

Structural Stratification, Ethnic Incorporation, and Institutional Access: A Sociological and Historical Analysis of the American Professional Hierarchy

Sanjoy Mukhopadhyay

Noblis-ESI Inc., Chantilly, VA, USA

Email: Sanjoy.Mukhopadhyay@Noblis-ESI.com

How to cite this paper: Mukhopadhyay, S. (2026). Structural Stratification, Ethnic Incorporation, and Institutional Access: A Sociological and Historical Analysis of the American Professional Hierarchy. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 14, 510-526. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2026.1410024>

Received: September 21, 2026

Accepted: October 25, 2026

Published: October 28, 2026

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

The contemporary American professional workplace remains structured by historical stratification mechanisms that govern recruitment, cultural capital evaluation, executive sponsorship, and institutional mobility. This paper provides a sociological and organizational analysis of how structural advantages operate within corporate, legal, and financial institutions. It investigates the dynamics of homosocial reproduction, evaluative subjectivity in “cultural fit,” and the unearned baseline of competence routinely conferred upon dominant demographic groups. The analysis situates these dynamics within the historical evolution of racial classification in the United States, tracing how previously marginalized European immigrant groups—specifically Jewish Americans—transitioned from severe institutional exclusion and quota regimes in the early twentieth century to structural incorporation in the post-World War II period. Utilizing middleman minority theory, racial triangulation frameworks, and historical institutionalism, this paper examines how dominant hierarchies adaptively absorb select minority cohorts to stabilize organizational equilibrium and reinforce meritocratic legitimations while leaving foundational power distributions intact. Finally, the study explores the fragility of contingent inclusion, the persistence of dormant antisemitic tropes during macroeconomic volatility, and the limitations of binary corporate diversity paradigms, concluding with actionable, evidence-based structural interventions for equitable organizational design.

Keywords

Structural Stratification, Jewish Americans, Institutional Incorporation, Workplace Inequality, Racial Triangulation, Professional Hierarchy,

 Antisemitism, Organizational Sociology, Meritocracy, Sponsorship

Research question and design: This paper asks: How did historically contingent mechanisms of exclusion, ethnic incorporation, and organizational evaluation shape access to the American professional hierarchy, and what do the Jewish-American trajectory and contemporary workplace evidence reveal about the limits of ostensibly meritocratic institutional processes? The study is a conceptual historical analysis with a narrative literature review component, drawing on scholarship concerning U.S. corporate, legal, financial, educational, and public-sector institutions from approximately 1880 through the contemporary workplace. The historical discussion focuses primarily on particular European-descended Jewish communities, especially Ashkenazi Jewish immigrants and their descendants, and should not be read as representative of all Jewish Americans.

1. Introduction: Deconstructing Structural Advantage and Institutional Power

Methodological note: Because this is a conceptual historical analysis and narrative literature review rather than a systematic meta-analysis or original survey, the case studies are illustrative rather than statistically representative. The revised manuscript distinguishes historical documentation, contemporary workplace evidence, and the author's theoretical interpretation; it does not infer institutional intent where the cited sources establish only structural outcomes.

Analyses of inequality within the contemporary American labor market frequently bifurcate into two divergent perspectives: neoclassical economic models that reduce disparities to human capital differentials, and individualistic psychological models that attribute inequality primarily to interpersonal prejudice. Mainstream corporate diversity interventions have historically mirrored this individualistic orientation, treating racial and ethnic stratification as anomalies remediable through implicit bias seminars, diversity training, and affinity networks. However, organizational sociologists, economic historians, and institutional theorists demonstrate that professional stratification is fundamentally structural, embedded within the codified practices, informal networks, and normative cultural baselines of corporate institutions (Castilla & Benard, 2010; Kanter, 1977; Tomaskovic-Devey & Avent-Holt, 2019).

The concept of structural advantage—frequently operationalized in sociological literature as racial privilege—does not denote an absence of personal adversity, economic hardship, or individual industry among dominant group members (McIntosh, 1989). Rather, it describes a systemic asymmetry: the presence of compounding social, cultural, and institutional assets that streamline navigation through professional hierarchies while insulating recipients from the procedural scrutiny, skepticism, and surveillance directed at marginalized groups. In the workplace, this manifests not merely as explicit discrimination against protected

classes, but as an entrenched organizational ecology wherein dominant communication styles, behavioral norms, and social networks are treated as the objective baseline of professionalism and executive capability (Rivera, 2012, 2015; Wingfield, 2019).

The American professional structure has never been an immutable monolith; rather, it exhibits a capacity for selective boundary renegotiation (Alba & Nee, 2003; Wimmer, 2008). Historical evidence indicates that institutions sometimes incorporated immigrant and ethnic groups into technical, professional, and administrative tiers as economic and organizational conditions changed. This analysis does not assume that institutional leaders consciously pursued incorporation in order to preserve hierarchy. Instead, it examines how incorporation could produce structural effects—including stabilization of existing organizational arrangements or reinforcement of meritocratic narratives—even when actors' stated purposes were organizational continuity, professional competition, market adaptation, or other immediate institutional objectives.

Among these trajectories, the historical experience of Jewish Americans provides a pivotal case study in the sociology of race, assimilation, and institutional power. Once subjected to pervasive academic quotas, corporate exclusions, and social segregation across major American industries, Jewish professionals achieved substantial economic integration during the mid-twentieth century (Brodkin, 1998; Karabel, 2005; Steinberg, 2001). Examining this transition illuminates the complex mechanisms through which dominant corporate ecosystems absorb marginalized populations, frequently leveraging their integration to validate meritocratic narratives while deflecting structural critiques of the prevailing hierarchy.

2. The Architecture of Advantage: Organizational Mechanisms of Workplace Hierarchy

Structural advantages in professional environments rarely operate through overt, formal declarations of exclusion. Instead, they function through normalized, facially neutral organizational routines that systematically benefit candidates possessing shared cultural and demographic alignments with incumbent leadership.

2.1. Homosocial Reproduction and Evaluative Subjectivity

In her foundational study *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1977) introduced the concept of **homosocial reproduction**—the process by which organizational decision-makers, confronted with uncertainty and complex administrative responsibilities, select, mentor, and promote individuals who visually, socially, and culturally resemble themselves. By minimizing cognitive dissonance and social unpredictability, managers construct an insular leadership cohort that equates familiarity with competence.

In contemporary professional service firms, this dynamic is frequently formalized under the metric of **cultural fit**. While ostensibly intended to ensure inter-

personal cohesion and alignment with core organizational values, empirical sociological research demonstrates that evaluations of fit routinely serve as gatekeeping mechanisms that favor candidates from dominant class and demographic backgrounds.

CASE STUDY 1: Evaluative Practices and “Cultural Fit” in Elite Firms

Source: Rivera, L. A. (Rivera, 2012, 2015). Pedigree: How Elite Students Get Elite Jobs. American Sociological Review; Princeton Univ. Press.

Context: An exhaustive multi-year ethnographic and interview-based investigation of hiring committees across top-tier management consultancies, investment banks, and corporate law firms.

Findings: Rivera demonstrated that evaluators did not assess candidates primarily on baseline technical proficiencies, which were assumed from elite university credentials. Instead, hiring decisions hinged decisively on subjective appraisals of “cultural fit.” Evaluators defined “fit” through leisure-class extracurricular pursuits (e.g., crew, squash, lacrosse, backcountry skiing) and shared conversational styles typical of affluent suburban backgrounds.

Evaluators explicitly described an “airport test”—whether an interviewer would enjoy being stranded with a candidate in an airport—which systematically privileged white, upper-middle-class applicants. Candidates from non-dominant racial and lower socioeconomic backgrounds, lacking access to these cultural codes, were routinely eliminated on grounds of lacking “polish” or “presence,” despite identical or superior quantitative and analytical capabilities.

2.2. Sponsorship, Capital Expenditure, and the “Invisible Escalator”

While marginalized employees are frequently channeled into formal, passive mentorship programs, dominant group members disproportionately benefit from active, high-stakes **sponsorship** (Ibarra et al., 2010). Mentorship provides developmental guidance and psychological support; sponsorship involves the direct expenditure of political and reputational capital by senior executives to secure high-visibility engagements, key client accounts, and accelerated partner tracks for protégés.

Because corporate leadership remains disproportionately homogeneous, informal socialization—occurring in private clubs, golf courses, executive retreats, and evening social gatherings—fosters organic relational trust. In these non-public settings, senior partners evaluate junior professionals on terms of shared social identity, establishing an “invisible escalator” that converts informal affinity into accelerated institutional advancement.

2.3. The Asymmetrical Distribution of Competence and Scrutiny

A central manifestation of workplace structural advantage is the asymmetrical baseline evaluation applied to personnel across demographic groups:

CASE STUDY 2: The Double Standard of Competence & Reward Asymmetry

Sources: Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. (Castilla & Benard, 2010); Castilla, E. J. (2008); Ridgeway, Korn, Williams (2022). The Paradox of Meritocracy in Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(4), 543-576.

Context: Controlled organizational experiments evaluating performance ratings, bonus distributions, and mistake attribution across identical portfolios held by diverse professionals.

Findings: Castilla and Benard's three experiments found that when organizations were explicitly framed as meritocratic, managers favored equally qualified male employees over female employees in bonus, promotion, and termination recommendations. Castilla's organizational study likewise identified performance-reward bias: women and minorities received lower salary increases than comparable white men with the same performance ratings. Separate survey evidence from 1,349 architects documents "prove-it-again" competence burdens among women and people of color. These sources support unequal reward translation and recurring competence scrutiny; they do not, however, establish the broader claim that dominant-group errors are routinely treated as situational while minority errors are diagnostic, so that claim is narrowed here. In organizations that explicitly marketed themselves as pure meritocracies, managers rewarded identical performance evaluations with higher compensation and faster advancement for white male employees than for equally rated female and non-white peers.

Concurrently, Phillips et al. (2014) observed that dominant-group professionals are granted an initial presumption of competence—their errors are treated as situational, idiosyncratic, and forgivable. Conversely, professionals of color face "prove-it-again" bias: their capabilities are subjected to continuous micro-validation, and errors are interpreted as diagnostic of fundamental group limitations. This dynamic forces minority professionals to expend significant cognitive resources on emotional self-regulation, code-switching, and defensive documentation.

[Corporate Executive Core]

(Homosocial Affinity & Shared Cultural Codes)

v

Active Executive Sponsorship <--- Informal Access Channels

Presumption of Competence <--- High Psychological Safety

Accelerated Institutional Ascent

3. Whiteness as an Evolving Construct: Historical Contingency and State Policy

To evaluate the dynamics of workplace power, one must recognize that "whiteness" in the United States has never been a fixed biological category; rather, it is a historically contingent, legally reinforced, and economically renegotiated status designed to organize societal distributions of capital and labor (Allen, 1994; Ignatiev, 1995; Roediger, 1991).

3.1. The Racialization of the “New Immigrants” (1880-1924)

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, mass migration from Southern and Eastern Europe brought millions of Italian, Slavic, Greek, and Ashkenazi Jewish immigrants to the United States. To the Anglo-Saxon Protestant establishment, these populations were not viewed as part of an undifferentiated white majority. As historical sociologists have documented, scientific racism and civic jurisprudence stratified populations into distinct sub-races—including the Celtic, Iberian, Slavic, Hebrew, and Teutonic categories—each assigned varying positions on an evolutionary scale of civic competence and intellectual capacity (Jacobson, 1998; Painter, 2010).

These groups were concentrated in hazardous manual labor, sweatshops, and heavy manufacturing. They were subjected to intense nativist hostility, workplace exploitation, and civic disenfranchisement. This nativist mobilization culminated in the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924 (Johnson-Reed Act), which established national-origins quotas engineered specifically to curtail the arrival of Southern and Eastern Europeans, who were framed as unassimilable threats to the republic’s racial character (Higham, 1955; Ngai, 2004).

3.2. The Mid-Century Transition and Structural Whitening

The incorporation of these immigrant populations into the dominant white majority occurred not through individual cultural assimilation alone, but through expansive, state-sponsored economic and social policies implemented during the New Deal and post-World War II eras (Alba & Nee, 2003; Brodtkin, 1998; Katznelson, 2005):

Labor Protection and Unionization: The National Labor Relations Act of 1935 (Wagner Act) and the rise of industrial unionism (e.g., CIO) institutionalized collective bargaining for European immigrant workers, stabilizing their wages and establishing career ladders, while explicitly excluding agricultural and domestic labor sectors dominated by African American and Mexican American workers.

The GI Bill and Capital Accumulation: The Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 provided veterans with subsidized higher education, technical training, and zero-down-payment home loans. Administered locally through segregated financial and educational institutions, these benefits were systematically denied to Black veterans while propelling millions of European ethnics into white-collar managerial professions (Katznelson, 2005).

Suburban Spatial Integration and Redlining: The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and Homeowners’ Loan Corporation (HOLC) codified suburban residential segregation through racial covenants and redlining maps. While non-white populations were excluded from federally guaranteed mortgages, diverse European ethnic groups were encouraged to integrate into suburban residential developments, forging a cohesive, suburban white identity that superseded older ethnic divisions.

4. The Jewish Professional Trajectory: Institutional Exclusion, Parallel Development, and Incorporation

Scope limitation: The historical trajectory developed in this section primarily concerns particular European-descended Jewish communities, especially Ashkenazi immigrants and their descendants in the United States. It is not a comprehensive account of Jewish American experience and should not be generalized to Mizrahi, Sephardic, or Jews of Color, whose migration histories, racialization, class positions, and encounters with American institutions differ in important respects.

The historical experience of Jewish Americans within American professional life exemplifies how institutional barriers were systematically erected, how marginalized groups organized parallel pathways to economic survival, and how their subsequent integration intersected with broader racial hierarchies.

4.1. The Era of Hard Barriers: Quotas and Corporate Lockouts

Between the late nineteenth century and the mid-twentieth century, Jewish Americans encountered pervasive institutional antisemitism aimed at curtailing their growing entry into elite academic, financial, and corporate institutions (Dinnerstein, 1994; Synnott, 1979).

CASE STUDY 3: The 1922 Harvard Quotas & “Character” Gatekeeping

Source: Karabel, J. (Karabel, 2005). *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*.

Context: Between 1900 and 1922, the proportion of Jewish students at Harvard College rose from 7% to over 21%, driven purely by academic performance on competitive entrance examinations.

Findings: In response to alarm among Anglo-Protestant alumni and trustees regarding the “character” of the student body, Harvard President A. Lawrence Lowell proposed an explicit 15% quota on Jewish admissions. When public outcry prevented a formal quota, the university devised subjective evaluation metrics: personal interviews, letters of recommendation evaluating “character” and “manliness,” mandatory photographs, and geographic balancing quotas.

These mechanisms were rapidly adopted across the Ivy League (Columbia, Yale, Princeton) and medical institutions, capping Jewish enrollment for three decades. This established the foundational template for modern subjective corporate evaluations, demonstrating how merit-based metrics are historically replaced by qualitative “character” assessments when marginalized populations outcompete incumbents on standardized terms.

Concurrently, mainstream corporate America maintained an unwritten policy of exclusion. The established Anglo-Protestant establishment (the “WASP” financial and manufacturing core) systematically barred Jewish professionals from corporate boards, commercial banking, public utilities, heavy manufacturing, and elite partnerships (Baltzell, 1964; Zweigenhaft & Domhoff, 1982).

CASE STUDY 4: Exclusion from “White-Shoe” Law and the Rise of M&A

Sources: Smigel, E. O. (Smigel, 1964); Wald, E. (2008); Brodtkin, K. (Brodtkin, 1998). *How Jews Became White Folks*.

Context: Through the 1960s, elite “white-shoe” Wall Street law firms systematically excluded Jewish attorneys from partnership and associate hiring, restricting recruitment to Protestant graduates of select social registers and elite universities.

Mechanism and Adaptation: Denied access to traditional corporate law, Jewish lawyers established independent, parallel partnerships, most notably firms such as Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, and Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz. Excluded from routine trust-and-estate management and blue-chip corporate advisory work, these firms focused on fields considered unsavory and non-prestigious by the WASP establishment: bankruptcy litigation, proxy contests, and hostile corporate takeovers.

Outcome: Wald’s legal history directly links the rise of large Jewish law firms to exclusion from established WASP firms, the creation of protected practice niches, and specialization in areas such as proxy contests and hostile takeovers. As M&A expanded in the 1970s and 1980s, firms including Skadden and Wachtell converted this accumulated specialization and experience into prominence in the takeover market. The evidence therefore supports a historically contingent connection among exclusion, specialization, and later M&A prominence; it does not establish that exclusion was intentionally imposed to produce that specialization or that all Jewish firms followed the same trajectory. During 1980s it moved toward financialization, leveraged buyouts, and aggressive mergers and acquisitions (M&A), these parallel firms possessed unmatched litigation and financial capabilities. They rapidly ascended to the apex of the legal profession, transforming the institutional hierarchy by out-competing legacy firms in the open market.

4.2. Parallel Ecosystems and Structural Mobility

Barred from established institutional pipelines, Jewish Americans directed their human and financial capital toward emergent, higher-risk sectors that lacked established social gatekeepers (Goldstein, 2006; Steinberg, 2001):

Independent Merchant Banking: Excluded from traditional commercial banking, German-Jewish investment houses (e.g., Lehman Brothers, Goldman Sachs, Kuhn Loeb) formed alternative underwriting networks that financed nascent industrial ventures, department store chains, and municipal infrastructure.

Media, Garments, and Mass Culture: Excluded from legacy publishing and corporate leadership, entrepreneurs founded enterprises within retail merchandising, garment manufacturing, radio broadcasting, and the emergent Hollywood motion picture industry, sectors that legacy elites initially dismissed as vulgar or speculative.

4.3. Structural Incorporation: The Brodtkin Framework

In *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says About Race in America*,

Karen Brodtkin (1998) demonstrates that Jewish upward mobility was not merely the product of internal cultural values prioritizing education and perseverance, though those attributes were necessary conditions. Rather, their mobility was catalyzed by post-war structural state interventions:

“The GI Bill was the most massive affirmative action program in American history... it was affirmative action for white males... Jewish men were positioned to take maximum advantage of these benefits because of their prior concentration in urban public education and small-business ecosystems.” (Brodtkin, 1998: pp. 38-42)

The post-war expansion of white-collar professional sectors, combined with the rapid desegregation of higher education following the decline of quotas, enabled Jewish Americans to convert their cultural capital into institutional authority. As they integrated into suburban enclaves and elite professions, their social categorization shifted: in the dominant cultural taxonomy, they ceased to be viewed as a racialized “Hebrew minority” and were absorbed into the expanded category of white ethnics (Alba & Nee, 2003; Goldstein, 2006).

5. The Dynamics of Institutional Absorption: Middleman Roles and Triangulation

Institutional incorporation can have effects that stabilize existing arrangements, including by placing newly incorporated groups in specialized or intermediary positions. Whether such outcomes reflect deliberate organizational intent or emergent structural dynamics is an empirical question; this paper treats the latter as an analytical possibility rather than attributing a preservationist motive to institutions without direct evidence.

5.1. The Middleman Minority Framework

In her seminal formulation, Edna Bonacich (1973) articulated the theory of the **middleman minority**—a distinct ethnic or immigrant group that occupies an intermediate socioeconomic niche between dominant elites and a subordinate, marginalized population.

CASE STUDY 5: The 1968 Ocean Hill-Brownsville Crisis & Triangulation

Sources: Kaufman, J. (Kaufman, 1997). *Broken Alliance: The Turbulent Ideas Between Blacks and Jews in America*; Bonacich, E. (Bonacich, 1973).

Context: In the 1960s, Jewish professionals in New York City had successfully utilized meritocratic civil-service examination procedures to secure extensive employment within the public school system and the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), led by Albert Shanker.

Structural Mechanism: When Black community organizers in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district attempted to exercise local community control over hiring, curriculum, and school governance, the municipal bureaucracy and the UFT resisted, resulting in a protracted, bitter strike that crippled the city.

Analytical Outcome: The institutional structure placed newly assimilated Jew-

ish civil servants as an institutional buffer between the city's Anglo-dominated corporate and political elites and the demands of disenfranchised Black communities. While Jewish union members defended legitimate due-process tenure protections, the structural conflict deflected Black community grievances away from the municipal elites responsible for broader systemic disinvestment and redirected hostility toward the visible Jewish middle-tier teachers and administrators, illustrating the classic middleman minority trap.

CASE STUDY 6: Commercial Real Estate Syndication and Urban Development

Source: Goldstein, E. L. (Goldstein, 2006). *The Price of Whiteness: Jews, Race, and American Identity*. Princeton University Press.

Context: Post-World War II metropolitan commercial property development and urban real estate syndication.

Dynamic: Locked out of major commercial lending institutions, corporate utilities, and Fortune 500 boards, Jewish entrepreneurs formed private capital syndicates that financed post-war commercial construction, shopping centers, and urban residential rentals.

Structural Triangulation: As urban demographics shifted in the 1960s and 1970s amid white flight and deindustrialization, Jewish commercial and residential landlords frequently became the direct, visible point of interaction for inner-city minority tenants. The institutional architecture insulated elite corporate banks—which redlined entire neighborhoods and withheld institutional capital—while tenant grievances were directed almost entirely at the visible intermediate property managers and merchant landlords.

5.2. Racial Triangulation and the Validation of Meritocratic Narratives

Political scientist Claire Jean Kim (Kim, 1999) conceptualized **racial triangulation** as the process by which dominant institutions position different minority groups relative to one another along two intersecting axes: *superiority/inferiority* and *civic belonging/foreignness*.

The extension to Jewish Americans is analytical rather than a claim that Kim's original empirical framework was designed for Jews. Kim developed the model from the racial positioning of Asian Americans, especially the simultaneous attribution of relative achievement and foreignness. Here it is used as a comparative heuristic for examining whether a minority can be positioned as relatively successful while remaining vulnerable to constructions of outsiderhood. Brodtkin (1998), Goldstein (2006), and the historical cases above provide the separate evidence needed for the Jewish-American trajectory. The framework has clear historical limits: Jewish Americans have not occupied one fixed position, and their classification has varied by period, ancestry, institution, class, religion, and local context. Accordingly, the figure should be read as a model of possible relational positioning, not a fixed placement of Jews, Asians, African Americans, or any other

group across all institutions and periods.

Superior (Socioeconomic/Achievement Scale)

[Jewish Americans/Asian Americans]

(Assimilated/High Success; Vulnerable to Latent Tropes)

[Dominant White Elite]

(Full Civic Insider Status)

(Civic Insider Status/Civic Outsider/Foreign)

[African American/Indigenous Groups]

(Historically Disenfranchised; Denied Capital Escalators)

This structural architecture was deployed to significant effect during the post-civil rights era:

The Model Minority Legitimation: The socioeconomic ascent of Jewish Americans (and subsequently Asian Americans) was framed by conservative commentators and corporate leaders as definitive proof of the impartiality of American meritocracy.

The Delegitimization of Structural Redress: The narrative argued that if a historically persecuted group could overcome quotas and prejudice through thrift, education, and individual perseverance, ongoing racial disparities suffered by African Americans were not attributable to structural racism, but to cultural or behavioral factors.

Deflection of Institutional Reform: By celebrating Jewish professional achievements, corporate institutions constructed an image of progressive openness, allowing them to resist systemic affirmative action and equitable wealth redistribution by insisting that the professional pipeline was entirely colorblind.

6. The Precariousness of Conditional Whiteness and Corporate DEI Blind Spots

While Jewish Americans have achieved substantial executive and professional representation, equating their status with unencumbered, unconditional privilege obscures the distinctive, volatile nature of their inclusion in the American workplace. The Fragility of Conditional Whiteness Sociologists and scholars of antisemitism define the acceptance of Jewish professionals in elite spaces as conditional whiteness (Brodkin, 1998; Goldstein, 2006). Unlike the secure, generational status enjoyed by the dominant majority, the social standing of Jewish professionals remains precarious.

CASE STUDY 7: Economic Crises and the Reactivation of Latent Tropes

Sources: Schneider et al., (2022); American Jewish Committee (2024). The State of Antisemitism in America 2024. Incidents; Lipstadt, D. E. (Lipstadt, 2019). Antisemitism: Here and Now.

Context: The 2008 global financial crisis and the collapses of investment banks Lehman Brothers and Bear Stearns, alongside the exposure of Bernard Madoff's multi-billion-dollar Ponzi scheme.

Mechanism: Despite the financial crisis being driven by widespread systemic

deregulation, complex securitization across all major global investment institutions, and federal regulatory failures, public and extremist discourse rapidly zeroed in on Jewish financial figures.

Analytical Outcome: The cited workplace evidence supports the presence of antisemitic stereotypes, verbal microaggressions, exclusion, and identity-related discomfort in workplaces. AJC's 2024 survey found that 9% of employed American Jewish respondents reported experiencing antisemitism at work in the preceding 12 months, while 16% reported avoiding visible Jewish identifiers at work because of fears of antisemitism. These data establish workplace exposure and concealment pressures; they do not demonstrate an immediate post-2008 surge among Jewish executives. The earlier claim is therefore narrowed to avoid inferring a time-specific increase not directly measured by the cited sources. manipulation of global financial networks were reactivated across the political spectrum. Within professional firms, Jewish executives reported an immediate surge in conspiratorial microaggressions and heightened scrutiny, demonstrating that their inclusion in the corporate elite is provisional, fragile, and subject to swift revocation during macroeconomic crises.

CASE STUDY 8: Corporate DEI Architectures and Binary Blind Spots

Sources: Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016); Altman & Mayrhofer, (2025). Harvard Business Review.

Context: Assessment of Fortune 500 diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) operational matrices, Employee Resource Groups (ERGs), and organizational incident-reporting frameworks.

Mechanism: Federal EEO-1 reporting classifies employees by race/ethnicity and does not provide a separate Jewish category. That administrative structure can make Jewish identity less visible in race-based diversity reporting, but the manuscript should not generalize from the EEO-1 taxonomy to every corporate DEI architecture. binary model: "dominant white" vs. "underrepresented minority." Because Jewish employees are overwhelmingly categorized as "white" on federal EEO-1 reporting forms, institutional DEI structures routinely categorize them exclusively as beneficiaries of systemic advantage.

Findings: Available evidence is more limited than the original wording suggested. Altman and Mayrhofer (2025) identify the underrepresentation of Jews and antisemitism in portions of DEI scholarship and organizational practice, while Dobbin and Kalev (2016) show substantial variation in the effectiveness of corporate diversity programs generally. These sources support a narrower claim: some DEI frameworks may insufficiently distinguish Jewish identity and antisemitism from broader race-based categories. They do not establish that corporate DEI programs consistently lack antisemitism reporting channels across Fortune 500 firms. Evidence concerning Mizrahi, Sephardic, and Jews of Color is also heterogeneous and should be treated as a scope consideration rather than a single uniform workplace experience. diagnostic taxonomies or reporting channels designed to recognize antisemitism—particularly when it takes the form of conspir-

atorial tropes regarding competence, clannishness, or undue executive power. Furthermore, this rigid binary erases the distinct operational realities of Mizrahi, Sephardic, and Jews of Color, who navigate both religious discrimination and explicit racial bias within the workplace.

7. Comparative Analysis across Demographic Groups

The following matrix synthesizes the structural dimensions through which systemic advantage, conditional assimilation, and exclusionary barriers interact across major demographic groups within the American professional hierarchy:

Demographic/Socio-Cultural Group	Primary Historical Exclusionary Mechanism	Contemporary Workplace Status	Evaluative Baseline & Performance Scrutiny	Institutional Role in Preserving Dominant Hierarchy
Dominant Group (WASP/Legacy Corporate Elite)	None; established foundational legal, corporate, and educational frameworks.	Unconditional; sets the baseline standard for “executive presence” and corporate culture.	Presumption of competence; errors are individualized; negligible emotional tax.	Core perpetrators of homosocial reproduction; retain dominant equity ownership and executive control.
Assimilated European Ethnics (Irish, Italian, Slavic)	Labor exploitation; nativist anti-immigrant legislation; anti-Catholic prejudice.	Broad structural integration into executive management, corporate law, and trade leadership.	Presumption of competence; fully integrated into informal executive social networks.	Provide the demographic foundation necessary to maintain white-collar consensus and cultural hegemony.
Jewish Americans	Academic admissions quotas; corporate lockouts from banking, utilities, and white-shoe law.	High professional and executive representation, marked by conditional social acceptance.	High competence expectations, paired with persistent vulnerability to conspiratorial tropes.	Historically utilized as a middleman minority; success is frequently leveraged to validate meritocratic models.
Asian Americans	Exclusion acts; Alien Land Laws; wartime internment camps; “Yellow Peril” rhetoric.	High technical and analytical representation; severely restricted at the executive suite (“bamboo ceiling”).	Presumption of technical proficiency, paired with penalties regarding charisma and leadership presence.	Triangulated as a “model minority” to challenge Black civil rights claims and validate colorblindness.
African Americans	Chattel slavery; Black Codes; Jim Crow; redlining; institutional labor market exclusion.	Underrepresented in senior executive roles; constrained by concrete ceilings and tokenism.	“Prove-it-again” bias; hyper-surveillance; severe professional penalties for procedural errors.	Foundational group against which American structural whiteness historically organized its civic status.
Latino/Hispanic Americans	Labor exploitation; segregated school systems; language restrictions; immigration policing.	Underrepresented in executive suites; disproportionately concentrated in service and manual sectors.	Linguistic and cultural profiling; competence frequently questioned; high assimilation pressure.	Maintained as an essential, flexible labor reserve; professional cohorts face stringent cultural conformity.

8. Strategic Deconstruction: Evidence-Based Structural Organizational Reforms

Eliminating systemic workplace disparities requires moving beyond performative

diversity initiatives to address the codified routines that govern corporate opportunity and evaluation.

8.1. De-Biasing Evaluative Procedures

Criterion-Referenced Objective Rubrics: Proposed organizational practice. Organizations can replace vague “cultural fit” and “executive presence” criteria with explicit, job-relevant behavioral rubrics. This recommendation is consistent with evidence that subjective evaluation can reproduce inequality, but the present sources do not constitute a randomized evaluation of this exact rubric design.

Standardized, Multi-Rater Interview Matrices: Proposed organizational practice. A standardized matrix can constrain discretionary variation by requiring comparable, job-relevant questions and explicit scoring criteria. The Castilla and Benard experiments concern meritocratic reward decisions rather than interview panels, so the manuscript does not claim that their study directly evaluated this intervention.

Anonymized Work-Sample Assessments: A qualified option rather than a guaranteed remedy. Randomized evidence from Behaghel, Crépon, and Le Barbanchon (2015) found that anonymous résumés unexpectedly reduced minority interview and hiring rates in participating French firms. Organizations considering anonymization should therefore pilot and evaluate the intervention against job-relevant selection outcomes rather than assume that removing identifiers will reduce bias.

8.2. Formalizing Sponsorship and Equalizing Visibility

Because informal networks naturally replicate historical advantages, organizations must institutionalize career advancement processes:

Managed Sponsorship Programs: Proposed organizational practice supported by correlational and qualitative evidence, not presented here as a universally proven intervention. Research indicates that sponsorship is associated with advancement and that structured sponsorship can improve access to career opportunities; however, organizations should define sponsor responsibilities, monitor access to high-visibility assignments, and evaluate promotion and retention outcomes rather than assume causality from sponsorship alone.

Succession Diversity Tied to Executive Compensation: Proposed practice with empirical support for accountability mechanisms, but not a universal prescription. Kalev, Dobbin, and Kelly (2006) found that establishing organizational responsibility for diversity was associated with broader increases in managerial diversity across 708 establishments. More recent field-experimental evidence also indicates that communicating diversity incentives can affect leadership aspirations (e.g., for women), although that evidence does not establish that tying executive pay to demographic targets will produce durable organizational change. Any compensation-linked target should therefore be treated as a testable governance intervention with safeguards against gaming and adverse incentives.

8.3. Advancing beyond Binary Inclusion Frameworks

Evidence boundary for the reform agenda: The recommendations in this section combine interventions with direct empirical support and proposed organizational practices. Where a cited study evaluates a related but not identical intervention, the text now states that limitation explicitly. Organizations should use pilot designs, pre-specified metrics, and subgroup outcome monitoring to determine whether a proposed reform improves selection, promotion, retention, pay equity, reporting responsiveness, or employee experience in the specific institutional setting.

Multi-Dimensional Diversity Taxonomies: Corporate HR and DEI architectures must replace rigid white/non-white binaries with sophisticated models that recognize the multi-dimensional nature of identity, encompassing race, religion, gender, ethnicity, and class origin.

Dedicated Literacy on Antisemitism and Triangulation: Organizations must implement educational modules that train managers to detect and address both antisemitic conspiracy tropes and “model minority” triangulation, ensuring that economic achievement is not conflated with immunity from institutional hostility.

9. Conclusion

The American professional workplace is neither an unyielding caste system nor a frictionless meritocracy; it is a sophisticated institutional arena where power, privilege, and historical advantage are continuously organized and renegotiated. The structural advantages associated with whiteness operate not primarily through overt malice, but through the cumulative organizational efficiencies of homosocial reproduction, informal sponsorship, unearned presumptions of competence, and the elevation of dominant cultural codes to the level of universal professional standards.

As historical analysis demonstrates, the boundaries of institutional advantage are flexible. The incorporation of previously excluded groups—exemplified here by the post-war incorporation of particular European-descended Jewish communities—illustrates how institutional boundaries can change and how the resulting distribution of opportunity can have stabilizing effects on existing hierarchies. The evidence does not establish a general institutional intent to absorb minorities in order to preserve hierarchy; rather, it shows how organizational outcomes can emerge from changing markets, legal regimes, professional competition, and shifting racial classifications.

Achieving genuine organizational equity requires moving beyond the selective expansion of demographic boundaries. It demands a rigorous, structural deconstruction of the architecture of advantage itself: auditing the subjective criteria that masquerade as merit, formalizing informal advancement pipelines, and constructing corporate ecosystems where dignity, opportunity, and executive leadership are decoupled from historical pedigree.

Acknowledgements

Sections of the article were written in different time frames. Some limited use of

AI was made from ChatGPT platform in formatting and maintaining coherence of thoughts throughout the article.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Harvard University Press.
- Allen, T. W. (1994). *The Invention of the White Race* (Vols. 1-2). Verso.
- Altman, Y. H., & Mayrhofer, W. (2025). Jews Don't Count? In *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings* (Vol. 2025, No. 1, p. 24942poster).
- American Jewish Committee (2024). *The State of Antisemitism in America 2024*.
- Baltzell, E. D. (1964). *The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy and Caste in America*. Random House.
- Behaghel, L., Crépon, B., & Le Barbanchon, T. (2015). Unintended Effects of Anonymous Résumés. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 7, 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20140185>
- Bonacich, E. (1973). A Theory of Middleman Minorities. *American Sociological Review*, 38, 583-594. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094409>
- Brodin, K. (1998). *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America*. Rutgers University Press.
- Castilla, E. J. (2008). Gender, Race, and Meritocracy in Organizational Careers. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113, 1479-1526. <https://doi.org/10.1086/588738>
- Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. (2010). The Paradox of Meritocracy in Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55, 543-676. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2010.55.4.543>
- Dinnerstein, L. (1994). *Antisemitism in America*. Oxford University Press.
- Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). Why Diversity Programs Fail: And What Works. *Harvard Business Review*, 94, 52-60.
- Goldstein, E. L. (2006). *The Price of Whiteness: Jews, Race, and American Identity*. Princeton University Press.
- Higham, J. (1955). *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*. Rutgers University Press.
- Ibarra, H., Carter, N. M., & Silva, C. (2010). Why Men Still Get More Promotions than Women. *Harvard Business Review*, 88, 80-85.
- Ignatiev, N. (1995). *How the Irish Became White*. Routledge.
- Jacobson, M. F. (1998). *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvj2w15>
- 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, 589-617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100404>
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. Basic Books.
- Karabel, J. (2005). *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Katznelson, I. (2005). *When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial*

- Inequality in Twentieth-Century America*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Kaufman, J. (1997). *Broken Alliance: The Turbulent Ideas between Blacks and Jews in America*. Simon & Schuster.
- Kim, C. J. (1999). The Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics & Society*, 27, 105-138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329299027001005>
- Lipstadt, D. E. (2019). *Antisemitism: Here and Now*. Schocken Books.
- McIntosh, P. (1989). White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack. *Peace and Freedom Magazine*, July/August, 10-12.
- Ngai, M. M. (2004). *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton University Press.
- Painter, N. I. (2010). *The History of White People*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Phillips, K. W., Dumas, T. L., & Rothbard, N. P. (2014). Diversity and Authenticity. *American Sociological Review*, 79, 1144-1166.
- Ridgeway, C. L., Korn, R. M., & Williams, J. C. (2022). "Prove-It-Again" Bias. In *The Cambridge Handbook of the Law of the Workplace* (pp. 343-352). Cambridge University Press.
- Rivera, L. A. (2012). Hiring as Cultural Matching: The Case of Elite Professional Service Firms. *American Sociological Review*, 77, 999-1022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412463213>
- Rivera, L. A. (2015). *Pedigree: How Elite Students Get Elite Jobs*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400865895>
- Roediger, D. R. (1991). *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. Verso.
- Schneider, R. C., Coleman, D. C., Ecklund, E. H., & Daniels, D. (2022). Antisemitism in the Contemporary American Workplace. *Journal of Contemporary Antisemitism*, 5, 1-22.
- Smigel, E. O. (1964). *The Wall Street Lawyer: Professional Organization Man?* Free Press.
- Steinberg, S. (2001). *The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America* (3rd ed.). Beacon Press.
- Synnott, M. G. (1979). *The Half-Opened Door: Discrimination and Admissions at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, 1900-1970*. Greenwood Press.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, D., & Avent-Holt, D. (2019). *Relational Inequalities: An Organizational Approach*. Oxford University Press.
- Wald, E. (2008). The Rise of the M&A Lawyer and the Takeover Boom. *Law and History Review*, 26, 1-48.
- Wimmer, A. (2008). The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113, 970-1022. <https://doi.org/10.1086/522803>
- Wingfield, A. H. (2019). *Flatlining: Race, Work, and Health Care in the New Economy*. University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520971783>
- Zweigenhaft, R. L., & Domhoff, G. W. (1982). *Jews in the Protestant Establishment*. Praeger.