The Cultural Blueprint That Regulates Unconscious Bias in Organizations

Seth STONE[1]
Lydia A. PERT[2]
Franco GANDOLFI[3]

Abstract

Unconscious bias is often treated as an individual psychological flaw rather than a systemic design issue. This paper reframes bias as an emergent property of organizational architecture—the cultural blueprint—that determines how cognition scales into collective behavior. Drawing on psychological and neuroscientific evidence, it reviews how automatic judgments arise from dual-process cognition and are regulated through prefrontal control mechanisms. It then connects these findings to organizational design, demonstrating how structural choices such as authority distribution, accountability, voice, and data systems either constrain or amplify bias. The analysis integrates insights from behavioral research, brain science, and organizational theory to propose a model in which design functions as a form of distributed cognitive regulation. By embedding feedback, oversight, and equitable decision protocols into systems, leaders can convert awareness into durable structural change. The paper concludes that fairness is not merely a moral aspiration but a design outcome: organizations perpetuate and sustain the conditions they are built to create.

1. Introduction

The concept of unconscious bias has become central to discussions of workplace diversity, inclusion, and fairness. It refers to automatic and unintentional processes that shape people's behavior and judgment without their conscious awareness (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). In a workplace context, however, unconscious bias operates within both individuals and the systems they create. It can be understood as a structural pattern; systemic errors in organizational design and decision-making that reflect and reproduce those underlying cognitive shortcuts (Payne, Vuletich, & Lundberg, 2017; Acker, 2006; Reskin, 2000). Common biases include gender, racial/ethnic, and affinity bias, which can distort hiring, promotion,

---

[1] Dr. Seth Stone, University of Jamestown, Jamestown, ND, USA, e-mail: seth.stone@uj.edu
[2] Lydia A. Pert, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, USA, e-mail: lydiapert@gmail.com
[3] Dr. Franco Gandolfi, California Institute of Advanced Management (CIAM); Georgetown University, Washington DC, USA, e-mail: francogandolfi@hotmail.com

leadership evaluation, and team dynamics (Derous & Ryan, 2019; Moss-Racusin et al., 2012; Quillian & Lee, 2023). Such biases undermine fairness, limit diversity, and hinder organizational performance (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). Despite extensive research and intervention programs, issues of equity and inclusion persist (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016; Greenwald et al., 2022), underscoring the need to re-examine how unconscious bias is conceptualized and addressed. In particular, traditional approaches tend to treat bias as a matter of individual attitudes, rather than as something shaped and amplified by organizational design.

Unconscious bias operates as an automatic cognitive process, but in the workplace, it manifests through the systems and structures leaders create. Organizational routines, decision protocols, power hierarchies, and accountability mechanisms all shape whether automatic judgments are regulated or allowed to influence outcomes unchecked (Lee & Ding, 2023). The design of those systems can unintentionally produce cultures of bias and, over time, toxicity. Once such dynamics become normalized, the organization begins to validate the very design that produced them, effectively creating a feedback loop and a closed system of dysfunctional behavior.

This paper aims to reposition unconscious bias primarily as a product of organizational systems rather than solely a human biological flaw, emphasizing that leaders function as the architects who design the workplace environments in which bias is either regulated or amplified. To achieve this end, the paper begins with a critical appraisal of unconscious bias through psychological and neuroscientific evidence, asking whether the concept is scientifically robust and applicable to workplace practice. Then it examines the extent of unconscious bias, drawing on research in psychology and neuroscience. Further, it evaluates tools used to measure bias, such as the Implicit Association Test (IAT), Electroencephalography (EEG), and functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI), assessing their relevance to workplace contexts. Additionally, it analyzes how organizations attempt to mitigate bias through interventions, drawing on meta-analyses and individual studies. Finally, the paper integrates these findings within an organizational design framework and concludes with a model that reframes bias as a property of systems rather than individuals. This model introduces the concept of the *cultural blueprint*: the underlying architecture that translates individual cognition into collective behavior. It also identifies specific mechanisms leaders can use to redesign organizational systems so that automatic bias is less likely to become embedded as routine practice.

2. The Science of Bias

Understanding bias in organizations requires beginning with the cognitive processes that lead to biased judgments in the first place. Labeling bias as a matter of personal prejudice or hostility is a drastic oversimplification of a highly complex process. Bias is ultimately a reflection of the ways the human brain sorts, categorizes, and interprets information under complex and/or uncertain conditions (Kahneman, 2011). Because workplaces demand almost immediate interpretations based on limited data, such as social and nonverbal cues, people often rely on heuristics, the

mental shortcuts that operate automatically and outside conscious awareness (Kahneman, 2011; Bargh, 1999). These processes are not inherently malicious; in fact, they are the brain's way of helping people expend less energy (Kahneman, 2011). However, these natural processes are not always beneficial, as they can distort how people perceive and even treat others. The remainder of this section reviews the empirical foundations of unconscious bias from a psychological and neurological perspective, clarifying what these processes are and how they influence behavior. It also explains how unconscious bias is measured and discusses the strengths and limitations of those tools to determine whether they actually help explain differences in workplace outcomes.

2.1 Psychological Foundations

Do unconscious biases actually exist? Evidence from psychology indicates they do, though their impact is variable. Dual-process theory proposes two interacting systems of thought: System 1, a fast, automatic system, and a slower, deliberative System 2 (Kahneman, 2011). Building on this, work on implicit cognition shows that people form automatic evaluative associations toward social groups that can shape perception and judgment outside their awareness (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Bargh, 1999). Classic laboratory paradigms (e.g., stereotype-activation and lexical-decision tasks) demonstrate faster responses to stereotype-consistent pairings, and related effects have been observed in contexts relevant to hiring and evaluation (Derous & Ryan, 2019; Moss-Racusin et al., 2012). Meta-analyses, however, suggest a more tempered picture: implicit measures are reliably detected but account for only modest variance in discriminatory behavior (Oswald et al., 2013; Forscher et al., 2019). This pattern implies that unconscious bias operates probabilistically rather than deterministically, consistent with arguments that implicit bias often reflects context-sensitive cognitive states rather than stable traits (Payne, Vuletich, & Lundberg, 2017).

2.2 Neuroscience Insights

Additionally, neuroscientific findings converge on early, automatic processing of social category cues while underscoring the limits of inference. EEG studies detect rapid event-related potentials (ERPs) that differentiate in-group from out-group faces within a few hundred milliseconds, indicating that bias-related processing begins at very early stages (Ito & Urland, 2003; Kubota & Ito, 2007). fMRI studies show greater amygdala responses to out-group faces, with increased activity in prefrontal control regions when participants have time or motivation to regulate automatic responses (Phelps et al., 2000; Cunningham et al., 2004). Reviews synthesize these findings as engagement of affective salience and control networks during social categorization, supporting the dual-process theory (Kubota, Banaji, & Phelps, 2012; Amodio, 2014). Importantly, neural correlates align with, but do not deterministically predict, discriminatory behavior, so overinterpreting activation as prejudice risks biological reductionism (Amodio, 2014).

The psychological and neurological evidence for the existence of unconscious bias has direct applicability to the workplace. Unconscious bias is measurable but inconsistent: automatic associations are common, yet their behavioral expression depends on situational demands and control (Payne, Vuletich, & Lundberg, 2017). This helps explain why workplace judgments, such as screening CVs or rating leadership potential, can drift under time pressure or ambiguity, but also why bias is not inevitable when structure and accountability are present (Kalev, Dobbin & Kelly, 2006). These ambiguities motivate the next section, which examines how bias is measured and whether those tools credibly capture phenomena tied to real workplace outcomes.

2.3 Measuring Implicit Bias

Evaluating how unconscious bias is measured is essential to judging whether it truly explains disparities observed in workplaces. This section focuses on three important behavioral and neuroscientific tools—the IAT, EEG, and fMRI—aimed in this context at capturing automatic responses that individuals may be unwilling or unable to report (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Kurdi et al., 2019). However, each brings methodological and interpretive limits that affect how confidently results can be applied to organizational settings.

The IAT measures the strength of automatic mental connections people hold between social categories and evaluative attributes such as gender–career or race–competence associations (Greenwald et al., 1998). During the test, participants quickly sort words or images that appear on a screen into paired categories; faster responses to specific pairings indicate stronger unconscious associations (Greenwald et al., 1998). The IAT is widely used in psychology and has been adopted in many workplace bias-awareness programs to illustrate how automatic associations can shape judgment without intent. Meta-analyses show the IAT reliably detects implicit associations but only weakly predicts discriminatory behavior (Oswald et al., 2013; Kurdi et al., 2019; Forscher et al., 2019). Forscher et al. (2019) conducted a meta-analysis of more than 400 intervention studies. They found that while implicit-bias scores can be shifted, the effects decay rapidly, often within hours or days. A large-scale experimental study comparing 17 bias-reduction strategies across 17,000 participants found immediate improvement, but most effects disappeared after 24 hours (Lai et al., 2016). Kurdi et al. (2019) similarly found that even robust interventions rarely produce durable change in implicit measures or translate into long-term behavioral differences.

Whereas psychological tools like the IAT reveal the behavioral expression of implicit bias, neuroscientific techniques help explain the mechanisms that produce those responses and clarify their limits as measures of workplace behavior. Neuroscience offers two insights that behavioral tools cannot: temporal and spatial mapping of how bias unfolds in the brain (Kubota et al., 2012). EEG reveals when bias-related processing occurs, within milliseconds of perception (Ito & Urland, 2003; Kubota & Ito, 2007). fMRI identifies where it occurs within networks linking emotional salience to cognitive control (Phelps et al., 2000; Cunningham et al.,

2004). Meta-reviews show consistent engagement of these affective-salience and control systems, indicating that bias is automatic yet regulatable (Kubota et al., 2012; Amodio, 2014). However, neural activation is correlational and shaped by experimental context and sample composition (Amodio, 2014); brain data enrich theoretical understanding but seldom predict real-world outcomes. In practice, this means that while neuroscience confirms the biological reality of automatic bias, it also highlights the conditions under which conscious regulation and, therefore, effective workplace structures such as decision protocols or accountability systems can interrupt it (Derous & Ryan, 2019; Dobbin & Kalev, 2016).

2.4 Synthesis

Collectively, the behavioral and neuroscientific measures demonstrate that unconscious bias is tangible, measurable, and biologically grounded, yet challenging to capture with precision or to translate directly into organizational outcomes (Amodio, 2014; Kubota, Banaji, & Phelps, 2012; Kurdi et al., 2019). The IAT reveals surface associations, neuroscience clarifies their mechanisms, and both expose the instability of bias across contexts. This inconsistency helps explain why workplace initiatives based on these measures often yield mixed results. In practice, it does not matter whether a hiring manager's amygdala lights up in response to a particular face, but whether the surrounding system has been designed to regulate or amplify that automatic response (Lippens et al., 2022). Understanding how these individual-level mechanisms interact with organizational design and how leadership structures shape the effects of unconscious bias is essential. It leads to the following question: how can organizations apply this evidence, and will those approaches create lasting change?

These neural and behavioral findings illuminate precisely where organizational systems must intervene: at moments of automatic judgment, cognitive overload, or ambiguous accountability (Payne, Vuletich, & Lundberg, 2017; Amodio, 2014). The same conditions that activate implicit cognitive shortcuts in individuals are also present in organizational processes such as high time pressure, unclear evaluation criteria, and limited feedback loops. Translating neuroscience and psychology into design, therefore, means identifying and reengineering these structural triggers so that the organization itself becomes a regulator of bias rather than its amplifier.

3. Workplace Application

While the psychology and neuroscience of unconscious bias help explain how automatic judgments form, the key question for organizations is what to do with that knowledge. Many workplaces have fallen into the trap of believing that if individuals become more aware of their own biases, their behavior will naturally and automatically change for the better. This belief has led to a strong emphasis on training and workshops geared toward raising awareness of bias. However, awareness alone does not change the conditions under which decisions are made

(Stone, 2012). Workplace decisions typically occur under time pressure and ambiguity, creating environments in which automatic responses are more likely to influence thought processes and resulting behaviors (Payne, Vuletich, & Lundberg, 2017; Amodio, 2014). To truly understand why bias persists in organizations, and how to interrupt it, this section distinguishes individual-level interventions from system-level redesign, explaining why the latter is essential for durable change.

In what follows, the term *cultural blueprint* is used to describe the implicit architecture through which individual cognition scales into collective behavior. Just as a building's blueprint dictates how each element connects to the next, an organization's *cultural blueprint* encodes the values, decision rules, and feedback systems that shape how people think and act at work. When that blueprint embeds bias through unexamined assumptions, unbalanced authority, or moral shortcuts, those design flaws replicate themselves throughout the system. Conversely, redesigning the blueprint to prioritize accountability and equity allows organizations to translate awareness into durable, behavioral change.

3.1 Limitations of Individual-Level Interventions

Unconscious bias training and related diversity initiatives have become central to organizational strategies for reducing inequality (Dobbin & Kalev, 2018). However, the evidence presented suggests that their outcomes are mixed and often short-lived. Meta-analyses show that while such programs can temporarily increase awareness or change implicit-association scores, durable behavioral or structural change is uncommon (Forscher et al., 2019; Bezrukova et al., 2016). A core limitation of behavioral interventions that stem from tools such as the IAT is that many treat bias as an individual cognitive defect to be corrected rather than as a product of systemic and contextual forces, neglecting the organizational conditions that allow automatic judgments to influence decisions (Noon, 2017; Salari et al., 2024). In other words, these efforts target the mind but overlook the system, which is the *cultural blueprint* of the organization that either allows bias to continue unrestrained or introduces controls that ultimately limit how bias manifests.

3.2 Designing for Cognitive Regulation

Empirical studies reveal that brief bias-awareness sessions can improve self-reported intentions but rarely translate into measurable changes in essential workplace processes such as hiring, promotion, or evaluation outcomes (Atewologun, Cornish, & Tresh, 2018). By contrast, initiatives that modify the decision environment, such as structured interviews, standardized performance criteria, or transparent accountability systems, consistently yield more substantial and more sustainable effects (Derous & Ryan, 2019; Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). These design-based approaches shift the focus from changing individual attitudes to changing how the entire system thinks. These findings echo insights from neuroscience: automatic responses are most likely to dominate under time pressure or ambiguity, whereas slower and more deliberative processes engage prefrontal

regulation and reduce biased outcomes (Amodio, 2014). Designing organizational systems that slow decision-making or require justification, therefore, can operationalize this principle of cognitive control at scale (Derous & Ryan, 2019).

3.3 The Role of Leadership in Bias Regulation

Critics further argue that emphasizing unconscious bias can create a sense of inevitability, implying that prejudice is biologically hard-wired and thus leading to the unintended consequence of excusing responsibility (Noon, 2017). However, the same evidence base shows that bias is malleable when structures foster reflection and accountability (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). Consequently, the value of the unconscious-bias framework lies less in its diagnostic precision and more in its ability to prompt organizational learning about how context shapes cognition (Atewologun, Cornish, & Tresh, 2018). From an organizational design perspective, leaders are the architects of the entire organization: the systems they build either interrupt or institutionalize bias. Overall, the workplace application of unconscious bias research reveals both its promise and its limits: it provides a compelling entry point for awareness and education, but, on its own, cannot deliver equitable outcomes. Genuine progress requires embedding these psychological and neuroscientific insights within systemic, leadership-driven reforms that reshape how decisions are made and evaluated. This connection between cognition and design leads directly to the discussion of how organizations determine bias tolerance and, in its absence, enable toxicity.

These behavioral and neural findings illuminate precisely where organizations must intervene: during snap evaluations, under heavy time pressure, or when lines of responsibility are unclear. The following section extends this logic from cognition to structure, examining how the design of systems—not just the behavior of individuals—determines whether bias is regulated or reinforced.

4. Bias in Design

While unconscious bias originates in individual cognition, its most lasting and damaging effects occur at the system level, where design choices govern how work is organized and how power flows. Organizations convert personal judgments into formal routines and policies that shape daily interactions. As a result, bias in organizations is rarely overt prejudice; it appears in the ordinary design of processes that determine who is heard, promoted, or included (Bojesson, 2024). In this sense, bias is not just something individuals have; it is something organizations can design for or design against.

4.1 Bias as a Structural Issue

Organizational design is the deliberate arrangement of structures, roles, and decision-making processes that create the context in which bias is either contained or amplified (Burton et al., 2020; Joseph & Sengul, 2024). Designs with concentrated authority, low transparency, and weak feedback mechanisms often amplify bias by limiting scrutiny and dissent (Reskin, 2000; Meyer et al., 2010). Such configurations

invite toxic patterns to take root: leaders with unchecked power can shape norms, silence opposition, and imprint personal preferences onto systems and strategies (Padilla et al., 2007; Einarsen et al., 2007; Tepper, 2000). Over time, these preferences become embedded as "the way things are done," institutionalizing bias into the organization's fabric.

Even ostensibly neutral systems can reproduce inequity. Performance metrics, promotion criteria, and algorithmic tools often reflect the values and historical patterns of those who designed them, inadvertently reinforcing class, gender, or race hierarchies (Acker, 2006; Kalev et al., 2006; Barocas & Selbst, 2016). Meritocratic rhetoric can worsen the problem by legitimizing biased outcomes as fair and earned (Castilla & Benard, 2010). In each case, design choices, whether in governance, data, or evaluation, determine the degree to which bias becomes self-reinforcing. Upper-echelons theory suggests that leaders' cognitive frames become embedded in strategy and structure, meaning bias in leadership thought often becomes bias in organizational design (Hambrick & Mason, 1984).

4.2 Accountability and Oversight Gaps

When decision-making authority is detached from oversight, bias flourishes unnoticed. Ambiguous reporting lines and overlapping responsibilities make it unclear who can intervene when fairness erodes (Cloud, 2013). When accountability is diffused, responsibility becomes invisible. Everyone assumes someone else will intervene, and bias quietly persists. At both executive and operational levels, the absence of independent review allows personal biases to become policy (Fasolo et al., 2024). Over time, unchallenged decisions harden into structures that are resistant to change, creating organizations that reward conformity rather than correction. For instance, when executive power and board oversight converge under the same individual or a tightly allied group, decision authority and accountability collapse into a single entity, eliminating the structural friction that regulates bias.

4.3 Human and Moral Dimensions of Design

Biased design choices often stem from self-interest and motivated reasoning. Leaders justify inequitable systems through moral disengagement and selective framing, convincing themselves that expedient or self-protective actions serve the greater good (Bandura, 1999; Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004). These cognitive dynamics mirror the same unconscious shortcuts operating at the individual level, now scaled to organizational power. In short, design failure and moral failure frequently coexist: one supplies the structure, the other the justification.

4.4 Toxic Leadership and Bias

These structural patterns do not emerge on their own. They mirror the intentions, blind spots, and values of those who design and enforce them. In this sense, bias is not merely a systems issue but a leadership issue: it persists or recedes according to the priorities of those at the top who define what fairness means in

practice (Jo & Shin, 2025). Organizational norms around fairness and accountability ultimately mirror the tone at the top; when leaders devalue transparency, systems follow suit (Ahmed et al., 2024; Akinyele et al., 2024). Intentional design, by contrast, embeds accountability and voice into the system itself, turning structure into a safeguard rather than a source of bias.

These dynamics position leadership as both the origin and the remedy of organizational bias. The systems that embed inequity are not self-perpetuating; they are sustained or dismantled by those who hold authority (Wolor et al., 2022). Leaders, through their allocation of attention, resources, and values, operationalize design principles that either constrain or amplify bias across the organization.

4.5 Reinforcement Cycles That Sustain Bias

These systemic antecedents reveal how flawed structures enable bias to become self-sustaining. Faulty organizational design can create the very environments that allow destructive and biased leaders to be selected, promoted, and normalized. Contexts marked by high power distance, instability, and weak checks and balances mute corrective feedback and make norm violations appear tolerable (Padilla et al., 2007; Einarsen et al., 2007). Once in power, such leaders engage in systematic, repeated behaviors that undermine organizational goals and subordinate well-being, producing climates of hostility and unfairness (Tepper, 2000).

Upper-echelons theory further predicts that leaders' cognitive frames and values become imprinted in strategy and structure (Hambrick & Mason, 1984). Through this imprinting, toxic leaders reconfigure reporting lines, incentives, and decision routines to align with their own preferences, closing channels for dissent and creating organizational silence (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). Over time, structural changes originally intended to "streamline" operations instead concentrate authority, codify personal bias, and embed inequity into the organization's design (Acker, 2006).

Empirically, organizations lacking responsibility-centered diversity infrastructures, such as formal structures that assign and monitor accountability for change, see bias endure. In contrast, those with such mechanisms show measurable improvements in representation (Kalev et al., 2006). This evidence underscores that design choices are not neutral: they either constrain or amplify toxic leadership and, by extension, the reproduction of bias. In short, flawed structures create the conditions under which bias becomes self-sustaining long before it becomes visible in culture.

4.6 Normalization Through Routine Practice

At the psychological and social level, bias becomes embedded through everyday behavior (Vaughan, 1997). Once structural reinforcement takes hold, biased routines begin to feel ordinary. Organizations rarely make an explicit choice to tolerate bias; instead, they drift there. Small, expedient departures from stated

standards accumulate until rule-bending becomes routine and seemingly harmless. Vaughan (1997) termed this the normalization of deviance: when repeated near-misses and the absence of immediate consequences recalibrate what seems acceptable.

Corrupt incentives further accelerate the slide. When performance metrics reward output and speed above all else, employees receive rational signals to prioritize efficiency over ethics (Kerr, 1975; Gandolfi et al., 2025a). Cognitive mechanisms reinforce this drift: motivated reasoning helps individuals justify poor decisions, and moral disengagement allows them to act without guilt (Kunda, 1990; Bandura, 1999; Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004). Over time, exceptional choices become the norm, and the organization's moral compass quietly reorients toward expedience (Welsh et al., 2015).

Three interlocking processes solidify this drift: institutionalization, rationalization, and socialization (Ashforth & Anand, 2003). Institutionalization embeds bias into rules and procedures; rationalization supplies justifications that make biased practices seem appropriate; and socialization teaches newcomers to accept "how things are done." Formal policies may persist, but practice drifts away from principle: organizations adopt legitimacy-signaling structures while daily behavior diverges (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Bromley & Powell, 2012).

External and social pressures can reinforce the illusion of fairness. Compliance programs and grievance systems often function as symbols of equity rather than as tools of reform (Edelman, 1992; Edelman et al., 1999). As more employees conform to the biased routine, descriptive norms—what others do—begin to eclipse injunctive norms; what people believe should be done (Cialdini et al., 1990; Granovetter, 1978). Once that shift occurs, bias becomes self-policing: deviation from the norm feels risky, and silence replaces correction.

Structural inertia then locks the cycle in place. What began as expedience becomes tradition, and the cost of reversal appears too high. The result is a closed cognitive-organizational loop in which bias is continuously reproduced through both structure and habit.

The good news is that the same forces can be redirected. Responsibility structures, such as blind recruitment, diverse task forces, and climates that encourage voice and psychological safety, can help organizations identify and correct these errors, restoring fairness and dismantling the conditions that sustain toxic leadership (Detert & Burris, 2007; Kalev et al., 2006; Gandolfi et al., 2025b). In short, bias persists when design tolerates it but recedes when design regulates it.

Taken together, these mechanisms form a closed cognitive–organizational loop. Bias begins as an individual shortcut, becomes institutionalized through flawed design, and then normalizes through repeated behavior until it feels inevitable. The task of leadership is to interrupt that loop (Artinger et al., 2025). Leaders must design systems that mimic the brain's own regulatory architecture, embedding feedback, accountability, and learning into the organization's daily functioning. Only by aligning cognition, structure, and culture can organizations prevent drift toward normalization and sustain ethical, evidence-based practice.

5. Breaking the Cycle

The persistence of bias within organizations is not a failure of awareness; it is a failure of design. Breaking that cycle requires leaders to intervene at the level of structure, process, and culture simultaneously (Fasolo et al., 2024). The four strategies that follow represent distinct yet interdependent design levers for systemic change: structural (how authority and decisions are organized), procedural (how accountability is enforced), relational (how voice and safety are cultivated), and informational (how data systems reinforce or correct bias). Together, these levers translate psychological insight into organizational architecture, closing the loop between recognition and regulation. Collectively, these interlocking structures form what this paper terms the *cultural blueprint*: the integrated design of systems, norms, and practices through which an organization's values, biases, and behavioral patterns become embedded and self-reinforcing. The blueprint represents not a static culture, but a dynamic architecture that continuously translates individual cognition into collective behavior.

Breaking the cycle of organizational bias depends on environments where decision processes are governed by equitable, consistent standards rather than personal instinct. While removing human judgment from the equation entirely is neither realistic nor productive, it must be augmented and constrained within firm boundaries that reduce ambiguity and make space for equity (Pathirannehelage et al., 2024). In practice, organizations that intentionally structure decision-making to slow evaluation, surface assumptions, and prioritize substantive criteria over feelings, opinions, or time constraints are better positioned to interrupt bias at its source.

Neuroscience shows that bias is most likely to surface when the brain operates in automatic, heuristic mode under time pressure, ambiguity, or cognitive overload (Amodio & Cikara, 2021). The prefrontal cortex, which governs reflection and impulse regulation, temporarily disengages (Gronchi et al., 2024) in these conditions, allowing rapid associative patterns from the amygdala and basal ganglia to drive judgment. The goal of organizational design, therefore, is not to eliminate bias within the individual mind but to engineer systems that engage collective regulation at scale. Structures, norms, and accountability mechanisms serve as externalized forms of cognitive control, slowing impulsive decision loops, broadening perceptual input, and embedding feedback processes that mirror the brain's own corrective functions. When leaders design organizations that operationalize these neural safeguards, they convert psychological insight into architecture, ensuring that fairness is not merely a matter of individual virtue but a property of the system itself.

5.1 Structure High-Stakes Decisions

Evidence points to the need for a strict structure around the most high-stakes organizational choices. That means defining role criteria up front and using structured interviews with firm evaluation frameworks. It also means building

performance reviews in ways that are not open to personal interpretation: even terms like "meets expectations" and "exceeds expectations" are subjective and require further clarification to avoid bias from slipping into evaluations. Meta-analyses have found that structured interviews and feedback forms are among the most consistently fair evaluation tools, and they far outperform ad hoc judgments that leave extensive room for bias (McDaniel et al., 1994; Levashina et al., 2014; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Blind evaluations, wherever possible, can also help prevent bias. A well-known example of design shaping bias comes from orchestral hiring practices. When orchestras introduced blind auditions, women's advancement rates rose dramatically (Goldin & Rouse, 1997). By removing demographic cues, decision-makers were prevented from making automatic pattern-based judgments, forcing attention onto skill and performance. This intervention revealed how seemingly minor design adjustments can recalibrate cognitive processes and produce systemic gains in fairness (Williams et al., 2025).

5.2 Enforce Accountability

To prevent or reverse biased patterns, organizations must intentionally redistribute decision-making authority and establish clear lines of accountability that do not depend on individual personality. Research on corporate governance consistently shows that separating executive functions, such as the CEO and Board Chair roles, increases oversight and decreases the likelihood that one person can disproportionally influence organizational direction and processes (Krause et al, 2014). Comprising boards of fully independent, objective individuals and using external recruiting processes to select executives also helps reduce conflict of interest and ensure that there is not a situation where one or a few people are in power, surrounded by uncritical allies who never challenge them or hold them accountable (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Organizations can strengthen accountability by implementing more comprehensive review practices, such as incorporating peer review in raise and promotion evaluations to limit the influence of any one person over another (Kalev et al., 2006). Additionally, increasing transparency in decision-making allows individuals at every level of the organization, with diverse worldviews and perspectives, the opportunity to evaluate and question the assumptions that might have gone into the decisions (Bainbridge, 2002). Finally, sustained oversight, such as audits or third-party assessments, can help ensure that accountability becomes part of the organizational design rather than inconsistent occurrences (Paine, 1994). These interventions cannot eliminate bias outright; however, they create environments in which bias is managed and individuals are held accountable.

5.3 Create Safe Reporting Channels

Effective bias control depends on safe, trusted reporting channels, yet followers, especially those in high power-distance contexts, often hesitate to use

them (Gandolfi et al., 2025b). Leadership responsibility lies in ensuring that reporting channels not only exist but also function effectively and are trusted by individuals at every level of the organization. Part of ensuring people are both able and willing to use reporting channels involves creating psychologically safe working environments where employees can raise concerns and point out inequities without fear of retaliation (Edmondson, 1999; Mrayyan & Al-Rjoub, 2024). Leaders' day-to-day behaviors, such as asking for input and acting on it, can help create a culture where people raise concerns quickly, before issues devolve into situations that require more formal reporting. Of course, in the event that situations do devolve, protected escalation paths that support effective whistleblowing have been found to lead to an immediate reversal of problematic behaviors or attitudes when reports are taken seriously (Near & Miceli, 1995; Near & Miceli, 1996).

5.4 Build Equity into Data Systems

Organizations that rely heavily on data and automated tools need to make sure those systems support fairness rather than introducing or amplifying bias. Algorithms are not neutral; they reflect the data and assumptions used to build them in the first place (Bender et al., 2021). For example, an applicant tracking system (ATS) trained on historical hiring data may quietly reproduce past preferences by down-ranking qualified candidates who differ from prior hires or privileging communication styles that match those of current leaders. In doing so, the algorithm launders old biases into new decisions, embedding inequity under the appearance of objectivity (Raji et al., 2020). Similar patterns can occur across other automated tools as well. Performance prediction models often reward communication styles similar to those of the people programming them. In each case, biased inputs shape the outcomes and reinforce bias that organizations need to address. Because of this, these algorithms should be reviewed and monitored just like any other important decision-making process. Researchers recommend conducting regular internal audits and developing clear documentation that explains what the tool is meant to do, how it performs across different groups, and its limitations (Mitchell et al., 2021). These steps help expose the assumptions that are often trained into automated models, and then the models can be retrained to influence outcomes in non-biased ways.

6. Conclusion

Unconscious bias represents an automatic yet malleable feature of human cognition, supported by psychological and neuroscientific evidence but constrained by context (Amodio, 2014). Measurement tools such as the IAT reveal implicit associations, while brain research clarifies their mechanisms and limits (Kubota, Banaji, & Phelps, 2012). In workplace practice, interventions based solely on awareness training yield modest, short-lived effects, whereas structural accountability and deliberate decision-making demonstrate greater impact (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016). The evidence across psychology, neuroscience, and organizational studies suggests that bias does not simply reside in individuals but in the systems

that shape how people think and decide together. Thus, the concept of unconscious bias remains valuable for raising awareness, but achieves lasting equity only when integrated into systemic organizational reform.

Importantly, this means that bias is not eliminated through changing attitudes alone, but through redesigning the conditions in which judgments are made. Leaders play a critical role in this process, serving as architects of the organization's culture. The design of that environment determines the level of bias tolerance and, ultimately, the organization's capacity to sustain fairness and inclusion. To reduce bias, organizations must structure high-stakes decisions, enforce clear and distributed accountability, create psychologically safe and accessible reporting channels, and embed equity considerations into data and algorithmic systems. These interventions do not remove human subjectivity, but they constrain it, shifting decision-making away from automatic judgments and toward more consistent evaluation practices. This perspective frames the *cultural blueprint* of organizations as the primary determinant of whether bias is regulated or reinforced. In short, organizations reproduce what they are designed to reproduce. If leaders design for equity, bias becomes preventable rather than inevitable.

References

1. Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society, 20*(4), 441-464. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243206289499
2. Ahmed, A. K., Atta, M. H. R., El-Monshed, A. H., & Mohamed, A. I. (2024). The effect of toxic leadership on workplace deviance: the mediating effect of emotional exhaustion, and the moderating effect of organizational cynicism. *BMC Nursing*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02308-x
3. Akinyele, A. I., & Chen, Z. (2024). Dark clouds of leadership: causes and consequences of toxic leadership. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, *55*(4), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.2024.2442185
4. Amodio, D. M. (2014). The neuroscience of prejudice and stereotyping. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 15*(10), 670-682. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3800
5. Amodio, D. M., & Cikara, M. (2021). *The social neuroscience of prejudice. Annual Review of Psychology, 72*, 439-469. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010419-050928
6. Ashforth, B. E., & Anand, V. (2003). The normalization of corruption in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *25*(1), 1-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-3085(03)25001-2
7. Artinger, F. M., Marx-Fleck, S., Junker, N. M., Gigerenzer, G., Artinger, S., & Dick, R. van. (2025). Coping with uncertainty: The interaction of psychological safety and authentic leadership in their effects on defensive decision making. *Journal of Business Research*, *190*, 115240-115240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115240
8. Atewologun, D., Cornish, T., & Tresh, F. (2018). *Unconscious bias training: An assessment of the evidence for effectiveness* (Research Report 113). Equality and Human Rights Commission. https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/our-work/our-research/unconscious-bias-training-assessment-evidence-effectiveness-0?utm_source=chatgpt.com
9. Bandura, A. (1999). *Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*(3), 193-209. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3

10. Bainbridge, S. M. (2002). *Director primacy: The means and ends of corporate governance. Northwestern University Law Review, 97*(2), 547-606. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.300860

11. Bargh, J. A. (1999). The cognitive monster: The case against the controllability of automatic stereotype activation. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp. 361-382). Guilford Press.

12. Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). *Big data's disparate impact. California Law Review, 104*(3), 671-732. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2477899

13. Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610-623). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922

14. Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin, 142*(11), 1227-1274. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000067

15. Bojesson, C. (2024). Understanding the role of organizational design in fostering long-term dynamic capabilities: a longitudinal case study. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *32*(11), 94-107. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoa-07-2023-3861

16. Bromley, P., & Powell, W. W. (2012). *From smoke and mirrors to walking the talk: Decoupling in the contemporary world. Academy of Management Annals, 6*(1), 483-530. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2012.684462

17. Burton, R. M., Obel, B., & Håkonsson, D. D. (2020). *Organizational design: A step-by-step approach* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

18. Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. (2010). *The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 55*(4), 543-676. https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2010.55.4.543

19. Cialdini, R. B., Kallgren, C. A., & Reno, R. R. (1990). *A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(6), 1015-1026. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.6.1015

20. Cloud, H. (2013). *Boundaries for Leaders*. Harper Collins.

21. Cunningham, W. A., Johnson, M. K., Raye, C. L., Gatenby, J. C., Gore, J. C., & Banaji, M. R. (2004). Separable neural components in the processing of Black and White faces. *Psychological Science, 15*(12), 806-813. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00760.x

22. Derous, E., & Ryan, A. M. (2019). When your résumé is (not) turning you down: Modeling ethnic bias in résumé screening. *Human Resource Management Journal, 29*(2), 113-130. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12217

23. Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). *Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? Academy of Management Journal, 50*(4), 869–884. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.26279183

24. Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). Why diversity programs fail. *Harvard Business Review, 94*(7-8), 52-60.

25. Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2018). Why doesn't diversity training work? *Anthropology Now, 10*(2), 48-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/19428200.2018.1493182

26. Edelman, L. B. (1992). *Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of civil rights law. American Journal of Sociology, 97*(6), 1531-1576. https://doi.org/10.1086/229939

27. Edelman, L. B., Uggen, C., & Erlanger, H. S. (1999). *The endogeneity of legal regulation: Grievance procedures as rational myth. American Journal of Sociology, 105*(2), 406-454. https://doi.org/10.1086/210316

28. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350-383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

29. Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 207-216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002

30. Fasolo, B., Heard, C., & Scopelliti, I. (2024). Mitigating Cognitive Bias to Improve

31. Organizational Decisions: An Integrative Review, Framework, and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management, 51*(6), 2182-2211. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063241 287188

32. Forscher, P. S., Lai, C. K., Axt, J. R., Ebersole, C. R., Herman, M., Devine, P. G., & Nosek, B. (2019). A meta-analysis of procedures to change implicit measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 117*(3), 522-559. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000160

33. Gandolfi, F., Stone, S., Ting, Q.-H., & Nasrah, S. K. (2025a). *The shadow of leadership: Examining the prevalence of toxic leadership in Malaysia. International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies, 8*(3), 2195-2205.

34. Gandolfi , F., Stone , S., Pert, L. A., Ting , Q.-H., & Nasrah, S. K. M. (2025b). Emerging From the Shadows: Follower Experience, Psychological Harm, and the Desire for Change Under Toxic Leadership in Malaysia. Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change, 10(2), 2920–2934. https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i2.2036

35. Goldin, C., & Rouse, C. (1997). *Orchestrating impartiality: The impact of "blind" auditions on female musicians* (NBER Working Paper No. 5903). National Bureau of Economic Research.

36. Granovetter, M. (1978). *Threshold models of collective behavior. American Journal of Sociology, 83*(6), 1420-1443. https://doi.org/10.1086/226707

37. Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 102*(1), 4-27. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.1.4

38. Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(6), 1464-1480. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464

39. Greenwald, A. G., Dasgupta, N., Dovidio, J. F., Kang, J., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Teachman, B. (2022). *Implicit-bias remedies: Treating discriminatory bias as a public-health problem. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 23*(1), 7-40. https://doi.org/10.1177/15291006211070781

40. Gronchi, G., Gavazzi, G., Viggiano, M. P., & Giovannelli, F. (2024). *Dual-process theory of thought and inhibitory control: An ALE meta-analysis. Brain Sciences, 14*(1), 101. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci14010101

41. Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). *Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. Academy of Management Review, 9*(2), 193-206. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4277628

42. Ito, T. A., & Urland, G. R. (2003). Race and gender on the brain: Electrocortical measures of attention to the race and gender of multiply categorizable individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(4), 616–626. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.616

43. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). *Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3*(4), 305-360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X

44. Jo, H., & Shin, D. (2025). The impact of recognition, fairness, and leadership on employee outcomes: A large-scale multi-group analysis. *PLOS ONE*, *20*(1), e0312951. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0312951

45. Joseph, J., & Sengul, M. (2024). Organization Design: Current Insights and Future Research Directions. *Journal of Management*, *51*(1), 249–308. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063241271242

46. Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow.* Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

47. Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review, 71*(4), 589-617. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100404

48. Kerr, S. (1975). *On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B. Academy of Management Journal, 18*(4), 769-783.

49. Krause, R., Semadeni, M., & Cannella, A. A. (2014). *CEO duality: A review and research agenda. Journal of Management, 40*(1), 256-286. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313503013

50. Kubota, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Phelps, E. A. (2012). The neuroscience of race. *Nature Neuroscience*, *15*(7), 940-948. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3136

51. Kubota, J. T., & Ito, T. A. (2007). Multiple cues in social perception: The time course of processing race and facial expression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 43*(5), 738-752. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2006.10.023

52. Kunda, Z. (1990). *The case for motivated reasoning. Psychological Bulletin, 108*(3), 480-498. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.480

53. Kurdi, B., Seitchik, A. E., Axt, J. R., Carroll, T. J., Karapetyan, A., Kaushik, N., … Banaji, M. R. (2019). Relationship between the Implicit Association Test and intergroup behavior: A meta-analysis. *American Psychologist, 74*(5), 569-586. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000364

54. Lai, C. K., Marini, M., Lehr, S. A., Cerruti, C., Shin, J. E., Joy-Gaba, J. A., Ho, A. K., Teachman, B. A., Wojcik, S. P., Koleva, S. P., Frazier, R. S., Heiphetz, L., Chen, E. E., Turner, R. N., Haidt, J., Kesebir, S., Hawkins, C. B., Schaefer, H. S., Rubichi, S., Sartori, G., … Nosek, B. A. (2016). Reducing implicit racial preferences: I. A comparative investigation of 17 interventions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. General*, *143*(4), 1765-1785. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036260

55. Lee, M. C. C., & Ding, A. Y. L. (2023). *Hierarchical Culture as a Cross-Level Moderator of the Relationship between Transformational Leadership, Performance Feedback, and Employee Job Performance.* Merits, 3(3), 504-520. https://doi.org/10.3390/merits3030030

56. Levashina, J., Hartwell, C. J., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2014). The Structured Employment Interview: Narrative and Quantitative Review of the Research Literature. *Personnel Psychology, 67*(1), 241-293. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12052

57. Lippens, L., Vermeiren, S., & Baert, S. (2022). The state of hiring discrimination A meta-analysis of (almost) all recent correspondence experiments. *European Economic Review*, *151*, 104315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2022.104315

58. McDaniel, M. A., Whetzel, D. L., Schmidt, F. L., & Maurer, S. D. (1994). *The validity of employment interviews: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(4), 599-616. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.599

59. Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). *Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340-363. https://doi.org/10.1086/226550

60. Meyer, R. D., Dalal, R. S., & Hermida, R. (2010). A review and synthesis of situational strength in the organizational sciences. *Journal of Management, 36*(1), 121-140. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309349309

61. Mitchell, S., Potash, E., Barocas, S., D'Amour, A., & Lum, K. (2021). Algorithmic Fairness: Choices, Assumptions, and Definitions. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, *8*(1), 141-163. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-042720-125902

62. Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). *Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 706-725. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3707697

63. Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109*(41), 16474-16479. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211286109

64. Mrayyan, M. T., & Al-Rjoub, S. F. (2024). Levels and Predictors of Leaders' Humble Leadership, Participants' Psychological Safety, Knowledge Sharing in the Team, and Followers' Creativity in Nursing: A Cross-Sectional Online Survey. *Journal of Nursing Management, 2024*(1). https://doi.org/10.1155/2024/9660787

65. Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1995). *Effective whistle-blowing. Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 679-708. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080334

66. Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1996). *Whistle-blowing: Myth and reality. Journal of Management, 22*(3), 507-526. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639602200306

67. Noon, M. (2017). Pointless diversity training: Unconscious bias, new racism and agency. *Work, Employment and Society, 32*(1), 198-209. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017017719841

68. Oswald, F. L., Mitchell, G., Blanton, H., Jaccard, J., & Tetlock, P. E. (2013). Predicting ethnic and racial discrimination: A meta-analysis of IAT criterion studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*(2), 171-192. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032734

69. Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). *The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders,*

70. susceptible *followers, and conducive environments. The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 176-194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.001

71. Pathirannehelage, S., Herath, H. M. D. R., & Fernando, P. (2024). Design principles for artificial-intelligence-augmented decision-making: balancing human judgment and machine prediction. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 22(3), 329-345. https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2024.2330402

72. Paine, L. S. (1994). *Managing for organizational integrity. Harvard Business Review, 72*(2), 106-117. https://hbr.org/1994/03/managing-for-organizational-integrity

73. Payne, B. K., Vuletich, H. A., & Lundberg, K. B. (2017). The bias of crowds: How implicit bias bridges personal and systemic prejudice. Psychological Inquiry, 28(4), 233-248. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2017.1335568

74. Phelps, E. A., O'Connor, K. J., Cunningham, W. A., Funayama, E. S., Gatenby, J. C., Gore, J. C., & Banaji, M. R. (2000). Performance on indirect measures of race evaluation predicts amygdala activation. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 12*(5), 729-738. https://doi.org/10.1162/089892900562552

75. Quillian, L., & Lee, J. J. (2023). Trends in racial and ethnic discrimination in hiring in six Western countries. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(6). https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2212875120

76. Raji, I. D., Smart, A., White, R. N., Mitchell, M., Gebru, T., Hutchinson, B., Smith-Loud, J., Theron, D., & Barnes, P. (2020). Closing the AI accountability gap: Defining an End-to-End Framework for Internal Algorithmic Auditing. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 33–44. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372873

77. Reskin, B. F. (2000). The proximate causes of employment discrimination. *Contemporary* Sociology*, 29*(2), 319-328. https://doi.org/10.2307/2654387

78. Salari, N., Fattah, A., Amin Hosseinian-Far, Mojdeh Larti, Sharifi, S., & Mohammadi, M. (2024). The prevalence of workplace microaggressions and racial discrimination: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Safety and Health at Work*, *15*(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shaw.2024.05.002

79. Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). *The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel* psychology*: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. Psychological Bulletin, 124*(2), 262-274. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.262

80. Stone, S. M. (2012, September 23). *The value proposition for change.* Regent Global Business Review, 5(2). https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/rgbr/vol5iss2/RGBR-Vol5Iss2-stone-4.pdf

81. Tenbrunsel, A. E., & Messick, D. M. (2004). *Ethical fading: The role of self-deception in* unethical *behavior. Social Justice Research, 17*(2), 223-236. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SORE.0000027411.35832.53

82. Tepper, B. J. (2000). *Consequences of abusive supervision. Academy of Management Journal,* 43(2), 178-190. https://doi.org/10.2307/1556375

83. Vaughan, D. (1997) The Challenger Launch Decision: Risky Technology, Culture, and Deviance at NASA. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226346960.001.0001

84. Welsh, D. T., Ordóñez, L. D., Snyder, D. G., & Christian, M. S. (2015). *The slippery slope: How* small *ethical transgressions pave the way for larger future transgressions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(1), 114-127. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036950

85. Williams, M. J., Esianor, B., Hendrick, S., Farlow, J. L., Farrell, A., Kupfer, R. A., Meyer, T. K., Vinson, K. N., Wandell, G. M., & Chen, A. Y. (2025). Everyday challenges to women's presence and authority yield greater burnout and less persistence in a male-dominated profession. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *122*(20). https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2415826122

86. Wolor, C. W., Ardiansyah, A., Rofaida, R., Nurkhin, A., & Rababah, M. A. (2022). Impact of toxic leadership on employee performance. *Health Psychology Research*, *10*(4). https://doi.org/10.52965/001c.57551