and men in jobs and professions.

Optimal Distinctiveness Theory

The Optimal Distinctiveness Theory originates from functionality of social identity based on two opposite needs of the individual (Brewer 1991). According to this theory, social identity and behavior of the individual in social life are determined by the need to become similar and integrated with a group and to be approved, exact opposite needs of differentiating from others, and individuation (Brewer, 1991; 1993). Brewer (1991) argues that it is not unusual for an individual to need a certain degree of similarity and differentiation from others. In this regard, Snyder and Fromkin (1980) explain this with Uniqueness Theory. This theory addresses emotional and behavioral reactions of individual based on his/her knowledge of similarity with others. Individual gets unhappy due to his/her knowledge related to his/her high level of similarity or differentiation with others. In other words, individual wants to be partially similar and differentiated from others. Accordingly, Uniqueness Theory serves the Optimal Distinctiveness Theory. Therefore, in accordance with the Optimal Distinctiveness Theory, individual makes a classification during the process of integration and differentiation, and the classification process brings along us-them discrimination and bias.

The theory makes some suggestions such as reducing conflicts in intergroup relations, reclassification in order to cope with biases, creating a common in-group identity or arranging the classification, and thus, helps to minimize the negative consequences of tokenism. As stated under the title of Social Identity Theory, individuals make discrimination of us and them by in-group bias and this causes intergroup conflicts. However, while the Optimal Distinctiveness Theory suggests reclassification, it refers to new bonds to be established between dominant groups and tokens.

Similarity-Attraction Paradigm

Byrne (1961, 1971) argued that there is a positive relationship between similarity and attraction in his "Interpersonal Attraction Theory". According to this model, when people have similar characteristics, they find each other more attractive and make more positive evaluation about each other (Byrne, 1962: 166-168). These similarities can be gender, age, ethnicity, political preferences, perception, value, thought, personality and emotional status (Byrne,

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

1961; Morell, Twillman, Sullaway, 1989; Nahemow, Lawton, 1975; Rosenblatt, Greenberg, 1988; Tenney, Turkheimer, Oltmanns, 2009). The higher the perceived interpersonal similarity, the more comfortable and indirectly approved the individuals feel in their environments. Newcomb (1956) stated that attraction is the result of mutual rewarding. This is because that while one's receiving approval from others about his or her opinions and ideas increases somewhat his or her positive feelings by providing him/her with a reward, inability to receive approval is perceived as a punishment because it reinforces negative feelings such as discomfort, dissatisfaction and uneasiness (Newcomb, 1956: 577). Individuals' interacting with the ones similar to them is a satisfying experience reinforcing one's attitudes and values. Therefore, people have more positive feelings towards people they get along with and agree, and they like these people more (Byrne and Nelson, 1964).

Attraction-Selection-Attrition Model

The essential point of the Attraction-Selection-Attrition Model, suggested by Schneider as an extension of the similarity-attraction paradigm, is not the behavior of individual, but the behavior of individual within the organization (Schneider, 1987: 438). Mischel (1968: 295) urges that behavior of individual is a function of environment and conditions in which behavior occurs. According to this view, behavior emerges as a function of individual and environment (Lewin, 1951). Accordingly, individual or environment should be considered as a single function rather than as separate ones (Terborg, 1981). The second important point is that Schneider did not focus on the differences of individuals within organization. He was mostly interested in which aspects of individual was paid attention by an organization and in which aspect that organization differentiated from other organizations. Traditional assumptions suggest that individuals within an organization resemble that organization over time. However, an organization is considered as a function of the personalities of its members in the ASA Model. In other words, total behaviors of individuals within the organization develop the behaviors of organization (Schneider, 1987: 440). Scheneider (1987: 438-444, 1995: 749). Below are the steps explaining the compliance between individuals and organizations in line with the ASA model:

Attraction: Attraction process is the stage of estimating fit between individual's own preferences related to choice of organization and qualifications of potential work environment. At this point, if individual finds the structure, processes, culture and goals declared by the organization and his/her personality, characteristics and goals similar and compatible, s/he wants to be included in that organization. Thus, Holland (1985) described an individual's career choices as a function of his or her own interests and personality. In his career approach, Holland (1964) argued that individuals should prefer jobs believed by them as appropriate for their interests and, he has introduced six types of career options: investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, conventional and realistic. In addition to this, Holland stated that career environment can also be grouped because the environmental pattern of profession consists of similar individuals and these similar individuals attract people with similar characteristics to this environment. In a similar way, Vroom (1966) and Tom (1971) emphasized mentioned similarity attraction in their studies. They found that similar individuals make similar professional preferences, spend their time in similar environments, and have similar behaviors patterns.

Selection: The second stage of the attraction-selection-attrition model is selection. This stage refers to the formal and non-formal selection process applied by organization in order to employ and place according to the qualifications and characteristics expected from a potential employee. The ASA model urges that individuals with similar characteristics and qualifications with their organizations attract them during their job applications, and these organizations select these individuals as employees. The selection stage has an important role both in the process of employing individuals suitable for organization and in labor force turnover process. While individual unable to resemble the organization and its environment leaves organization, those resembling the organization and its environment will remain in organization. This is important in terms of providing basis to develop more homogenous structures by individuals remaining in the organization. Because similar individuals will continue to be members of the same organization and serve the selection of similar individuals to them and this will create strong resistance points in accepting new individuals who are not similar to them to their organization. These resistance points will be strengthened by search for similar behaviors, experiences, orientations, emotions, thoughts and reactions.

Attrition: Attrition stage considered as the last stage of model, refers to the leaving of individuals unable to adapt organization. Individuals, who could not meet the qualifications required for objectives set by the organization, leave the organization.

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

The ASA model has an important role in explaining the tokenism theory. As mentioned before while tokenism focuses on individual's negative experiences obtained due to his/her demographic difference and numerical scarcity within the organization, the ASA model draws attention to individual-organization fit in order to prevent the formation of these negative experiences. In the first stage of the model, it describes the way to be followed by individual in profession and career choices in order to avoid such negative experiences and urges the effect of similarity on attraction. In the second stage called selection, it draws attention to the behaviors of individuals providing basis for homogeneous structure of organization, in other words, put forwards selections of the dominant group in organizations. The third and last step addresses behavior of individual in the event that negative experiences are lived with the dominant group, put it differently, there is a lack of individual-organization fit.

Similarity-Attraction Approach and Attraction-Selection-Attrition Model, argued as a derivative of this approach, are effective in allowing token group to determine to select which strategy against dominant group. The first of these strategies is social mobility. This strategy refers to the situation of tokens wishing to develop their social identities but living negative experiences in their in-groups. Tokens prefer to move away from in-group by using social mobility strategy. Social creativity and social change strategies are collective strategies aiming to develop the social identity of in-group collectively, and they differ from the social mobility strategy in this respect. In this manner, studies show that individuals wishing to develop their social identities first apply the social mobility strategy, in other words, the individual strategy is more widely used in the achievement of positive social identity.

Conclusion and Suggestions

Theory of Tokenism developed by Kanter in 1977 is examined conceptually in this study. In the first part of the study, the phenomenon of tokenism has been explained and the group typologies serving to the tokenism have been stated on the basis of proportional distributions. The concepts of minority and discrimination, being at the basis of this phenomenon, have been addressed. Power loss and limitations and restrictions imposed on tokens due to their numerical scarcity and their different demographic characteristics from the dominant group have also been explained in this section.

Dimensions of restrictions and limitations applied by the dominant group to the tokens have been addressed in the second part of the study. These dimensions have been ranked as performance pressure, boundary heightening, roles attributed to tokens, disapproval for the profession, status positioning and intervention methods. The effects of stereotypes built by gender and occupational typing on individuals' occupational choices have been discussed. It has also been addressed in this part that women could choose professions considered as masculine and continue to work in that profession, and the acceptance of role encapsulation.

In the last part of the study, socio-psychological approaches supporting and providing a basis for the theory of tokenism have been explained. These theories ranked as Social Identity Theory, Social Dominance Theory, Optimal Distinctiveness Theory, Similarity-Attraction Paradigm and Attraction Selection-Attrition Model are important in order to understand the theory of Tokenism. First of all, these approaches strengthen the theory in terms of revealing the behaviors of individual within the organization, determining group dynamics affecting these behaviors, and indicating the effect of these dynamics on group bias. Second, the re-statement of the dominant and token groups urged by the Theory of Tokenism on the basis of the concepts of “us and foreign” enriches the theory. Thirdly, it reveals how the restrictions imposed by the homogeneous structure on token affect the new choices of the organization and the individual. Fourth and lastly, it has been discussed under the title of Attraction-Selection-Attrition Model that which strategies can token, differentiated from the organization against dominant group and forced to move away, apply. Although there are various studies on tokenism in USA and Europe, the need for scientific studies and practices in Turkey is urged as there is not any study in Turkish literature related to this subject. In this regard, this study has been carried out in order to draw attention to the concept of tokenism and the theories that could provide basis for this concept. What is more, considering that the subject of tokenism is not only gender, conducting future studies in different dimensions will enrich the literature.

References

Aksu, B (2012). Toplumsal Cinsiyete Dayalı Ayrımcılık, Ayrımcılık:Çok Boyutlu Yaklaşımlar (Der: Kenan Çayır Ve Müge Ayan Ceyhan), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

Ashforth, B. & Mael, F. (1989). Social Identity Theory And The Organization, Academy Of Management Review,14(1), 20-39.

Bilgin, N. (2007). Kimlik İnşası, Ankara, Aşina Kitaplar.

Boossard, J. H.S. (1932). Residential Propinquity As A Factor In Marriage Selection. American Journal Of Sociology, 38, 219-224.

Brewer, M. & Miller, N. (1996). Intergroup Relations, Open University Press.

Brewer, M.(1991). The Social Self: On Being The Same And Different At The Same Time, Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin, 17.5: 475-482.

Budig, M.(2002). Male Advantage And The Gender Composition Of Jobs: Who Rides The Glass Escalator?,Social Problems 49.2: 258-277.

Buunk, A. & Gibbons F. (2007). Social Comparison: The End Of A Theory and The Emergence Of A Field, Organizational Behavior And Human Decision Processes 102.1: 3-21.

Byrne, D. (1961). Interpersonal Attraction And Attitude Similarity, The Journal Of Abnormal And Social Psychology, 62, 713-715.

Byrne, D. (1962). Response To Attitude Similarity-Dissimilarity As A Function Of Affiliation Need, Journal Of Personality, 30, 164-177.

Byrne, D. (1971). The Attraction Paradigm, Academic Press, Vol. 11.

Byrne, Donn, & Buehler, John A. (1955). A Note On The Influence Of Propinquity Upon Acquaintanceships, Journal Of Abnormal And Social Psychology, 51, 147-148.

Byrne, D. & Nelson D. (1964). Attraction as a function of attitude similarity dissimilarity: The effect of topic importance, Psychonomic Science, 1.1-12: 93-94.

Byrne D. & Neuman, J.H. (1992). The Implications Of Attraction Research For Organizational Issues, K. Kelley (Eds.), Issues, Theory, And Research In Industrial And Organizational Psychology, Elsevier, New York, 29-70.

Cherry, F. & Deaux, K. (1978). Fear Of Success Versus Fear Of Gender-İnappropriate Behaviour, Sex Roles, 4, 97-101.

Cook, B. (1978). Women Judges: The End Of Tokenism, İn W.L. Hepperly And L.Crites (Eds.), Women İn The Courts, Washington: National Center For State Courts, 84-105.

Coser, R. L. (1981). Where Have All The Women Gone? In Access To Power: Cross-National Studies Of Women And Elites, Edited By Cynthia Fuchs Epstein & Rose Laub Coser, Winchester, Ma: Allen & Unwin.

Crocker, J. & Mcgraw, K. M. (1984). What's Good For The Goose İs Not Good For The Gander: Solo Status As An Obstacle To Occupational Achievement For Males And Females, American Behavioral Scientist, 27.3: 357-369.

Çakınberk, A., Derin, N., & Demirel, E. T. (2011). Örgütsel Özdeşleşmenin Örgütsel Bağlılıkla Biçimlenmesi: Malatya ve Tunceli Özel Eğitim Kurumları Örneği, İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi, 3 (1), 89-121.

Deaux, K. & Ullman J. (1983). Women Of Steel. New York: Praeger.

Dion, K.L. (1975). Women's Reactions To Discrimination From Members Of The Same Or Opposite Sex, Journal Of Research In Personality, 9.4: 294-306.

Doosje, B. & Ellemers, N. (1997). Stereotyping Under Threat: The Role Of Group İdentification, The Social Psychology Of Stereotyping And Group Life (Edit.), Rusell, Spears, Oxford: Blackwell, 257-273.

Epstein, C. (1981). Women İn Law, Garden City, Ny: Anchor.

Fairhurst, G. T. & Snavely, B. K. (1983). A Test Of The Social İsolation Of Male Tokens, Academy Of Management Journal, 26: 353-361.

Festinger, L. (1954). A Theory Of Social Comparison Processes, Human Relations, 7(2), 117-140.

Floge, L & Merrill, D. (1985). Tokenism Reconsidered: Male Nurses And Female Physicians İn A Hospital Setting, Social Forces, 64(4), 925-947.

Fottler, M. P. (1976). Attitudes Of Female Nurses Toward The Male Nurses: A Study Of Occupational Segregation, Journal Of Health And Social Behavaior, 17: 98-110.

Fromkin, H. L. & Snyder C.S. (1980) The Search For Uniqueness And Valuation Of Scarcity, Social Exchange, Springer, Boston, Ma, 57-75.

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

Goethals, G. R. & Darley J. M. (1987). Social Comparison Theory: Self-Evaluation And Group Life, Theories Of Group Behavior, Springer, New York, Ny, 21-47.

Goldenhar, L. M., Naomi G.S.; Hurrell, J.; Ruder, A. & Deddens, J. (1998). Stressors And Adverse Outcomes For Female Construction Workers, Journal Of Occupational Health Psychology, 3: 19-32.

Greed, C. (2000). Women In The Construction Professions: Achieving Critical Mass, Gender, Work & Organization, 7.3: 181-196.

Greenberg, Emily & Burton Levine (1971). Role Strain In Men Nurses, Nursing Forum 10:416-30.

Griffitt, W. (1970). Environmental Effects On Interpersonal Affective Behavior: Ambient Effective Temperature And Attraction, Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 15.3: 240.

Gruber, J. & Bjorn L. (1982). Blue-Collar Blues: The Sexual Harassment Of Women Autoworkers, Work And Occupations 9:271-98.

Hammond, J. A. & Mahoney, C. (1983). Reward-Cost Balancing Among Women Coal Miners, Sex Roles, 9: 17-29.

Hogg, M.A. & Abrams, D. (1990). Social Motivation, Self-Esteem And Social Identity, Social Identity Theory: Constructive And Critical Advances. (Eds. D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg) London: Harvester Vheat Sheaf, 28-47.

Holland J. L. (1985). Making Vocational Choices: A Theory Cf Careers, Englewood Cliffs, Nj: Prentice-Hall.

Hughes, E. (1945). Dilemmas And Contradictions Of Status, American Journal Of Sociology, 50:353-59.

Izraeli, D. N. (1983). Sex Effects Or Structural Effects? An Empirical Test Of Kanter's Theory Of Proportions, Social Forces 62:15.

Riemer, J. W. (1979). Hard Hats: The Work World Of Construction Workers, Beverly Hills: Sage, 1979, 201.

Joshi, A., Liao, H., & Roh, H. (2011). Bridging Domains In Workplace

Demography Research: Review And Reconceptualization, Journal Of Management, 37(2), 521.

Jurik, N. (1985). An Officer And A Lady: Organizational Barriers To Women Working As Correctional Officers In Men's Prisons, Social Problems 32:375-88.

Kadushin, A. (1976). Men In A Woman's Profession, Social Work, 21:6, 440-447.

Kanter, R. M. (1976). The İmpact Of Hierarchical Structures On The Work Behavior Of Women And Men, Social Problems, 23.4: 415-430.

Kanter, R.M. (1977). Men And Women Of The Corporation, New York: Basic Books.

Kırkbeşoğlu, E., Tüzün, İ.K. (2009). Bireycilik-Toplulukçuluk İkileminde Mesleki Özdeşleşme Ve Örgütsel Özdeşleşme Ayrımı, Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 1 (1), 1-8.

King B. E., Hebl R. M. & George M. J. (2010) Understanding Tokenism:Antecedents And Consequences Of A Psychological Climate Of Gender Inequity, Journal Of Management, Vol. 36, No.2, March 2010, 482 – 510.

Klein, W. M. (1997). Objective Standards Are Not Enough: Affective, Self-Evaluative, And Behavioral Responses To Social Comparison İnformation, Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 72.4: 763.

Kraiger, K, & Kevin F. (1985). A Meta-Analysis Of Ratee Race Effects In Performance Ratings, Journal Of Applied Psychology, 70: 56-65.

Laws, J.L. (1975). The Psychology Of Tokenism: An Analysis,Sex Roles,1:51-67.

Lehmiller, J. J. & Schmitt M. T.(2007). Group Domination And Inequality In Context: Evidence For The Unstable Meanings Of Social Dominance And Authoritarianism, European Journal Of Social Psychology, 37.4: 704-724.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field Theory In Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers (Edited By Dorwin Cartwright).

Lupina-Wegener, A. Drzensky, F.; Ullrich, J. & Van Dick, R. (2013). Focusing On The Bright Tomorrow? A Longitudinal Study Of Organizational Identification And Projected Continuity İn A Corporate Merger, British Journal Of Social Psychology, 53 (1), 1-21.

Marden, C. & Meyer G. (1973). Minorities In American Society, New York: D. Van Nostrand.

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

Martin, S.E. (1980). Breaking And Entering: Policewomen On Patrol, Berkeley: University Of California Press.

Walter, M. (2009). From Personality And Assessment (1968) To Personality Science, 2009, Journal Of Research In Personality, 43.2: 282-290.

Powell M.P.& Ellemers, N. (1996). Being Different Or Being Better? National Stereotypes And Identifications Of Polish And Dutch Students, European Journal Of Social Psychology, 26, 97-114.

Morell, M.A., Twillman, R. K., & Sullaway, M. E. (1989). Would A Type A Date Another Type A?: Influence Of Behavior Type And Personal Attributes In The Selection Of Dating Partners, Journal Of Applied Social Psychology, 19, 918-931.

Nahemow, L., & Powell, M.L. (1975). Similarity And Propinquity İn Friendship Formation, Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 32(2), 205.

Newcomb, T. M.(1956). The Prediction Of Interpersonal Attraction, American Psychologist 11.11 (1956): 575.

Ott, E. M. (1989). Effects Of The Male–Female Ratio At Work: Policewomen And Male Nurses, Psychology Of Women Quarterly, 13, 41–58.

Ott, M. D. (1978). Female Engineering Students: Attitudes, Characteristics, Expectations, Responses To Engineering Education, Ithaca, Ny: Cornell University.

Owens, W.A. & Schoenfeldt L.F. (1979). Toward A Classification Of Persons, Journal Of Applied Psychology, 64.5: 569.

Podmore, D. & Spencer, A. (1982). Women Lawyers In England: The Experience Of İnequality, Work And Occupations, 9, 337- 361.

Reskin, B..F. & Hartmann H.I. (1986). Women's Work, Men's Work: Sex Segregation On The Job, Washington Dc: National Academy Press.

Riordan, C. M. (1997). Advancing Relational Demography Theory: A Construct Validity Study Of Three Measures Of Demographic Similarity, Academy Of Management Proceedings, Vol. 1997, No.1.

Rosenblatt, A., & Greenberg, J. (1988). Depression And Interpersonal Attraction: The Role Of Perceived Similarity, Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 55, 112-119.

Schachter, S. (1951). Deviation, Rejection, And Communication, The Journal Of Abnormal And Social Psychology, 46.2: 190.

Schmitt, M. T., Spears, R.& Branscombe N.R. (2003). Constructing A Minority Group İdentity Out Of Shared Rejection: The Case Of International Students, European Journal Of Social Psychology, 33.1: 1-12.

Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The Asa Framework: An Update. Personnel Psychology, 48, 747-774.

Schneider, B. (1987). The People Make The Place, Personnel Psychology, 40.3: 437-453.

Schneider, B. (1994). Interactional Psychology And Organizational Behavior, In Cummings Ll, Staw Bm (Eds), Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison Of Multiple Models (Pp:27-57). New York, Academic Press.

Schneider, B., Goldstein K.A., (1994). What İs This Thing Called Fit? In Anderson Nr, Herriot P (Eds), Bioadata Handbook (Pp423-450) Palo Alto Cpp Books.

Schneider, D. J. (2004). The Psychology Of Stereotyping, K. W. Fischer, E. T. Higgins, M. Johnson Ve W. Mischel, (Ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.

Schreiber, C.(1979). Men And Women In Transitional Occupations. Cambridge.

Segal, B. (1962). Male Nurses: A Study In Status Contradictions And Prestige Loss. Social Forces 41:31-38.

Seifert, K. (1973). Some Problems Of Men In Child Care Centerwork, Child Welfare.

Spangler, E., Gordon M.A. & Pipkin R.M. (1978). Token Women: An Empirical Test Of Kanter's Hypothesis, American Journal Of Sociology, 84.1: 160-170.

Sumner, W.G. (1906). Polkways. Boston: Ginn.

Sürgevil, O. (2008). Farklılık Kavramına ve Farklılıkların Yönetimine Temel Oluşturan Sosyopsikolojik Kuramlar ve Yaklaşımlar, Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 11(20), 111-124.

Swerdlow, M. (1989). Men's Accommodations To Women Entering A Non-Traditional Occupa Tion, Gender & Society, 3:373.

IJCEAS

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

Tajfel, H. & Forgas, J. P. (1981). Social Categorization: Cognitions, Values And Groups, J. P. Forgas (Eds.), Social Cognition: Perspectives On Everyday Understanding. London: Academic Press. 113-41.

Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P. & Flament,C. 0(1971). Social Categorisation And İntergroup Behaviour, European Journal Of Social Psychology, 1, 149-178.

Tajfel, H. & Turner J. C. (1982. Social Identity And Intergroup Relations, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An Integrative Theory Of İntergroup Conflict In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.),The Social Psychology Of Intergroup Relations, Monterey, Ca: Brooks/Cole.

Tajfel, H. (1978). Interindividual Behaviour And Intergroup Relations, Differentiation Between Social Groups : Studies In The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations (Eds) Henri Tajfel, London, Acedemic Press.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social Psychology Of Intergroup Relations, Annual Review Of Psychology, 33,1-39.

Taylor, S. E.; Fiske, S. T.; Etcoff, N. L., & Ruderman, A. J. (1978). Categorical And Contextual Bases Of Person Memory And Stereotyping, Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 36(7), 778.

Tenney, E. R., Turkheimer, E., & Oltmanns, T. F. (2009). Being Liked Is More Than Having A Good Personality: The Role Of Matching, Journal Of Research In Personality, 43, 579-585.

Terborg, J. R. (1981) Interactional Psychology And Research On Human Behavior In Organizations, Academy Of Management Review, 6, 569-576.

Tezcan, M. (1995). Sosyolojiye Giriş. Ankara: Feryal Matbaası.

Tom V. R. (1971). The Role Of Personality And Organizational İmages In The Recruiting Process, Organizational Behavior And Human Performance, 6, 573-592.

Toren, N. & Kraus, V. (1987). The Effects Of Minority Size On Women's Position İn Academia, Social Forces, 65.4: 1090-1100.

Turner, J. (1987). Rediscovering The Social Group: A Self Categorization Theory, Oxford: Basil Blakcwel.

Turner, J. (1978). Social Categorization And Social Discrimination In The Minimal Group Paradigm, Differentiation Between Social Groups: Studies In The Social Psychology Of Intergroup Relations, 101-140.

Valian V. (1998): Why So Slow? The Advancement Of Women, Cambridge, Ma: Mıt Press.

Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Stellmacher, J. & Oliveer, C. (2004). The Utility Of A Broader Conceptualization Organizational Identification: Which Aspect Really Matter?, Journal Of Occupational And Organizational Psychology, 77:1.

Van Dijk, H., Van Engen, M. L., & Van Knıppenberg, D. (2012). Defying Conventional Wisdom: A Meta-Analytical Examination Of The Differences Between Demographic And Job-Related Diversity Relationships With Performance, Organizational Behavior And Human Decision Processes, 119, 38-53.

Van Knıppenberg, D. & Schıppers, M. C. (2004), “Work Group Diversity”, Annual Review Of Psychology, 58, 515-541.

Van Knippenberg, Ad (1989). Strategies Of Identity Management, In J. P. Van Oudenhoven, & T. M. Willemsen (Eds.), Ethnic Minorities: Social Psychological Perspectives (Pp. 59–76), Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Vroom, V. H. (1966). Organizational Choice: A Study Of Pre- And Post-Decision Processes, Organizational Behavior And Human Performance, 1, 212-226.

Webster, M. & Driskell, J. (1985). Status Generalization, In Joseph Berger; Morris Zelditch (Eds.) Status, Rewards And Influence (Pp.108-141). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wetherell, M. (Eds.) (1996). Identities, Groups And Social Issues. London: Sage.

Wills, T. A. (1981). Downward Comparison Principles In Social Psychology, Psychological Bulletin, 90.2: 245.

Worchel, S., Grossman, M., & Coutant, D. (1994). Minority Influence In The Group Context: How Group Factors Affect When The Minority Will Be İnfluential. (Edt) Serge Moscovici, Angelica Mucchi-Faina, & Anne Maass (Eds.), *Nelson-Hall Series In Psychology. Minority İnfluence* (Pp. 97-114). Chicago, Il, Us: Nelson-Hall Publishers.

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: 9, Issue: 1, Year: 2019, pp. 205-231
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.

Wright, S. C., & Donald M. T. (1999). Success Under Tokenism: Co-Option Of The Newcomer And The Prevention Of Collective Protest, British Journal Of Social Psychology, 38.4: 369-396.

Yoder, J. D. (2002). 2001 Division 35 Presidential Address: Context Matters: Understanding Tokenism Processes And Their Impact On Women’s Work, Psychology Of Women Quarterly, 26, 1-8.

Yoder, J. D., Crumpton P.L., & Zipp, J.F., (1989). The Power Of Numbers In Influencing Hiring Decisions, Gender & Society, 3.2: 269-276.

Young, C. J., Mackenzie D.L. & Sherif C.W.(1980). In Search Of Token Women In Academia, Psychology Of Women Quarterly, 4.4: 508-525.

Zimmer, L. (1986). Women Guarding Men, Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

Zimmer, L. (1988). Tokenism And Women In The Workplace: The Limits Of Gender-Neutral Theory, Social Problems, 35:64-77.