

Chapter 1 : Examples of prejudice & discrimination in society today (article) | Khan Academy

But as we ascend in the social scale, the process of discriminating and being discriminated by hearing increases in difficulty, partly because voices are assimilated, partly because the faculty of voice-discrimination is a plebeian virtue not much developed among the Aristocracy.

It is treating someone differently simply because of who they are or what they believe. We all have the right to be treated equally, regardless of our race, ethnicity, nationality, class, caste, religion, belief, sex, language, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, health or other status. Working with disadvantaged communities across the world we work to change discriminatory laws and protect people. Sometimes these victories are bittersweet, such as when the Moroccan parliament changed its discriminatory rape law in , meaning rapists can no longer escape punishment by forcing their victims to marry them. This was two years too late for Amina Filali and her grieving family. She killed herself in after being forced to marry the man she said had raped her. But how does this happen? At the heart of all forms of discrimination is prejudice based on concepts of identity, and the need to identify with a certain group. This can lead to ignorance and even hate. Certain groups can even be viewed by the authorities as more likely to be criminal simply for who they are, such as being poor, indigenous or black. Sometimes people are criminalized directly for who and what they are - such as being gay. Sometimes it happens indirectly – for example employers asking for a high-level of proficiency in a native language when the tasks involved do not actually require it. In many countries racism is nourished by increasingly xenophobic responses to immigration. Amnesty is calling for Get rid of discriminatory laws and release anyone who is in prison because of them. Protect everyone - whoever they are - from violence. Draw up new laws and build institutions that tackle the root causes of discrimination. Women and girls The experience of women and girls illustrates the nature of discrimination. In far more places than you might imagine, laws exist making women second-class citizens. When the state dismisses violence against women as a private or domestic matter, it sends a clear message that violence against women is condoned. Discrimination against women is often made worse when they belong to more than one disadvantaged group because of their income, race, ethnicity, sexual identity, caste, religion, class or age. In the acquittal of her attackers two years later, the court noted that the incident could not possibly have happened because upper caste men would not rape a woman of a lower caste. Help us fight against discrimination.

Chapter 2 : Prejudice and Discrimination in Psychology | Simply Psychology

verb (used without object), dis-crim-i-nat-ed, dis-crim-i-nat-ing. to make a distinction in favor of or against a person or thing on the basis of the group, class, or category to which the person or thing belongs rather than according to actual merit; show partiality: The new law discriminates against foreigners.

Structural violence Structural violence is an important factor in the treatment of people living with AIDS. Poor Farmer argues that social determinants affecting the lives of certain cultural groups alter their risk of infections and their ability to access treatment. Educating doctors on the interactions between social life and healthcare would help level out the injustices in healthcare. Research[edit] Current research has found that discrimination against people living with HIV is a contributing factor for delayed initiation of HIV treatment. Many people also believe that AIDS is related to homosexuality. Even so, research has found that societal structure and beliefs influence the prevalence stigma and discrimination. The nurses or medical volunteers may lack the proper knowledge of how to treat the individuals too, if they lack resources and funding. The total knowledge score obtained by all the participants ranged from 2 to 16, with an average of They often take extreme precaution against HIV positive clients for fear of transmission, and at times may refuse HIV positive clients some aspects of care. Medical volunteers, nurses, and doctors, especially in low-income areas, will disclose their status without fear of rejection, isolation and discriminated against. Research is still being done to see if therapy and other psychological services will be a buffer between the discrimination and stress. The study highlights the importance to reduce discrimination toward PLHIV and the difficulty to alleviate its negative consequences. Violence is an important factor against the treatment of people living with AIDS. Any violence against HIV infected individuals or people who are perceived to be infected with HIV can severely shut down the advancement of treatment in response to the progression of the disease. Paul Farmer argues that social determinants affecting the lives of certain cultural groups alter their risk of infections and their ability to access treatment. Farmer also argues that social intervention may be key in altering the gap in treatment between these groups of people. Instrumental AIDS stigmaâ€”a reflection of the fear and apprehension that are likely to be associated with any deadly and transmissible illness. Internalized stigma and discrimination ran rampant in the study, but also throughout the PLHIV community. In response, PLHIV have developed self-deprecating mindsets and coping skills to deal with the social repercussions versus accepting of their current status and seeking help. People who are HIV positive often deal with stigma, even though with the proper medication this can be manageable lifelong disease. PLHIV, when shut off from their community. Those individuals can no longer feel like part of society, which, as humans, we need communities to feel understood and wanted. Many of the children were orphans due to the death of parents, had sibling deaths, and even some themselves, who were born with HIV. At Mvelaphanda Primary school, their mortality rate is increasing in their children, especially young women. These women are more at risk than their male counterparts due to many being involved with older men who have various partners and do not participate in safe sex practices. Some of these students are themselves parents of students at the school. The problem is that even when family members are informed of the cause of death, which is likely to be AIDS, they choose to inform people that the cause of death was " witchcraft ". In a research study done in the western region of Saudi Arabia. The stigma is profound in Saudi Arabia as Islam prohibits behaviours associated with risk factors related to transmission of HIV, such as non-marital sex, homosexuality and intravenous drug use. PLHIV experienced isolation and lack of psycho-social and emotional support. In response to their experiences many participants accepted their diagnoses as destiny and became more religious, using spirituality as their main coping strategy.

Chapter 3 : What is "discrimination"? | Ontario Human Rights Commission

For one thing, Zahs is a very discriminating hoarder. â€” Peter Rainer, The Christian Science Monitor, "Saving Brinton chronicles discovery of film rarities," 15 June Small farmers can serve more discriminating customers while big farms provide product for more cost-conscious consumers, Kogan and DeAngelo say.

We focus our discussion on discrimination against disadvantaged racial minorities. Our definition encompasses both individual behaviors and institutional practices. To be able to measure the existence and extent of racial discrimination of a particular kind in a particular social or economic domain, it is necessary to have a theory or concept or model of how such discrimination might occur and what its effects might be. The theory or model, in turn, specifies the data that are needed to test the theory, appropriate methods for analyzing the data, and the assumptions that the data and analysis must satisfy in order to support a finding of discrimination. Without such a theory, analysts may conduct studies that do not have interpretable results and do not stand up to rigorous scrutiny. The purpose of this chapter is to help researchers think through appropriate models of discrimination to guide their choice of data and analytic methods for measurement. We begin by discussing four types of discrimination and the various mechanisms that may lead to such discrimination. The first three types involve behaviors of individuals and organizations: The fourth type involves discriminatory practices embedded in an organizational culture. Next, we compare these discriminatory behaviors and institutional practices with existing legal standards defining discrimination in the courts Page 56 Share Cite Suggested Citation: The National Academies Press. We then discuss how these discriminatory behaviors and practices might operate within the domains of education, employment, housing, criminal justice, and health. Finally, we discuss concepts of how cumulative discrimination might operate across domains and over time to produce lasting consequences for disadvantaged racial groups. This chapter is not concerned with identifying the relative importance of the various types of discrimination; rather, it is designed to present a set of conceptual possibilities that can motivate and shape appropriate research study designs. Yet discrimination can include more than just direct behavior such as the denial of employment or rental opportunities ; it can also be subtle and unconscious such as nonverbal hostility in posture or tone of voice. Furthermore, discrimination against an individual may be based on overall assumptions about members of a disadvantaged racial group that are assumed to apply to that individual i. Discrimination may also occur as the result of institutional procedures rather than individual behaviors. Intentional, Explicit Discrimination In , Gordon Allport, an early leader in comprehensive social science analysis of prejudice and discrimination, articulated the sequential steps by which an individual behaves negatively toward members of another racial group: Each step enables the next, as people learn by doing. In most cases, people do not get to the later steps without receiving support for their behavior in the earlier ones. In this section, we describe these forms of explicit prejudice. By themselves such comments may not be regarded as serious enough to be unlawful balanced against concerns about freedom of speech , but they constitute a clear form of hostility. Together with nonverbal expressions of antagonism, they can create a hostile environment in schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods Essed, ; Feagin, Verbal and nonverbal hostility are first steps on a continuum of interracial harm-doing. In laboratory experiments see Chapter 6 for detailed discussion , verbal abuse and nonverbal rejection are reliable indicators of Page 57 Share Cite Suggested Citation: They also precede and vary with more overtly damaging forms of treatment, such as denial of employment Dovidio et al. Such nonverbal hostility reliably undermines the performance of otherwise equivalent interviewees. In settings of discretionary contactâ€”that is, in which people may choose to associate or notâ€”members of disadvantaged racial groups may be isolated. In social situations, people may self-segregate along racial lines. In work settings, discretionary contact may force out-group members into lower-status occupations Johnson and Stafford, or undermine the careers of those excluded from informal networks. Sociological studies have measured avoidance in discretionary social contact situations by report or observation Pettigrew, b; Pettigrew and Tropp, In legal settings, avoidance of casual contact can appear as evidence indicating hostile intent. Avoidance may appear harmless in any given situation but, when cumulated across situations, can lead to long-term exclusion

and segregation. It may be particularly problematic in situations in which social networking matters, such as employment hiring and promotion, educational opportunities, and access to health care. Avoiding another person because of race can be just as damaging as more active and direct abuse. Segregation occurs when people actively exclude members of a disadvantaged racial group from the allocation of resources and from access to institutions. The most common examples include denial of equal education, housing, employment, and health care on the basis of race. The majority of Americans about 90 percent in most current surveys; Bobo, support laws enforcing fair and equal opportunity in these areas. The data indicate that these hardcore discriminators view their own group as threatened by racial outgroups Duckitt, Moreover, even the 90 percent who report support for equal opportunity laws show less support when specific remedies are mentioned see Chapter 8. Physical attacks on racial outgroups have frequently been perpetrated by proponents of segregation Green et al. Extermination or mass killings based on racial or ethnic animus do occur. These are complex phenomena; in addition to the sorts of individual hostility and prejudice described above, they typically encompass histories of institutionalized prejudice and discrimination, difficult life conditions, strong and prejudiced leadership, social support for hostile acts, and socialization that accepts explicit discrimination Allport, ; Newman and Erber, ; Staub, Our report focuses more on the levels of discrimination most often addressed by social scientists. In most cases involving complaints about racial discrimination in the United States, explicit discrimination is expressed through verbal and nonverbal antagonism and through racial avoidance and denial of certain opportunities because of race. Racial segregation is, of course, no longer legally sanctioned in the United States, although instances of de facto segregation continue to occur. Subtle, Unconscious, Automatic Discrimination Even as a national consensus has developed that explicit racial hostility is abhorrent, people may still hold prejudicial attitudes, stemming in part from past U. Although prejudicial attitudes do not necessarily result in discriminatory behavior with adverse effects, the persistence of such attitudes can result in unconscious and subtle forms of racial discrimination in place of more explicit, direct hostility. Such subtle prejudice is often abetted by differential media portrayals of nonwhites versus whites, as well as de facto segregation in housing, education, and occupations. The psychological literature on subtle prejudice describes this phenom- Page 59 Share Cite Suggested Citation: Members of the ingroup face an internal conflict, resulting from the disconnect between the societal rejection of racist behaviors and the societal persistence of racist attitudes Dovidio and Gaertner, ; Katz and Hass, ; McConahay, Subtle forms of racism are indirect, automatic, ambiguous, and ambivalent. We discuss each of these manifestations of subtle prejudice in turn Fiske, , and then examine their implications for discriminatory behavior. Indirect prejudice leads ingroup members to blame the outgroupâ€”the disadvantaged racial groupâ€”for their disadvantage Hewstone et al. The blame takes a Catch form: The outgroup members should try harder and not be lazy, but at the same time they should not impose themselves where they are not wanted. Such attitudes on the part of ingroup members are a manifestation of indirect prejudice. Differences between the ingroup and outgroup linguistic, cultural, religious, sexual are often exaggerated, so that outgroup members are portrayed as outsiders worthy of avoidance and exclusion. Indirect prejudice can also lead to support for policies that disadvantage nonwhites. Subtle prejudice can also be unconscious and automatic, as ingroup members unconsciously categorize outgroup members on the basis of race, gender, and age Fiske, People have been shown to respond to even subliminal exposure to outgroups in these automatic, uncontrollable ways Dovidio et al. However, the social context in which people encounter an outgroup member can shape such instantaneous responses. Outgroup members who are familiar, subordinate, or unique do not elicit the same reactions as those who are unfamiliar, dominant, or undifferentiated Devine, ; Fiske, Such automatic reactions have also been shown to lead to automatic forms of stereotype-confirming behavior Bargh et al. The main effect of subtle prejudice seems to be to favor the ingroup rather than to directly disadvantage the outgroup; in this sense, such prejudice is ambiguous rather than unambiguous. That is, the prejudice could indicate greater liking for the majority rather than greater disliking for the minority. As a practical matter, in a zero-sum setting, ingroup advantage often results in the same outcome as outgroup disadvantage but not always. Empirically, ingroup members spontaneously reward the ingroup, allocating discretionary resources to their own kind and thereby relatively disadvantaging the outgroup Brewer and Brown, People spontaneously view

their own ingroups but not the outgroup in a positive light, attributing its strengths to the essence of what makes a person part of the ingroup genes being a major example. These ambiguous allocations and attributions constitute another subtle form of discrimination. According to theories of ambivalent prejudice e. Outgroups may be disrespected but liked in a condescending manner. At other times, outgroups may be respected but disliked. White reactions to black professionals can exemplify this behavior. Some racial outgroups elicit both disrespect and dislike. Poor people, welfare recipients, and homeless people all erroneously perceived to be black more often than white frequently elicit an unambivalent and hostile response. The important point is that reactions need not be entirely negative to foster discrimination. One might, for example, fail to promote someone on the basis of race, perceiving the person to be deferential, cooperative, and nice but essentially incompetent, whereas a comparable ingroup member might receive additional training or support to develop greater competence. All manifestations of subtle prejudice—indirect, automatic, ambiguous, and ambivalent—constitute barriers to full equality of treatment. Subtle prejudice is much more difficult to document than more overt forms, and its effects on discriminatory behavior are more difficult to capture. In their study, the experimenter first showed white participants either black or white young male faces, presented at a subliminal level. The experimenter then either did or did not provoke the participant by requiring that the experiment be started over because of an apparent computer error. Compared with other participants, those who saw the black faces and were also provoked by the experimenter behaved with more hostility as revealed in a videotape of their immediate facial expressions and in their subsequent behavior, as rated by the experimenter. Generally, an emerging pattern of results from laboratory research see, e. In any event, the implicit measures have been shown to be statistically reliable Cunningham et al. Some of these laboratory findings have been generalized to the real world—for example, in contrasting subtle and explicit forms of prejudice Pettigrew, b and in research on specific phenomena, such as ingroup favoritism Brewer and Brown, The discussion of experimental methods in Chapter 6 elaborates on this point.

Statistical Discrimination and Profiling Another process that may result in adverse discriminatory consequences for members of a disadvantaged racial group is known as statistical discrimination or profiling. In this situation, an individual or firm uses overall beliefs about a group to make decisions about an individual from that group Arrow, ; Coate and Loury, ; Lundberg and Startz, ; Phelps, The perceived group characteristics are assumed to apply to the individual. When beliefs about a group are based on racial stereotypes resulting from explicit prejudice or on some of the more subtle forms of ingroup-versus-outgroup perceptual biases, then discrimination on the basis of such beliefs is indistinguishable from the explicit prejudice discussed above. Statistical discrimination or profiling, properly defined, refers to situations of discrimination on the basis of beliefs that reflect the actual distributions of Page 62 Share Cite Suggested Citation: Even though such discrimination could be viewed as economically rational, it is illegal in such situations as hiring because it uses group characteristics to make decisions about individuals. Why might employers or other decision makers employ statistical discrimination? There are incentives to statistically discriminate in situations in which information is limited, which is often the case. For example, graduate school applicants provide only a few pages of written information about themselves, job applicants are judged on the basis of a one-page resume or a brief interview, and airport security officers see only external appearance. In such situations, the decision maker must make assessments about a host of unknown factors, such as effort, intelligence, or intentions, based on highly limited observation. Why is information limited in such cases? Instead, decision makers look for signals that cannot easily be faked and are correlated with the attributes a decision maker is seeking.

Chapter 4 : Discrimination | Define Discrimination at www.nxgvision.com

Disability Discrimination. Disability discrimination occurs when an employer or other entity covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act, as amended, or the Rehabilitation Act, as amended, treats a qualified individual with a disability who is an employee or applicant unfavorably because she has a disability.

Many people wrongly think that discrimination does not exist if the impact was not intended, or if there were other factors that could explain a particular situation. In fact, discrimination often takes place without any intent to do harm. And in most cases, there are overlaps between discrimination and other legitimate factors. The young woman who interviews him finds him pleasantly similar to her favourite grandfather and tells him this as a compliment. This may be discrimination based on age and gender, even though it is clear the interviewer liked the man on a personal basis, and the person actually hired may have been more qualified for the job. In many cases, discrimination results from a tendency to build society as though everyone is the same as the people in power – all young, one gender, one race, one religion or one level of ability. Such barriers, even if unintended, are discrimination. Prejudice is a strong dislike or negative feelings held by someone about another person or group. These types of attitudes can be expressed as "isms" ageism, sexism, racism, etc. When people are stereotyped, all people in the group are given the same characteristics, regardless of their individual differences. While racism, sexism, etc. Therefore, it is important from a human rights perspective to address acts of discrimination and also ageist, sexist, racist, etc. Discrimination can take many forms. This type of discrimination generally arises from negative attitudes and biases relating to that ground. An employer rejected a Black candidate for a job after meeting her. He was visibly shocked and turned her down flat, without asking about her credentials. When asked what was wrong, he said something about maintaining the company image. In some cases, direct discrimination takes place through another person or other means. Discrimination can also occur when an employer adopts a practice or rule that, on its face, discriminates on a prohibited ground. A workplace adopts a rule of not hiring women who wish to start a family. This would be direct discrimination based on sex and family status. A placement agency refuses work to a bisexual, lesbian or gay person, because the company using their services told them to. In these three examples, the people giving the instructions can be held responsible for discriminating. The persons who followed the instructions to discriminate have also engaged in discrimination – they cannot claim to have just been following orders. A White employee is refused a promotion because she has a close friendship with a Black employee. A parent of a child with a severe disability is fired after missing work too many times to deal with medical emergencies. Intent or motive to discriminate is not a necessary element for a finding of discrimination – it is sufficient if the conduct has a discriminatory effect. Subtle forms of discrimination can often only be detected after looking at all of the circumstances. A woman is one of four people granted job interviews, from a pool of several dozen people who sent in resumes by mail. When she appears in person, the interviewer seems surprised and uncomfortable, does not make eye contact, and seems to hurry through the interview. The woman feels that the interviewer assumed that she was a lesbian based on aspects of her gender presentation, such as her hairstyle and clothing. She later learns that she did not get the position, but the company does not explain its decision. A Black vice-principal repeatedly tried to get promoted to the position of principal. It can be hard to determine if subtle discrimination is a factor in such situations. You may need to investigate and analyze the total context of the alleged behaviour, comment or conduct. This would include thinking about evidence that compares how others were treated in a similar situation, or evidence that a pattern of behaviour exists. The following actions may also be hints that racial discrimination is happening: Similarly, a finding of discrimination may be made when someone makes negative comments about a person advocating for human rights protections or equitable treatment. A small company is proud of its intensive team-building approach. People who do not attend these events are less successful at building the internal networks that lead to promotions. Employees who are female, single, gay or lesbian may not feel welcome at these events. People who have care-giving responsibilities after work or who use mobility aids, such as wheelchairs, would likely not be able to attend these events. Systemic discrimination can overlap with other kinds of discrimination,

such as harassment, and may arise from stereotypes and biases. The definition of systemic discrimination used by the Commission includes the following three elements: People can experience systemic discrimination differently based on the intersection of various grounds of discrimination, such as gender, disability, place of origin, and so on. In the example above, a racialized or single woman with a disability would be at a triple disadvantage. The following three considerations can be used to identify and address systemic discrimination: Use these three elements as a basis for actively monitoring for systemic discrimination and measures to address it. If the rule is not inclusive and does not accommodate individual differences to the point of undue hardship, it is discriminatory. A workplace introduces a new attendance management program that allows employees to take six days off per year. The program provides for disciplinary sanctions, up to and including termination, for each extra absence, regardless of the reason. Although this program is applied equally to all employees, it has not been inclusively designed and does not take into account the need to accommodate differences between employees due to family status, disability or other Code grounds. As a result of this test, the rule or standard itself must be inclusive and must accommodate individual differences up to the point of undue hardship. It is not enough to keep discriminatory standards and supplement them by accommodating people who cannot meet them. This ensures that each person is assessed according to his or her own personal abilities, instead of being judged against presumed group characteristics. The protections from reprisal apply to complainants, witnesses, advisors, representatives of complainants and witnesses, investigators and decision-makers or management who support a person raising human rights issues. People are protected from reprisal when they file a formal human rights claim. Employees should be able to raise human rights issues and have them dealt with fairly. They should not be punished for having done so. Employees who seek accommodation related to grounds such as creed, disability or family status should not be treated as less valuable or less committed to their work as a result. An employee believes that he was not promoted in his job because of his race. He tells his manager that he will contact a lawyer to see about filing a human rights claim. The next day he is fired. An employee quits her job after finding a new one and making a sexual harassment complaint under the Code against her former employer. She discovers that her previous employer contacted her new employer and made negative comments about her because of her complaint. An employee believes that he was given an unfair performance appraisal and passed over for skills upgrade training because he is older than other workers in his department. After he launches an internal complaint, he is demoted and transferred to another department. A teacher gets part-time work to balance her caregiving responsibilities with her work. Women in a company approach a manager in the human resources department with allegations of sexual harassment by the president. This may be found to be reprisal. Every person who is an employee has a right to freedom from harassment in the workplace by the employer or agent of the employer or by another employee because of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, age, record of offences, marital status, family status or disability. She was exposed to harassment based on both race and sex because she was a young woman the employer could assert economic power and control over. His comments arose from racist assumptions about the sexuality of Black women. How the conduct would be viewed by a reasonable person, taking into account the perspective of the person being harassed this is the objective element. The subjective views of the person being harassed. The subjective views of a person who has harassed someone do not determine whether a finding of harassment will be made. Harassment can be found to exist even if the harasser is not aware of how his or her behaviour is being received. In some cases, it will be obvious that the conduct or comments are offensive or unwelcome. In other cases, conduct or comment may not on their face be offensive, but the harasser should still reasonably know that they are unwelcome because of how the other person reacts. Some persons who are being harassed do not object because they are afraid of what will happen if they speak out. Sometimes people respond by becoming angry, using strong language or becoming emotional. Many people being harassed try to cope by playing along or responding the same way in return. These are all common ways for a harassed employee to keep some form of personal power in a vulnerable situation, to regain favour or just to get by. Tribunals have recognized that these types of responses are understandable and do not defeat a claim of harassment. An employee is exposed to racial discrimination and harassment in the workplace. To assess these situations accurately, you will need to apply

the subjective and objective elements of the test and be aware of the power dynamics that are happening. Bob, a senior manager, is well known for making racist and homophobic comments. Bob may still be liable for harassment, even though none of the employees objected. In effect, employees cannot disagree with his comments because of the workplace culture created by Bob, and condoned by the other senior executives. However, one serious incident may create a poisoned work environment – see the next section for more details. In a workplace, the only gay employee is repeatedly made the brunt of practical jokes and is ridiculed by his co-workers for no apparent reason. The workplace has a history of homophobic attitudes. Employers, people acting for employers, co-workers and other persons in the workplace, such as clients, are prohibited from harassing employees at work. Management has the responsibility to prevent and address situations that may allow harassment to develop or continue. Employers also may be liable in a human rights complaint if they knew of, or should have known of, harassment and could have taken steps to prevent or stop it. A person who has the authority to prevent or discourage harassment may be found responsible or "vicariously liable. Being exposed to negative or hostile treatment that is racially motivated has a negative impact on other employees, and may leave them wondering if they are also the target when they are not present. A Chinese woman works in a bakery where racial slurs and stereotypical language are common in the kitchen. Although these remarks are directed at her Black co-workers, she has been subjected to a racially "poisoned environment.

Chapter 5 : Discrimination | Definition of Discrimination by Merriam-Webster

Discriminating Among Meanings of Discrimination. Discrimination has senses with neutral, positive, and negative connotations. On the one hand, it can refer to "the act (or power) of distinguishing" or to "good taste, refinement."

Conformity could also be used as an explanation of prejudice if you get stuck writing a psychology essay see below. Examples of Discrimination Racial Discrimination Apartheid literally "separateness" was a system of racial segregation that was enforced in South Africa from to Non-white people where prevented from voting and lived in separate communities. Later, the Jews were placed in concentration camps by the Nazis. Age Discrimination This is a type of discrimination against a person or group on the grounds of age. Gender Discrimination In Western societies while women are often discriminated against in the workplace, men are often discriminated against in the home and family environments. For instance after a divorce women receive primary custody of the children far more often than men. Women on average earn less pay than men for doing the same job. Conformity as an Explanation of Prejudice and Discrimination Influences that cause individuals to be racist or sexist, for example, may come from peers parents and group membership. Social norms - behavior considered appropriate within a social group - are one possible influence on prejudice and discrimination. People may have prejudiced beliefs and feelings and act in a prejudiced way because they are conforming to what is regarded as normal in the social groups to which they belong: The effect of Social Norms on Prejudice Minard investigated how social norms influence prejudice and discrimination. The behavior of black and white miners in a town in the southern United States was observed, both above and below ground. Below ground, where the social norm was friendly behavior towards work colleagues, 80 of the white miners were friendly towards the black miners. Above ground, where the social norm was prejudiced behavior by whites to blacks, this dropped to The white miners were conforming to different norms above and below ground. Whether or not prejudice is shown depends on the social context within which behavior takes place. Pettigrew also investigated the role of conformity in prejudice. He investigated the idea that people who tended to be more conformist would also be more prejudiced, and found this to be true of white South African students. Similarly, he accounted for the higher levels of prejudice against black people in the southern United States than in the north in terms of the greater social acceptability of this kind of prejudice in the south. A study by Rogers and Frantz found that immigrants to Rhodesia now Zimbabwe became more prejudiced the longer they had been in the country. They gradually conformed more to the prevailing cultural norm of prejudice against the black population. Conformity to social norms, then, may offer an explanation for prejudice in some cases. At the same time, norms change over time, so this can only go some way towards explaining prejudice. Race relationships in the Pocahontas coal field. Journal of Social Issues, 8 1 , Regional differences in anti-Negro prejudice. Journal of abnormal psychology, 59 1 , Racial themes in Southern Rhodesia: How to reference this article:

Chapter 6 : Discrimination | Amnesty International

treatment or consideration of, or making a distinction in favor of or against, a person or thing based on the group, class, or category to which that person or thing belongs rather than on individual merit: racial and religious intolerance and discrimination.

The Concept of Discrimination What is discrimination? More specifically, what does it mean to discriminate against some person or group of persons? It is best to approach this question in stages, beginning with an answer that is a first approximation and then introducing additions, qualifications, and refinements as further questions come into view. In fact, the core human rights documents fail to define discrimination at all, simply providing non-exhaustive lists of the grounds on which discrimination is to be prohibited. Left unaddressed is the question of what discrimination itself is. Any viable account of what discrimination is will regard it as consisting of actions, practices, or policies that are “in some appropriate sense” based on the perceived social group to which those discriminated against belong. Thus, groups based on race, religion and gender qualify as potential grounds of discrimination in any modern society, but groups based on the musical or culinary tastes of persons would typically not so qualify. Discrimination against persons, then, is necessarily oriented toward them based on their membership in a certain type of social group. But it is also necessary that the discriminatory conduct impose some kind of disadvantage or harm on the persons at whom it is directed. In this connection, consider the landmark opinion of the U. Supreme Court in *Brown v. Board of Education*, holding that de jure racial segregation in public schools is unconstitutional. Thus, the court rules that segregation amounts to illegal discrimination against black children because it imposes on them educational and psychological disadvantages. Additionally, as *Brown* makes clear, the disadvantage imposed by discrimination is to be determined relative to some appropriate comparison social group. Typically, the relevant comparison group is part of the same society as the disadvantaged group, or at least it is governed by the same overarching political structure. In *Brown*, the relevant comparison group consisted of white citizens. Accordingly, it would be mistaken to think that the black citizens of Kansas who brought the lawsuit were not discriminated against because they were treated no worse than blacks in South Africa were being treated under apartheid. Blacks in South Africa were not the proper comparison class. The appropriate comparison class is determined by normative principles. American states are obligated to provide their black citizens an education that is no worse than what they provide to their white citizens; any comparison with the citizens or subjects of other countries is beside the point. It should also be noted that, whether or not American states have an obligation to provide an education to any of their citizens, if such states provide an education to their white citizens, then it is discriminatory for the states to fail to provide an equally good education to their black citizens. And if states do have an obligation to provide an education to all their citizens, then giving an education to whites but not blacks would constitute a double-wrong against blacks: Discrimination is inherently comparative, and the *Brown* case seems to suggest that what counts in the comparison is not how well or poorly a person or group is treated on some absolute scale, but rather how well she is treated relative to some other person. In other words, the harm of discrimination lies in the very act itself of racially separating black and white children, quite apart from the educational or psychological impact of the separation. On this understanding, treating blacks differently from whites amounts to discrimination, even if they are treated as well as whites. However, there is a critical problem with the view that the essence of discrimination is differential treatment rather than disadvantageous treatment. If this view were correct, then, under Jim Crow segregation, not only blacks but also whites would be victims of discrimination. Differential treatment is symmetrical: The system arguably held back economic progress for everyone in the South, but that point is quite different from the implausible claim that everyone was a victim of discrimination. Accordingly, it is better to think of discrimination in terms of disadvantageous treatment rather than simply differential treatment. Discrimination imposes a disadvantage on certain persons relative to others, and those who are treated more favorably are not to be seen as victims of discrimination. An act can both be discriminatory and, simultaneously, confer an absolute benefit on those discriminated against, because the conferral of the benefit

might be combined with conferring a greater benefit on the members of the appropriate comparison group. In such a case, the advantage of receiving an absolute benefit is, at the same time, a relative disadvantage or deprivation. For example, consider the admissions policy of Harvard University in the early twentieth century, when the university had a quota on the number of Jewish students. Harvard was guilty of discriminating against all Jewish applicants on account of their religion. Yet, the university still offered the applicants something of substantial value, viz. One might think that it downplays the harm done by discrimination to say that the disadvantage it imposes only need be a relative disadvantage. Disadvantages relative to fellow citizens, when those disadvantages are severe and concern important goods such as education, can make persons vulnerable to domination and oppression at the hands of their fellow citizens. Anderson The domination and oppression of American blacks by their fellow citizens under Jim Crow was made easier by the relative disadvantage imposed on blacks when it came to education. Norwegians might have had an even better education than southern whites, but Norwegians posed little threat of domination to southern whites or blacks, because they lived under an entirely separate political structure, having minimal relations to American citizens. Accordingly, one must seriously consider the possibility that children from poor countries are being discriminated against when they are unable to obtain the education routinely available to children in affluent societies. The relative nature of the disadvantage that discrimination imposes explains the close connection between discrimination and inequality. A relative disadvantage necessarily involves an inequality with respect to persons in the comparison class. Accordingly, antidiscrimination norms prohibit certain sorts of inequalities between persons in the relevant comparison classes. Shin For example, the U. But notice that this account does not make discrimination morally wrong as a conceptual matter. The imposition of a relative disadvantage might, or might not, be wrongful. In the next section, we will see how the idea of moral wrongfulness can be introduced to form a moralized concept of discrimination. In recent years, some thinkers have rejected the view that discrimination is an essentially comparative concept that looks to how certain persons are treated relative to others. Nonetheless, the leveling-down objection is problematic. That plaintiffs in discrimination cases do not ask that voting be abolished only shows that they know that they would be better off with everyone having the right to vote than with no one having it. Moreover, although leveling down would, in typical cases, deprive everyone of something to which all are entitled, it does not follow that leveling down would constitute discrimination. The universal denial of the franchise would be a wrong, but not the wrong of discrimination. Denial of the franchise amounts to discrimination only when it is selectively directed at some salient group within the adult population. But it does not follow from this point that discrimination is, by definition, morally wrong. We can, in fact, distinguish a moralized from a non-moralized concept of discrimination. The moralized concept picks out acts, practices or policies insofar as they wrongfully impose a relative disadvantage on persons based on their membership in a salient social group of a suitable sort. In contexts where the justifiability of an act or practice is under discussion and disagreement, the moralized concept of discrimination is typically the key one used, and the disagreement is over whether the concept applies to the act. Because of its role in such discussion and disagreement, the remainder of this article will be concerned with the moralized concept of discrimination, unless it is explicitly indicated otherwise. There is an additional point that needs to be made in connection with the wrongfulness of discrimination in its moralized sense. It is not simply that such discrimination is wrongful as a conceptual matter. An act that imposes a relative disadvantage or deprivation might be wrong for a variety of reasons; for example, the act might violate a promise that the agent has made. The act counts as discrimination, though, only insofar as its wrongfulness derives from a connection of the act to the membership in a certain group s of the person detrimentally affected by the act. Accordingly, we can refine the first-approximation account of discrimination and say that the moralized concept of discrimination is properly applied to acts, practices or policies that meet two conditions: Types of Discrimination in its Moralized Sense Legal thinkers and legal systems have distinguished among a bewildering array of types of discrimination: It is not easy to make sense of the morass of categories and distinctions. The best place to start is with direct discrimination. Schiek, Waddington, and Bell It was those two features—explicitness and intention—that made the Roma case a paradigmatic example of direct discrimination. Such examples of discrimination are ones which the agent performs with the

aim of imposing a disadvantage on persons for being members of some salient social group. It is clear that the policy of the bar was wrong, but the question of what makes the policy and other instances direct discrimination wrongful will be put on hold until section 4. In some cases, a discriminator will adopt a policy that, on its face, makes no explicit reference to the group that he or she aims to disadvantage. For example, during the Jim Crow era, southern states used literacy tests for the purpose of excluding African-Americans from the franchise. Because African-Americans were denied adequate educational opportunities and because the tests were applied in a racially-biased manner, virtually all of the persons disqualified by the tests were African-Americans, and, in any given jurisdiction, the vast majority of African-American adults seeking to vote were disqualified. The point of the literacy tests was precisely such racial exclusion, even though the testing policy made no explicit reference to race. Notwithstanding the absence of an explicit reference to race in the literacy tests themselves, their use was a case of direct discrimination. The reason is that the persons who formulated, voted for, and implemented the tests acted on maxims that did make explicit reference to race. Their maxim was something along the lines of: Constitution, I will favor a legal policy that is racially-neutral on its face but in practice excludes most African-Americans and leaves whites unaffected. However, it is too simple to say that direct discrimination simply is intentional discrimination. Lippert-Rasmussen rightly points out that there can be cases of direct discrimination not involving the intention to disadvantage anyone on account of her group membership. A disadvantage might, instead, be imposed as a result of a general indifference toward the interests and rights of the members of a certain group. Thus, an employer might use hiring criteria that unfairly disadvantages women, not because the employer intends to disadvantage women, but because the criteria are easy to use and he simply does not care that women are unfairly disadvantaged as a result. Such instances of discrimination might not have the paradigmatic status that an example like the Roma case has, but they should be counted as forms of direct discrimination, because the disadvantageous treatment derives from an objectionable mental state of the agent. The same goes for disadvantageous treatment that is the product of bias against a certain group, even when the bias does not involve an intention to treat the group disadvantageously. A paternalistic employer might intend to help women by hiring them only for certain jobs in his company, but, if the employer is motivated by unwarranted views about the capabilities of women, he is guilty of direct discrimination. Acts of direct discrimination can be unconscious in that the agent is unaware of the discriminatory motive behind them. It is plausible to think that in many societies, unconscious prejudice is a factor in a significant range of discriminatory behavior, and a viable understanding of the concept of discrimination must be able to accommodate the possibility. In fact, there is growing evidence that unconscious discrimination exists. It is important to note that the ECHR says that policies with disproportionate effects may be discriminatory even if that is not the aim of the policies. So what criterion determines when a policy with disproportionately worse effects on a certain group actually counts as indirect discrimination? There is no agreed upon answer. The ECHR has laid down the following criterion: Swedish law contains a different criterion: And in its interpretation of the Civil Rights Act of , the U. Despite the differences, these criteria have a common thought behind them: In other words, the impact must not be treated as wholly inconsequential, as if it were equivalent, for example, to a disproportionate impact on persons with long toe nails. Toe-nail group impact would require no justification, because it would simply be an accidental and morally inconsequential feature of the act, at least in all actual societies. In contrast, the thought behind the idea of indirect discrimination is that, if an act has a disproportionately disadvantageous impact on persons belonging to certain types of salient social groups, then the act is morally wrong and legally prohibited if it cannot meet some suitable standard of justification.

Chapter 7 : discrimination | Definition of discrimination in English by Oxford Dictionaries

Age Discrimination Age discrimination is a practice specifically protected by law. With a few rare exceptions, companies are forbidden from specifying an age preference in job advertisements. With a few rare exceptions, companies are forbidden from specifying an age preference in job advertisements.

Religious discrimination is valuing or treating a person or group differently because of what they do or do not believe or because of their feelings towards a given religion. For instance, the indigenous Christian population of the Balkans, known as the "rayah" or the "protected flock", was discriminated against under the Ottoman Kanunâ€™â€™Rayah. Local rulers and church officials closed many professions to religious Jews, pushing them into marginal roles considered socially inferior, such as tax and rent collecting and moneylending, occupations only tolerated as a "necessary evil". In a consultation on the issue, the United States commission on civil rights defined religious discrimination in relation to the civil rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Whereas religious civil liberties, such as the right to hold or not to hold a religious belief, are essential for Freedom of Religion in the United States secured by the First Amendment, religious discrimination occurs when someone is denied "the equal protection of the laws, equality of status under the law, equal treatment in the administration of justice, and equality of opportunity and access to employment, education, housing, public services and facilities, and public accommodation because of their exercise of their right to religious freedom". Misogyny, Misandry, Discrimination against intersex people, Transphobia, and Discrimination towards non-binary gender persons Though gender discrimination and sexism refer to beliefs and attitudes in relation to the gender of a person, such beliefs and attitudes are of a social nature and do not, normally, carry any legal consequences. Sex discrimination, on the other hand, may have legal consequences. Though what constitutes sex discrimination varies between countries, the essence is that it is an adverse action taken by one person against another person that would not have occurred had the person been of another sex. Discrimination of that nature is considered a form of prejudice and in certain enumerated circumstances is illegal in many countries. Sexual discrimination can arise in different contexts. For instance, an employee may be discriminated against by being asked discriminatory questions during a job interview, or by an employer not hiring or promoting, unequally paying, or wrongfully terminating, an employee based on their gender. The gender gap in median earnings of full-time employees according to the OECD One such example is Wikipedia. In the Wikipedian community, around 13 percent of registered users are women. Women are not only more harshly scrutinized, but the representation of women authors are also overlooked. Relative to men, across all source lists, women have a 2. Socially, sexual differences have been used to justify different roles for men and women, in some cases giving rise to claims of primary and secondary roles. While there are alleged non-physical differences between men and women, major reviews of the academic literature on gender difference find only a tiny minority of characteristics where there are consistent psychological differences between men and women, and these relate directly to experiences grounded in biological difference. They outnumbered men in such occupations as public relations managers, financial managers, and human resource managers. While a glass ceiling implies that women are less like to reach the top of the job ladder, a sticky floor is defined as the pattern that women are, compared to men, less likely to start to climb the job ladder. A sticky floor is related to gender differences at the bottom of the wage distribution. It might be explained by both employer discrimination and gender differences in career aspirations. Multiple jurisdictions now protect individuals on grounds of intersex status or sex characteristics. Nevertheless, the problem of gender discrimination does not stop at transgender individuals or with women. It is currently being contended in federal court, as of fall

Chapter 8 : Discrimination - Wikipedia

Discrimination consists of treatment of an individual or group, based on their actual or perceived membership in a certain group or social category, "in a way that is worse than the way people are usually treated".

Chapter 9 : Discriminating | Define Discriminating at www.nxgvision.com

Discrimination by Type Learn about the various types of discrimination prohibited by the laws enforced by EEOC. We also provide links to the relevant laws, regulations and policy guidance, and also fact sheets, Q&As, best practices, and other information.