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“Regarding Lupe”: A one-act play where two cultures collide on the road to a Latina’s performance appraisal

Regina F. Bento and Susan Rawson Zacur

Merrick School of Business, University of Baltimore, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

ABSTRACT

This article presents an original academic play, “Regarding Lupe,” that explores traditional and emerging Latina cultural values and how cross-cultural differences may affect a performance appraisal process. The dramatic structure of the play, inspired by Crandall and Eshleman’s Justification/Suppression Model of Prejudice (JSM), represents a novel and vivid way to engage students in learning why even an acculturated Latina executive may face stereotypes, prejudice, and unintentional discrimination in performance appraisal at work. Here we share the play and offer theoretical and cross-cultural information to facilitate the debriefing. We hope to contribute not only to the teaching and learning of diversity and discrimination, but also to an appreciation of the innovative pedagogical potential of academic plays.

Subjective performance appraisals are highly common and consequential for both individuals and organizations (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy, 2010; Rynes, Gerhart, & Parks, 2005). They also represent an area where bias can hit particularly hard and then be carried over to other areas of the organization, as today’s evaluation error becomes tomorrow’s taken-for-granted factual basis for incentive pay and career decisions. Subjectivity in an official appraisal document can be difficult to identify by those not directly involved since bias can be hidden within the “eye of the beholder” as work behaviors are selectively documented and interpreted by the appraiser.

When the individual being evaluated belongs to an outgroup (Alderfer, 1986; Dovidio, Gaertner, Anastasio, & Sanitioso, 1992), or to an intersection of outgroups (such as gender, ethnicity, and cultural background), performance appraisals are particularly vulnerable to attributional ambiguity (King, 2003; Weiner, 1985, 1986). Uncertainty about whether the evaluation was fair, or whether there has been discrimination due to outgroup status, can have very real consequences for the target of the evaluation. Discrimination—real or perceived, blatant or subtle, intended or unintended (Benokraitis, 1997)—can result in the loss of potential financial and nonfinancial rewards and advancement opportunities. According to the attributional theory of achievement motivation (Fiske & Taylor, 2013; Weiner, 1985, 1986), discrimination can also result in less tangible, but not less significant, emotional and cognitive damage to the target of the evaluation.

Learning about the nature, causes, and consequences of prejudice and discrimination in performance appraisal is, therefore, of great importance for management education and development. Achieving such learning, however, presents a significant pedagogical challenge for educators and trainers. The sensitive nature of the topics and the societal norms surrounding beliefs and attitudes toward ingroup/outgroup relations and minority social identities (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986; Turner, 1985) can lead students and trainees to approach those issues from a purely cognitive perspective, absorbing concepts and theories uncritically and expressing only socially desirable opinions, while keeping threatening emotions and cognitions firmly suppressed. This can arguably be even more damaging than not “learning” about these issues at all, since it can lull participants into self-complacency. If they develop an unwarranted self-image as being immune to the dynamics of prejudice and discrimination, they will be that much more vulnerable to its unconscious mechanisms—much in the same way that a superficial exposure to ethics education can lead students to develop an inflated moral identity that might keep them from recognizing their potential for moral lapses (Chugh & Kern, 2016).
How, then, can management educators and trainers tackle these pedagogical challenges? The literature has shown that many of the limitations of traditional lectures in this particular area can be addressed through the use of experiential learning (Chavez, Ferris, & Gibson, 2011; Dunn-Jensen, Jensen, Calhoun, & Ryan, 2016; Tromley, Giapponi, & McDevitt, 2014) to examine topics such as values, attitudes, beliefs, perceptual differences, biases (confirmation/disconfirmation bias, stereotyping, projection, halo effect), gender discrimination, cultural identity, and ethical decision making. There is also growing recognition of the significant potential of the liberal arts and the humanities to contribute to management learning (Colby, Ehrlich, Sullivan, & Dolle, 2011; Peters & Nesteruk, 2014), and in 2015 the Journal of Management Education dedicated an entire special issue to integrating liberal learning, humanities, and management education (Statler & Guillet De Monthoux, 2015). The use of arts-based methods in management education is becoming widely accepted (Adler, 2011, 2015), is celebrated in new journals such as Organizational Aesthetics (2012), and represents a natural fit for Organization Management Journal (OMJ), whose aims include advancing knowledge in management education, enhancing the teaching of management, and promoting pedagogical innovation (Organization Management Journal, 2017).

Here we focus on an emerging opportunity for this sort of “right-brain/left-brain” learning: theater and the use of plays (Boggs, Mickel, & Holtom, 2007; Ferris, 2001, 2002; Steed, 2005; Taylor, 2012, 2013, 2016). This article presents an original academic play, “Regarding Lupe,” about the misunderstandings between Lupe Herrera (a Latina executive at Global Products, a multinational corporation in Chicago), and Bob Smith (her boss, who holds semi-acknowledged biases about Hispanics but hesitates to act on them). The play takes place just before Lupe’s performance evaluation: as Lupe and Smith prepare for it, they each recall the same incidents but interpret them in completely different ways, as they see them through different cultural lenses. The other characters in the play help to highlight the contrasts between Latino and U.S. culture, and to understand the dynamics of prejudice and discrimination.

Before the play starts, a facilitator tells the audience that at the end there will be a vote on the outcome of Lupe’s performance appraisal. The play is then performed, either live (a full production or a simple stage-reading) or in a pre-recorded format. Once it ends, the facilitator conducts the voting process, and uses the results to transition into a full debriefing.

As an academic play, “Regarding Lupe” represents a pedagogical innovation, part of a new genre that emphasizes creativity, critical thinking, and student engagement. It is a “play,” in that it is meant to feel at all times like a “normal” literary and theatrical product, not as a vehicle for ostensible teaching. But it is also “academic,” in that the plot of the play is firmly rooted in a solid, research-based conceptual framework—Crandall and Eshleman’s (2003) Justification Suppression Model of Prejudice (JSM)—which serves as a basis for the debriefing.

The term “Latina” encompasses women from a set of ethnic and cultural backgrounds (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race). These cultures share enough common themes, values, and challenges to achieve a significant amount of commonality, while not being by any means monolithic. The term is used here because it differentiates between a woman (Latina) and a man (Latino), which makes it particularly appropriate for a conceptual examination of the intersectionality of gender and ethnicity, as opposed to the term “Hispanic,” which covers both genders and originated with government-generated demographic analyses.

Latina managers occupy a space at the intersection of gender, ethnicity, and class that is starting to be explored by management scholars (Blancero & DelCampo, 2012; Stone, Johnson, Stone-Romero, & Hartman, 2006; Volpone, 2012). Even when they see themselves as highly acculturated or even assimilated in U.S. culture, Latina managers have to deal with the fact that if they look or sound like a Latina—because of their Hispanic-sounding names, genotype (hair, facial features, skin color, etc.), or language or speech patterns (accent, code-switching, neologisms, etc.)—others might still see them primarily as members of an out-group. When an executive conducts an individual performance appraisal of a manager who is ostensibly Latina, that evaluator is both engaging in a task for which there is typically a lack of specific training or expertise (Gilbert, De Winne, & Sels, 2011) and also opening a door through which prejudice may enter the process (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003).

“Regarding Lupe” immerses participants in a cultural gap full of consequences, allowing them to experience the same incidents through the eyes of a Latina manager and her boss. To help readers navigate those cross-cultural waters, here we present not only the play and its debriefing notes, but also other supporting materials. The Participant Resources (Appendix A) include a glossary of the Spanish words and other special terms that are marked with an asterisk the
first time they appear in the play (Table A1); a brief comparison between the cultural values of Latinas and those in the U.S. dominant culture (Table A2); an explanation of the cultural scripts of Latinas that are embedded in the play (Table A3); and a summary of how those scripts might influence a Latina manager’s reaction to discrimination in performance appraisal (Table A4). We also offer Facilitator Resources (Appendix B), with detailed suggestions for conducting the play in face-to-face or online environments.

Learning about the cross-cultural dynamics that can bias the performance appraisal of Latina managers is relevant in its own right, as they represent a severely underresearched segment of the underresearched population of Latinas. But, as we show in the sections that follow, the significance of the play and its debriefing extends beyond the exploration of this particular context: It also provides insights about the dynamics of prejudice and discrimination toward other outgroups, and contributes to the broader theoretical discussion about diversity in the workplace.

The play: “Regarding Lupe”

Characters

LUPE (GUADALUPE) Thirty-seven years old. Born and raised in a California barrio*, looks distinctly mestiza,* and takes pride in being bicultural. Has an MBA and came to Chicago 10 years ago to work at Global Products (GP), where she is now an executive in charge of a cosmetics line. Recently divorced, went back to her maiden name (Herrera), and has custody of twin 4-year-old daughters. She is hosting her sisters Zizi and Dulce during their visit to Chicago. Lupe is feeling quite anxious about her upcoming performance appraisal.

ZIZI (EMERENCIANA) HERRERA. Thirty-five and single, has a PhD and teaches organizational behavior in Los Angeles. A colleague is covering her MBA classes while Zizi is in Chicago on a 2-week leave of absence to conduct field interviews for a book about Latinas in the workplace. Is staying at Lupe’s condo.

DULCE HERRERA. Thirty-three and single, has a PhD in software engineering. Works at a high-tech firm in Los Angeles (LA), and is also on a 2-week “working vacation” at Lupe’s, to help Zizi with the interviews for the book.

BOB (Robert) SMITH. Fifty-two, and married. Lupe’s boss at GP. Reports to Joe Goodwill. Hopes to replace Goodwill when he retires.

JOE GOODWILL—Early 60s, approaching retirement as GP’s Senior VP for Latin America. (This is a silent role—Goodwill has a phone conversation with Smith, but is not actually seen or heard. We only hear Smith’s side of the conversation.)

Setting

Lupe’s Chicago condo: open-space living area, connected to a kitchen (Stage Right), and a home office (Stage Left). Top-of-the-line Ikea furnishings in tones of gray, with brightly-colored Mexican accents. La Virgen de Guadalupe* tops a traditional home altar, surrounded by candles, photos, and Catholic saints. Upstage, on a raised platform, is a minimalist representation of Smith’s office, visible only during Act One, Scene 2.

Time

Late afternoon/evening, November 1, Día de Los Muertos.*

Place

Lupe’s Chicago condo (Act One, Scenes One and Two), Smith’s office (Act One, Scene Two).

Synopsis of scenes

Act 1, Scene 1: Día de Los Muertos, Lupe’s condo: Zizi and Dulce working on a manuscript.
Act 1, Scene 2: Same day, alternating between condo (Herrera sisters discussing Lupe’s upcoming appraisal) and Smith’s Global Products office (talking on the phone with his boss, Goodwill, about Lupe’s appraisal). Ends with audience voting about most likely appraisal outcome (positive or negative).

Act 1, scene 1

AT RISE: Lights reveal Lupe’s home office (Stage Left), while the rest of the stage remains dark. Zizi is typing on her laptop and Dulce is standing by the window.

ZIZI. [Stops typing] Come on, Dulce, are we going to work on the interview notes or what?

DULCE. [Sighing] I miss California, Zizi. Can you believe it’s barely November first and it’s already snowing in Chicago? Our Chicana* bodies are not made for this weather.

ZIZI. Where is the Herrera spirit of adventure? Our Abuelita* had to pay “coyotes”* to cross the Mexican border, going through all kinds of hell to hide in LA, and you complain about flying the friendly skies from LA to Chicago? Come on, Sis, live a little! And don’t forget that here we get to be with our sister. Haven’t you missed Lupe? She’s been here 10 years, only flying back to LA for the holidays. Mamá and Abuelita are always complaining that Lupe became a gringa* and forgot her family.

DULCE. And now, with the divorce … I don’t know how Lupe manages to compete in the rat race at work AND handle the twins at home. I wish her husband hadn’t decided to fool around with his assistant …

ZIZI. At least Lupe was able to keep the condo … This condo, where we’re staying for free! Don’t you feel a little guilty? Shouldn’t we be in a hotel, instead of taking advantage of Lupe? Two weeks can be a long time … Isn’t it enough that Mamá and Abuelita have already been staying here for a whole month?

DULCE. That’s your “American” side speaking. What are families for?

ZIZI. You mean—Chicano families. Thank goodness our culture believes in collectivism,* or we would have ended up in a cab at O’Hare Airport, heading straight to some nice, individualistic,* little hotel rooms …

DULCE. Speaking of culture, we really need to finish these interview notes. Not much time left until the deadline for the book! Thank goodness we’ll finish all the field research while we are in Chicago. When we get back to LA we’ll just need to do the writing …

ZIZI. Ay, “just” the writing! That’s actually the hardest part.

DULCE. [Leaves the window to sit across from Zizi] At least this is a book we really believe in. There’s so much people don’t understand about the cultural values of Latinas!

ZIZI. But I think that what will make our book really stand out is that we’re talking about an invisible segment: Latina managers. People like you and Lupe. Sometimes it feels like all those Latina executives we’ve been interviewing in LA and Chicago have been hiding under Harry Potter’s Invisibility Cloak …

DULCE. That makes it a pretty big cloak: Hispanics are the fastest growing minority in the country!

ZIZI. Aaargh… “Hispanic”! [Makes air quotes] This word always makes me think of bureaucrats and government statistics.

DULCE. No wonder: They were the ones who came up with the word! It is all about Census reporting and demographics.

ZIZI. And yet most people don’t understand that “Hispanic” [in air quotes] has to do with ethnicity, not race. Someone can be Hispanic and White, Hispanic and Black, Hispanic and whatever else …

DULCE. Right! That’s why it’s great that in the book we’re sticking with “Latina,” not “Hispanic.” We’re talking culture, not government statistics.

ZIZI. Yep, “Latina” is a good umbrella term: It shows that the book is not just about Chicanas like us, with our Mexican roots. The stories we’re telling are also about our hermanas* from Puerto Rico, Cuba, South and Central America, the whole sisterhood …

[Keys sound as Lupe arrives home]

DULCE. [Listening] Talking about sisters … Is that Lupe?
Act 1, scene 2

[Zizi and Dulce leave the office, as Lupe is arriving. The home office goes dark, and the lights turn on in the living area. Zizi and Dulce sit on the couch, while Lupe collapses in the easy chair across from them.]

ZIZI. Lupe, you are home early today!
LUPE. Did you forget that today is the Día de los Muertos? At work it actually felt like the Day of the Dead, but American style: a lot of grief about the performance appraisals coming up. I’m actually quite worried about what my boss is going to do for my appraisal. Not the best day to leave work early, but if I hadn’t done this I might as well be in the cemetery already, getting a head start on the celebrations ... as a permanent resident. Abuelita would have killed me! Where is she?
DULCE. Grandma left hours ago, with the twins and Mamá, carrying bags of food.
LUPE. Are you telling me they took my little four-year-olds to the cemetery and are having a picnic in the snow?? Isn’t it enough that they made me set up this altar and might end up burning my home to the ground? [Points to the Virgen de Guadalupe home altar, where lots of candles are flickering] Ay, those two women are getting old, but I’m the one going crazy. I couldn’t believe my eyes when they arrived here unannounced a month ago! True, their intention was to help with the girls, but couldn’t they have asked me before coming?
ZIZI. Come on, you’re not being fair. If they had told you beforehand, you’d have told them not to come. They have been worrying so much about you and the twins since your divorce! You know what it takes for them to leave the barrio ... 
LUPE. Didn’t they know that the girls attend Montessori school all day?
DULCE. Sure, but they think that little kids belong at home.
LUPE. Worse: They believe this still applies to me as well! They think I should never have left the barrio to come work in Chicago. They make me feel guilty, and then I have to repeat to myself: “You are a rising, successful executive at Global Products!” But five minutes later I’m calling them “Mamá” and “Abuelita,” as we have always done, and then I feel like a little kid who is breaking a rule by going to work. If I were a man they would be proud of me ... but I’m a woman and so I should be home baking cookies.
DULCE. Baking cookies isn’t such a bad idea. I’d love to have some right now.
ZIZI. You and food ... Anyway, I have never felt guilty about working.
LUPE. That’s because you are a “profesora,” and Mamá and Abuelita accept that teaching is an OK job for a woman. Also, they secretly hope that you will meet someone at work, get married and have lots of kids.
DULCE. [Laughing] Again, not such a bad idea.
LUPE. Whatever ... Gosh, I just need to rest a few more minutes, but then we should go to the cemetery, so they don’t freeze to death over there.
DULCE. Relax, you are always so stressed out when you get home from work!
LUPE. You, of all people, should know that anyone would be stressed out if they had to “switch codes” all the time like we do. I try to act more American than Uncle Sam all day at work, and then when I get home I’m expected to be a perfect Mexican mother, devoted to the kids and always putting my own needs aside. No wonder that stress, depression and suicide are becoming a real problem for Latinas. It isn’t easy to straddle the borderlands and be American by day and Chicana by night. And it’s worse for us Latinas than for Latinos. Machismo* is alive and well in Latino communities. Men get home and want to feel like kings—my ex-husband is living proof. He always made me serve him hand and foot, even though my job is just as tough as his. And then, when the economic crisis hit, he looked for comfort in his assistant, who always treated him like a god. In the end I couldn’t take it anymore. She wasn’t content to be just his “work wife,” she wanted the whole thing.
ZIZI. Do you ever feel like “Marianismo”* expectations are not just for home, but that we have to be submissive “Marias” at work as well? With all my feminism and Chicana activism, sometimes I catch myself acting as if I have to “aguantar”* stuff at work, putting up with unreasonable demands and being the good girl who respects authority and never talks back.
LUPE. No, I don’t think I do that.
ZIZI. Oh well . . . You know what? Before we leave for the cemetery, let’s check the news to see what’s going on with the snow and road conditions.

[Zizi turns on the TV, looking for the local weather forecast in the 5 o’clock news, only to find out that Abuelita had left the TV with the volume turned all the way up, because she’s getting deaf. The TV blares loud Mexican music, while Zizi tries to figure out the new remote control.]

[Lupe’s cell phone rings and she answers, while Zizi is still trying to decipher the control and mute the TV.]

LUPE. [Nods several times, as the caller keeps talking, then finally replies:] “Sure, Mr. Smith, I’ll work on my self-evaluation tonight and you will have it in your inbox early tomorrow morning. No, sir, no problem, I’m glad to do it. [Looks at her sisters, rolls her eyes and pretends to gag.] Thank you for putting so much thought into my appraisal. Have a great evening. [Hangs up the phone, looking dismayed. Appeals to her sisters:] Could you go meet them at the cemetery without me? My boss wants me to have a self-evaluation ready for tomorrow morning. I may have to work on it all night.

ZIZI. Sure . . . But why have you left the self-evaluation for the last minute, if it’s so important? A bit of a stereotype, isn’t it, leaving it for “Matiana”?

LUPE. I had no idea I was supposed to do it . . . Just heard it from Smith a minute ago. Apparently it’s a new thing GP wants the bosses to do: take into consideration our self-evaluations when they write our appraisals. In a way it sounds great, but I hate the idea of having to do it. It’s so hard to brag about myself, or to sound like I’m making excuses. On the other hand, at least this will give me a chance to have some input, so it will not just be Smith’s opinions.

DULCE. Why are you worried? Aren’t you doing well?

LUPE. Yeah, but with Smith you never know. Sometimes he looks at me with a disgusted expression and makes me feel like a cucaracha.” He’s really set in his ways, came to Chicago eons ago to work at GP. He’s desperate to become Senior VP for Latin America, when Goodwill retires. It’s actually quite ironic. How can he possibly hope to succeed if he despises Hispanics?

ZIZI. Unfortunately that will probably not stop him from getting what he wants . . . Have you had any problems with him lately?

[The light fades in Lupe’s condo, and a spotlight reveals (on a raised platform upstage) Bob Smith’s office at GP, where he is talking on the phone with his boss, Joe Goodwill. For the remainder of Scene 2, the spotlight will alternate between the two parallel conversations: Smith on the phone with Goodwill, and Lupe and her sisters at the condo.]

[Bob Smith’s GP office. Smith talking on the phone with Joe Goodwill]

SMITH. Hi Joe, it’s Bob. Glad I caught you. [Listens] Sure, we’re still on for Saturday. Dinner will be great! But I’m calling you now for a different reason. It’s regarding Lupe . . . I’m working on Lupe Herrera’s [mispronouncing the “r”s in her last name] performance appraisal. [Listens] Yeah, I agree, she’s a good gal. That’s why I wanted to touch base with you before writing anything final. I’ve asked her to write a self-evaluation, but in the meantime I wanted to get your take on some of my concerns.

[Lupe’s condo. Sisters continuing conversation, Lupe responding to Zizi’s question]

LUPE. Problems? Yeah, you can say that. I didn’t tell you this before, because I don’t like to complain, but there’s one thing that really worries me. It happened with our new line of cosmetics and nail polish for the Latin American market and Latinas in the U.S. During one of the first product development meetings, I made a presentation and said we should use vibrant colors. Guess what Smith did? He interrupted me, in front of everyone, saying “Nonsense, nonsense.” Then he said that, according to his wife, the trend this fall would be muted colors: that’s what her golf buddies were wearing. How’s that for market research? A bunch of “ladies who lunch.” [Making air quotes] What does that have to do with Latin America? But I was so embarrassed I didn’t say anything. We did what he wanted, and the new line is failing miserably. Now he rarely calls on me in a meeting, and whenever I raise a point about something, it’s as if I’m invisible. But if one of his golden boys says something similar later on, it’s suddenly a brilliant idea. What drives me
even crazier about the new cosmetic line fiasco is that I like neutral colors myself: look at this room, all in shades of gray . . . at least until Abuelita and Mamá arrived!

DULCE. They certainly added a bit of color . . .

LUPE. [Smiles distractedly] The problem is, I don’t know which part of that whole situation Smith will remember, when he writes my evaluation. The part where I was right and he was wrong, or the part where the new line ended up being a disaster?

[Smith at his GP office, continuing the conversation with Goodwill]

SMITH. I agree, Joe. It’s great to have a Hispanic female executive in our Latin America Division. I used to trust her opinions, but then we had the fiasco with the new fall line, and now I don’t know anymore . . . [Listens] Sure, I seem to remember that she once said something about brighter colors, but I was afraid that it was just the “Hispanic barrio” in her that was doing talking, so I discounted it . . . and then she never said anything about it again. That makes me think she’s not really leadership material: a leader has to keep trying until he gets heard!

[Listens] No, in the other meetings she was just a wallflower, never made any memorable points. [Listens] I don’t know, it’s as if she lost something after the divorce [Listens] Oh, you hadn’t heard? Yes, her husband left her, and now her mind seems to be somewhere else. I’ve been trying to give her less challenging tasks, with lower visibility, until she finds her footing again, but I’m afraid this might be backfiring. Lupe has been leaving work earlier and earlier this whole month. Maybe she got a boyfriend. Today, when I came back from lunch with the LA manager, Lupe had already left. Can you imagine? In the middle of the afternoon! [Listens] No, I don’t think she was sick. I just called her cell phone a few minutes ago, to say I needed her self-evaluation asap, and there was Mexican music blaring in the background. She must have been in a club or something . . . So I guess her self-appraisal will be left for mañana” . . .

[Lupe’s condo. Lupe continuing conversation with her sisters]

LUPE. And the new cosmetic line is not even the only problem. It’s also the small things, the little bars and put-downs that keep coming from Smith all the time. Maybe he doesn’t do it out of malevolence, but it hurts all the same. The other day I was in my office, eating the lunch that Abuelita had prepared, and he just waltzes in. He sniffed the air, wrinkled his nose, opened the window—even though it was really cold outside—and said: “Sorry, I have this keen sense of smell . . .” The nerve! Rather than judging my food choices, he should be thankful that I am willing to eat at my desk, to get more work done, rather than having one of his leisurely lunches! I don’t think he has any idea of what it took for me to be where I am today. Between working to pay my school expenses, being dependent on public transportation which uses up precious time, studying at all hours of the day and night, applying for scholarships, and earning the grades to keep those scholarships, I have earned my way here. It feels like I have always had to be smarter and more dedicated than anyone else just to have access to opportunities that others may take for granted.

[Smith at his GP office, continuing conversation with Goodwill]

SMITH. Sure, Joe, I agree that Lupe has much to offer, but sometimes she’s just too Hispanic. The other day I walked into her office and she was eating this foul-smelling Mexican stuff. The whole place stank like a pigsty. I opened the window but it didn’t really help. I tried to be polite about it, but ended up having to cut the conversation short. If I hadn’t left, my own lunch would probably have gone out the window—quite literally . . . It’s bad enough that she doesn’t behave like a GP executive and eats lunch at her desk like a staffer, but does it have to be something that smells so bad? It’s so inconsiderate of the needs of others . . . Not the sort of leadership attitude we expect from someone in her position. You know, Joe, I can’t quite say it in her formal appraisal, but sometimes it’s the little things, like the smelly food, or leaving early, that get to me. I’m not saying
that I expect gratitude, but she doesn’t seem to appreciate all I do for her.

[Lupe’s condo. Sisters continuing conversation]

DULCE. Lupe, has it occurred to you that maybe you’re making a mountain out of a molehill? Perhaps the poor guy is just an old geezer . . .

LUPE. Poor guy??? Aaargh!

DULCE. Maybe he has good intentions, and is just misguided about showing them.

LUPE. Misguided? How can you say that? Aren’t you and Zizi the brave defenders of oppressed Latinas? Aren’t you big shots in the Chicana Feminist Organization?

DULCE. Yeah, yeah . . . But isn’t there an itsy bitsy chance that you’re just being a little too paranoid? Maybe what’s really bothering you is that you consider yourself so acculturated, so cosmopolitan, but he’s treating you like a Chicana, and somehow that offends you. Maybe you’re just not used to being condescended to, but many Latinas are treated like that every single day, even those with the fanciest titles and in the most high-powered workplaces.

LUPE. Are you saying that I am as pathetic as cousin Millagros? Our very own Millagros, who won the genetic fair-skinned lottery, and now wants to “pass” for Angla? Did you know she even had her name legally changed from “Millagros Herrera” to “Millie Smith?” She straightened her hair and is now a bottle blonde, with blue eye contacts. I saw her the other day, going to work, and she looked like an Executive Barbie. Is that the kind of acculturation you think I want?

ZIZI. Of course not! That’s not what Dulce means. And if you want to be technical about it, Millie is not acculturated, she is assimilated. As a matter of fact, I think that acculturation is much more difficult than assimilation, because you have to pick and choose the elements of each culture to form an identity that fits you. Whenever I hear someone referring to acculturation as if it’s something you achieve in a seminar, I feel like saying: “Great! Is there an app for that?”

DULCE. Yeah, Zizi is right. Our concern is for you. If you insist in thinking that your boss is against you, this will not help you write a good self-appraisal. If you feel like a victim, you’ll come across like one. So just think of Smith as a silly old man who is lost in a world he doesn’t understand, and that’s changing around him. Try to imagine that he’s trying to be nice to you, but he just doesn’t know how.

[Smith’s GP office. Smith concluding conversation with Joe Goodwill]

SMITH. Thanks for listening, Joe, I really trust your instincts. I’ll think this over carefully and make sure I’m giving Lupe a fair chance. I just don’t want to relax the standards so much that I’d end up jeopardizing the division’s performance. That wouldn’t be fair to the company, nor to Lupe. See you Saturday!

[Smith hangs up with Goodwill and calls his wife.]

SMITH. Honey, I’m just calling to say that I’ll have to stay late in the office. [Listen] I know, it’s snowing, but I have this performance appraisal to finish up. I’d rather be done with it before I go home. This one is getting to me, for some reason. It’s regarding Lupe, and I’m still not sure what’s the right thing to do. Joe Goodwill seems to have this thing for her, and I don’t want him to think that I have a prejudice against Hispanics, or he’ll never recommend me to replace him when he retires. [Listen] Yeah, you know me: I don’t have prejudices. What the heck, my college roommate was Hispanic and I never had a problem with that. But even if I’m entirely right about Lupe’s appraisal, and the facts are on my side, I don’t want the slightest appearance of prejudice or discrimination, not to mention the legal headaches that might follow. [Listen] Right . . . it’s such a relief to know that with you I can be completely honest. [Listen] Yeah, I’m tired of entitled minorities. They just know how to whine and claim their “rights.” It’s all “gimme, gimme, gimme,” and they don’t give anything in return. Where is our country going? Those people keep having babies . . . [Listen] Gosh, did you know that we have become the second-largest Spanish-speaking country in the world? We’re even ahead of Mexico! We’re second only to Spain. No wonder our phone systems now say “Oprima numero dos para Español.” But this country speaks English, they should be able to understand “Press number two for Spanish”—or they shouldn’t have to press anything at all, for any other
language. If they want to stay here they better learn English! [Listens] Oh well, my darling, thanks for letting me vent. I feel better now.

[Listen] All this stuff is not Lupe’s fault, I know, so I want to be completely fair in her evaluation. I just want to be done with her appraisal. If I don’t finish it I’ll not be able to sleep. I really want to do the right thing, and I don’t want Goodwill to second-guess me. Don’t wait up for me—I don’t know what time I’m going to get home. Bye, love you!

[Lupe’s condo. Sisters continuing conversation]

LUPE. He’s trying to be nice? Then how would you explain that after years of working together, such a smart man has not been able to learn how to pronounce my last name? What’s so hard about “Herrera”?

ZIZI. Well, if you want to complain about names, let’s not forget about me . . . How many people do you think can say my real name: Emerenciana? Thank goodness everyone started calling me Zizi when I was a little child.

LUPE. But Emerenciana has such a nice meaning . . . Mamá said it’s from the Latin “Emerentius:” worthy of merit, she who will be rewarded. [Sighs] Speaking of rewards, right now I could really use a good-luck name like yours. There are all sorts of rewards depending on my performance appraisal—promotion opportunities, incentive pay, all the rest . . . Not to mention the reputation effect. So I need to get it right, even though I hate doing self-evaluations. I feel so awkward about trying to sing my own praises without sounding like I’m bragging.

ZIZI. You want my name? What about yours? Just ask for the protection of your namesake. You know how Abuelita swears that La Virgencita de Guadalupe can work any miracle. Just pray to your fairy godmother and start writing your self-appraisal. If you wait too long to start, writing doesn’t get any easier.

LUPE. Right . . . But if prayers really worked, soccer games in Mexico would all end on a tie! Anyway, thank you for letting me unload, but you guys really have to leave. You need to get to the cemetery before it gets even darker and colder. Contrary to what Mamá and Abuelita might think, I’m not a bad mom. I want my kids home, even if they get in the way of writing my self-appraisal [Laughs when realizing the absurdity of the situation] Go, go, bring all four snowwomen to defrost at home . . . And to think we don’t even have any relatives buried in Chicago!

ZIZI. Good, your sense of humor is back. Now go write the self-appraisal [Starts singing softly a stanza in “Burn it Blue,” from the soundtrack of the movie “Frida”] “Woman so weary/Spread your broken wings/Fly free as the swallow sings/See the dark lady smiles/She burns . . .”

[Dulce and Lupe join her, and the three sisters sing together]

ZIZI. [alternating] “And the night sky blooms DULCE, and with fire/(Y la noche que se encendia)/ LUPE. And the burning bed floats higher/(Y la cama que lleva)/And she’s free to fly (A volar)”

[Still singing, Dulce and Zizi get their winter gear, kiss Lupe and leave. Lupe starts walking reluctantly toward the studio, to work on the self-appraisal. The light fades to dark.]

**Audience vote: “Regarding Lupe”**

The Facilitator asks audience members to indicate which performance appraisal outcome (positive or negative) they believe is most likely (not most desirable), reminding them that there is no right or wrong answer. Participants cast their votes through a simple show of hands, or using their cell phones to send a text message to a free online voting system like as pollseverywhere.com, which then tallies and displays the votes. A debriefing session follows.

**Debriefing notes: Applying the JSM**

The materials provided in Appendix A (Participant Resources) and Appendix B (Facilitator Resources) are intended to support preparation for the play and debriefing.

As discussed in the Facilitator Resources, “Regarding Lupe” offers an opportunity to explore a wide range of topics that may influence performance appraisal: cultural values and scripts; perceptual filters; and Crandall and Eshleman’s (2003) Justification and Suppression Model of Prejudice, or JSM (including stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination; gender expectations; generational differences at work).

This section is dedicated to a deeper examination of how the debriefing can be used to explore the ways in which the JSM can mediate the relationship between misperception of cultural values and the expression of prejudice in performance appraisal:
The JSM suggests that prejudice is expressed as a function of three processes: genuine prejudice, suppression, and justification. The core emotional component of prejudice—genuine prejudice—is pure, original, and unmanaged negative feelings toward members of a devalued group. Because the expression of prejudice is at odds with an egalitarian self-image, suppression—motivated processes that seek to reduce the expression of prejudice—moderate[s] this expression. However, affect has strong motivational properties, and the suppression of this motivation creates tension and discomfort, and hijacks attention and depletes energy. As a result, people will engage justification processes—any process that allows the expression of genuine prejudice without internal guilt or anxiety, or other external punishments as a release for the pent-up emotion. According to the JSM, the expression of prejudice is decreased when suppression is maximized and justification is minimized, and prejudice is most likely to be expressed when suppression is minimized and justifications are maximized. (Crandall, Nierenberg, & Hebl, 2009, p. 479)

For example, if Justification strengthens and Suppression weakens, so that Justification overcomes Suppression, Smith will be more likely to express his prejudice in a negative appraisal of Lupe's performance. If, on the other hand, the strengthening of Justification and the weakening of Suppression are not enough for Justification to overcome Suppression, then Smith will be less likely to express his prejudice, thus increasing the likelihood of a positive appraisal of Lupe's performance.

The debriefing should help participants appreciate the moderating effects that organizational and individual attributes may have on the relationship between Smith's misperceptions of cultural values and the direction and intensity of the effects of these misperceptions on his Justification and Suppression mechanisms. For example, Suppression is likely to be weakened by organizational attributes such as GP's appraisal process, which seems to give Smith a lot of leeway in how he approaches Lupe's evaluation. One might ask whether he intends to ignore Lupe's self-appraisal, even after having requested it so forcefully and on such short notice. If so, Suppression would seem to be at work. In that case, one could argue that Smith does not seem to be concerned about personal accountability or organizational checks and balances, other than Goodwill's opinion and its possible impact on Smith's promotion prospects.

But what if Smith intends to use the appraisal form that he is completing as a basis for discussion alongside Lupe's self-appraisal? What if he intends to have an open, frank discussion about the behaviors that would support Lupe's future success in her career? What if he is going to try to do the right thing for the future of this young woman and for the company they both work for? If he thinks that this will lead to a more positive view of his leadership by Goodwill, then could this be a kind of Suppression? As one can see, the discussion of this play can be an opportunity for critical thinking with significant group interaction.

The play also provides plenty of information about the potential moderating effects of Smith's and Lupe's individual attributes. For example, what we glean about Smith's attributes (e.g., his socialization, authoritarian personality, negative attitudes toward Hispanics, lack of personal exposure to Hispanics in general and to Latinas like Lupe in particular) suggests ample opportunity for the strengthening of Justification and the weakening of Suppression. On the other hand, Smith's desire to impress Goodwill, in order to improve his succession chances, might tip those forces in the opposite direction.

By the same token, Lupe's individual attributes (such as competence in her job, level of acculturation, mastery of both languages, phenotype, race, country of origin, social class, family situation, name, self-presentation, and so on), can also influence Justification and Suppression mechanisms in different directions and intensity levels. Last but not least, the debriefing discussion may demonstrate that participants make different assumptions about the relative effects of the moderating variables (GP's, Smith's, and Lupe's attributes), and this might explain why they arrive at different votes about the most likely appraisal outcome (positive or negative).

During the debriefing, participants often wonder whether "stereotype is destiny": Can people really break free from stereotypical expectations related to their backgrounds? There is enough information in the play to show how Lupe and her sisters have significantly escaped from stereotype—through effort, education, work status, work ethic, and so on. However, Lupe has not entirely escaped being seen and treated in stereotypical ways (e.g., when Smith interprets certain situations so differently from the way she does).

The talent/effort explanation for Lupe's success that is embedded in the play can also be added to the debriefing. For example, the facilitator may want to elicit a discussion of how prejudice and stereotyping can bias the causal attributions of the appraiser toward perceived explanations such as luck and affirmative action. Given that attributions to talent and aptitude are typically associated with higher evaluations (Fiske & Taylor, 2013; Weiner, 1985, 1986), this discussion helps participants realize that biased causal attributions for success that discount or exclude such internal, stable factors may therefore result in subtle, unintentional discrimination in appraisal decisions.
Some participants might wonder whether the problem with Smith is primarily generational (e.g., in the conversation with Goodwill, when Smith says that “she’s a good gal,” instead of a woman)—or more directly tied to issues such as gender, class, or ethnicity. It seems to be hard for Smith to see Lupe as an executive, which might contribute for his difficulties in interacting with her. The exploration of these issues can result in a lively discussion where participants identify similar examples from their own experience apart from the play.

In concluding the debriefing or class discussion, the facilitator may want to refer to Carol Dweck’s concept of “mindsets” (Dweck, 2006). Rather than seeing the world as composed of people who are inherently bigoted or open-minded, participants can be encouraged to develop a more nuanced and hopeful perspective, seeing cultural sensitivity and cultural literacy from a growth mindset (something that can and should be developed), rather than from a fixed mindset (where “you either get it or you don’t”).

Participants sometimes express surprise at the idea that Smith could have risen to such a high executive level and yet be arguably “tone deaf” and prejudiced. Smith’s character, however, was inspired by very real and high-placed executives. When the play was performed at the Eastern Academy of Management, for example, several participants pointed out that “Smiths” are still alive and well out there in the world, in even less benign forms. What is even more interesting is that most “Smiths” do not even perceive themselves as being prejudiced in any way: They see themselves as fair and impartial, “just-the-facts” managers, which is one of the fascinating aspects of the work of Crandall and his co-authors (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Crandall et al., 2009). This comes out in the debriefing, in a very powerful way, when some participants argue that Smith “means well” and that his interpretations of events could be seen as making as much sense as Lupe’s. Some will look at Smith and see a prejudiced man. Others might look at him and see someone who is being demonized by Lupe, whom they might perceive as an “entitled” minority. The facilitator should highlight the segment in the dialogue where Zizi tells Lupe: “So just think of Smith as a silly old man who is lost in a world he doesn’t understand, and that’s changing around him” (p. 19). How many times, in practice, is this excuse used to write off bombastic behavior? Perceiving Smith as a member of the cadre of senior executives who do not know better makes him easier to dismiss, excuse, or ignore. Moreover, this characterization may make it easier for participants who share Smith’s perspective to disavow it, claiming that “it’s not me.”

“Regarding Lupe” allows us to go beyond conventional theoretical discussions of cultural differences and decision biases, where participants often stay at a superficial level, sticking to socially approved opinions and beliefs. Instead, this play elicits strong emotions, spirited debates, and powerful self-examinations where participants draw deeply from inside themselves, and from each other, to explore how prejudices related to gender and ethnicity may lead to unintentional, subtle discrimination in an organizational context as significant as performance appraisal and rewards.

**Conclusion**

Ever since the very first “Lupe” stage reading at the Eastern Academy of Management, and throughout our experience in using the play with undergraduate and graduate business students and executives, we have witnessed its power to engage participants in a vivid, direct way with the dynamics that lead to prejudice and discrimination in performance appraisal in the workplace, helping them cross orthodox boundaries in search of a deeper understanding of human nature and relationships. Participants who start the debriefing with a strong aversion toward Smith often end up with a more granular understanding of the complexity of his situation. Together with Goodwill, he might be seen as part of a cadre of senior executives who are having difficulty in grappling with the societal and cultural changes that are destabilizing the world as they knew it, while trying to envision what will be needed for success in a future that will honor diversity.

By the same token, participants who approach the play with an instinctive and often inchoate distaste for minorities, and in particular for those in the intersection of gender and ethnicity, often emerge from the debriefing with a new understanding and empathy for the transformational journeys of the Herrera sisters and other Latinas, as they shed, remix, and reinvent new identities worthy of respect within the prevailing culture of the executive suite. Regardless of what participants think will happen in the performance appraisal after the play ends, the debriefing evokes an appreciation for how the two cultures living within Lupe contribute to her evolving identity and resilience. The energy embedded in the symbolic mixing of two cultures is at the heart of the stanzas the Herrera sisters sing at the end of the play, from “Burn it Blue” (Veloso & Downs, 2002). That song—by Lila Downs (a Mexican-American Latina, just like Lupe and her sisters) and Caetano Veloso (from Brazil)—was part of the the Oscar-winning soundtrack for the movie “Frida,” about the life of Frida Kahlo, a Mexican painter who lived some of the most productive years of her career in the United States. As Luis Valdés (2011) reminds us in his bilingual
poem “Pensamiento Serpentino,” straddling two cultures is a uniquely generative challenge:

But REALITY es una Gran Serpiente
a great serpent that moves and changes
and keeps crawling
out of its
dead skin
despojando su pellejo viejo
to emerge
clean and fresh
la nueva realidad nace de la realidad vieja.
(Valdés, 2011)
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Appendix A. Participant resources for “Regarding Lupe”

Overview

This original short play will allow us to explore how prejudices related to gender and ethnicity may lead to unintentional, subtle discrimination in appraisal and rewards. A glossary of Spanish words and other special terms—marked with an asterisk (*) the first time they appear—can be found in Table A1.

Roles

LUPE (GUADALUPE) Thirty-seven years old. Born and raised in a California barrio,* looks distinctly mestiza* and takes pride in being bicultural. Has an MBA and came to Chicago 10 years ago to work at Global Products (GP), where she is now an executive. Divorced, went back to her maiden name (Herrera) and got custody of twin 4-year-old daughters. She is feeling quite anxious about her upcoming performance appraisal.

ZIZI (EMERENCIANA) Thirty-five and single, has a PhD and teaches industrial and organizational psychology in Los Angeles. She is staying at Lupe’s condo while on sabbatical, to write a book about Latinas.

DULCE HERRERA. Thirty-three and single, has a PhD in software engineering. She is also staying at Lupe’s condo, having taken a 2-week vacation from her job at a high-tech firm in Los Angeles to work on the book with Zizi.

BOB (Robert) SMITH. Fifty-two and married. He is Lupe’s boss at GP. Reports to Joe Goodwill.

JOE GOODWILL. Sr. VP for Latin America. (Silent role—mentioned, but not seen or heard)

FACILITATOR. Leads the audience voting process and final debriefing.

Setting

Lupe’s Chicago condo and Smith’s office

Time

November 1, Day of the Dead.

Questions for discussion

1. What factors might lead to a negative performance evaluation?
2. What factors might lead to a positive performance evaluation?
3. If you could have more information about this situation, what would you ask for and why?
4. If you were a management consultant, what would you say to Smith prior to his meeting with Lupe?
5. If you were a mentor, what would you say to Lupe prior to her meeting with Smith?

Tables

The four tables in the Participant Resources offer a glossary of terms (Table A1), a comparison of U.S.

Table A1. Glossary of terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abuelita</td>
<td>Grandma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguantar</td>
<td>endure, persist, bear, carry on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>a white, English-speaking American, as distinct from a Hispanic American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio</td>
<td>a Spanish-speaking neighborhood in a U.S. city, particularly in California and the Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicana/o</td>
<td>Woman (Chicana) or man (Chicano) of Mexican origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>Dimension in Hofstede’s taxonomy of cultural values (see Table A2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyotes</td>
<td>Mexican Spanish word applied to smugglers of illegal immigrants (mainly in southwestern United States and Mexico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cucaracha</td>
<td>a pejorative term for a woman of Mexican origin (“The Cockroach,” a traditional Spanish folk song and dance that is popular in Mexico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dia de Los Muertos</td>
<td>Day of the Dead (November 1), a holiday celebrated in Mexico and elsewhere, by people of Mexican origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gringa</td>
<td>a term used in Latin America or Spain to refer to a female of U.S. or British descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermanas</td>
<td>sisters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>term used in the U.S. Census to refer to people of Latin American descent (Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin), regardless of race, ancestry, or ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>refers to the “individualism” dimension in Hofstede’s taxonomy of cultural values (see Table A2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Virgen de Guadalupe</td>
<td>Our Lady of Guadalupe, a central figure in Catholic traditions in Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>often used interchangeably with Hispanic to denote a woman of Hispanic background; the term, however, has political connotations of pride in one’s roots in Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machismo</td>
<td>the privileged status of men in society, and the subaltern status of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mañana</td>
<td>“tomorrow,” a term used to describe the habit of delaying doing things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianismo</td>
<td>the Virgin Mary as a role model of purity, endurance and acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mestiza</td>
<td>woman of mixed race (typically with indigenous and Spanish descent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profesora</td>
<td>female educator (applies to Kº12 teacher or university professor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and Latina cultural values (Table A2), a summary of cultural scripts of Latinas (Table A3), and a list of how these scripts might influence how Latinas react to discrimination (Table A4).
Appendix B. Facilitator resources

The play

“Regarding Lupe” is an original short play in which Lupe, a 37-year-old mestiza cosmetics executive, is concerned about an upcoming performance appraisal by Mr. Smith, her 52-year old supervisor. The play explores traditional and emerging Latina cultural values and how they may be misperceived in a U.S. managerial context, so that even an acculturated Latina executive may face prejudice and discrimination in performance appraisal at work.

The setting
Lupe’s Chicago condominium where Lupe talks with her sisters and Mr. Smith’s office where he has phone conversations with his boss, Mr. Goodwill, and his wife. All action takes place on November 1, Dia de Los Muertos (Day of the Dead).

Significance
This play allows participants to witness the kinds of cultural and gender issues that young professional women face in being viewed as competent by their colleagues who may have different experiences and points of view that influence their perceptions.

Materials
Materials include the play itself, Participant Resources ( Appendix A), and Facilitator Resources (here in Appendix B). The Participant Resources includes a summary of the roles, questions for discussion, and four tables: A Glossary of Terms ( Table A1); a brief contrast of the cultural values of Latinas, along Hofstede’s taxonomy (1980, 1991), vis-à-vis dominant cultural values in the United States ( Table A2); a summary of cultural scripts of Latinas ( Table A3); and a list of how these scripts might influence how Latinas react to discrimination ( Table A4). The Facilitator Resources (here in Appendix B) offers suggestions for conducting the play and the debriefing.

Contextual background: Latina managers

The term “Latina” can refer to women from various Hispanic backgrounds. We use it here because it has cultural connotations, whereas the term “Hispanic” originated from governmental statistics. The U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Department of Labor use the term “Hispanic” to indicate the ethnicity of persons of “Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race” (U.S. Department of Labor, 2012).

According to the U.S. Census Bureau/U.S. Department of Commerce (2011), Hispanics are the fastest growing minority in the country, accounting for more than half the U.S. population growth in the last decade: One in every six Americans is Hispanic and the United States has become the second-largest Spanish-speaking country in the world (after only Spain, and ahead of Mexico). A recent survey by the Pew Research Center (Krogstad, 2016) revealed that in 2015 there were 57 million Hispanics living in the United States, with California being the state with the highest percentage of Latinos (15% of the Latino population lives in that state).

There is growing economic pressure for U.S. businesspeople to pay attention to Latina/o culture, beyond the obvious reason that it is the right thing to do in a society that, at the very minimum, espouses the value of diversity. The United States is now a country where the Hispanic vote can influence elections; where the Hispanic consumer market for products and services can make or break organizations; and where population trends may cause Hispanics to become the natural source of (wo)manpower, as business and the professions prepare to deal with the shortages that will follow the exit of baby-boomers from the labor market.

Understanding the Latina experience is now more pressing than ever. “Regarding Lupe” focuses on a segment of the population that been largely ignored in the literature, but whose importance becomes more obvious and urgent each day: Latinas who are college-educated and work in white-collar, managerial contexts. With the mass retirement of baby-boomers, the number of such Latinas is increasing exponentially. But even though Latinas are at the threshold of flooding the executive suites, very little is still known about the intersectional “double whammy” they experience from being a minority in both ethnicity and gender. Bosses and co-workers are often largely unaware about Latinas’ cultural values, thus creating potential misunderstandings for all involved.

Presentation of the play

Face-to-face training group or class. Allow a minimum of 45 minutes for this activity. Distribute the play and the “Participant Resources” before the session, or right at the beginning. After the various parts are assigned to participants, the stage reading of the play (script in hand, no sets) should take about 15 minutes. Following the performance, the audience members then vote on desired and likely outcomes for the situation that takes place in the play: What they would like to happen might not necessarily be what they think is most likely to happen next. The votes can take place
with a simple show of hands, or by having participants use their cell phones to call a free online voting system such as polls everywhere.com.

After the voting, facilitators and participants proceed to discuss any or all of the following questions:

1. What factors in the play might lead to a negative performance evaluation?
2. What factors might lead to a positive performance evaluation?
3. If you could have more information about this situation, what would you ask for and why?
4. If you were a management consultant, what would you say to Smith prior to his meeting with Lupe?
5. If you were a mentor, what would you say to Lupe prior to her meeting with Smith?

This can take about 20 minutes. The facilitator’s summation, using the debriefing notes provided here, can take around 30 minutes. This activity can stand alone or lead into a lecture on perception, inference, diversity, and/or cultural values that can take 30–60 minutes during the same or the following group meeting.

**Online class.** Ask online students to read the play and the Participant Resources, and to register their votes about what they think will happen next and why. Alternatively, depending on the resources available at your academic institution, you might create a video of the play (using student readers or more elaborate actors and staging) and post it online for students to watch and then cast their individual votes. Once students have read the play (or watched the video) and voted, ask them to engage in an online discussion of the questions given in the preceding, either as individual contributors to a discussion of the whole class, or by working in teams and posting the group responses for the class. After this initial discussion you can then facilitate a broader dialogue by expanding on their ideas and introducing the themes of the debriefing into the conversation.

**Debriefing procedures.** Once the voting results are known, and the question-driven initial discussion has taken place (face-to-face or online), the facilitator leads a debriefing session where participants explore the meaning of the results in light of the concepts and theories embedded in the play and their implications for practice. The debriefing material presented here can support a group/class debriefing or be edited for posting in an online teaching lesson, session, or lecture for Web classes.

“Regarding Lupe” can be an effective mechanism for exploring any of the following topics: cultural values and scripts; perceptual filters; and Crandall and Eshleman’s (2003) Justification and Suppression Model of Prejudice (including stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination; gender expectations; generational differences at work).

**Cultural values and scripts.** The debriefing helps to identify and appreciate the cultural values of Latinas in terms of Hofstede’s taxonomy (Blancero & Del Campo, 2012; Hofstede, 1980, 1991): collectivism, high power distance, high uncertainty avoidance (Table A2). This allows for a contrast with U.S. cultural values: individualism, low power distance, and low uncertainty avoidance.

Cultural values and scripts. The debriefing also provides an opportunity for participants to hunt for clues scattered throughout the text about cultural scripts of Latinas that might affect performance appraisal and reactions to discrimination (Tables A3 and A4): *familismo*, *machismo*, *Marianismo*, *personalismo*, *simpatia*, *confianza*, *respeto*, *agüentar*, religiosity, respect for tradition, community-orientation, conflict avoidance, risk aversion, hard work, and reluctance to sing one’s own praise (Blancero & Del Campo, 2012; Stone et al., 2006; Volpone, 2012).

In the play we see how Lupe’s cultural values are misperceived by Smith, and how these misperceptions may influence the likelihood that Smith will allow himself to experience and/or express his anti-Latina prejudice when appraising Lupe’s performance. We also see how Smith’s cultural values are misperceived by Lupe, and how these misperceptions may influence the way that she vents to her sisters and the way that she approaches the performance appraisal interview with Smith.

The appreciation of these cultural differences can also be used for discussion: For example, using career theory, the facilitator can point out that the play incorporates a duality that reflects the “new careers” theoretical perspective (Dany, Louvel, & Valette, 2011; Duberley, Cohen, & Mallon, 2006); Lupe’s career shows the liberating potential of agency and free will, but it also reveals how this can be constrained by elements of path dependence, as Lupe’s ability to deviate from stereotypical scripts is somewhat limited by her background and related cross-cultural issues.

**Perceptual filters.** As the debriefing proceeds, participants explore why Lupe and Smith perceive the same incidents so differently, due to their own perceptual filters about each other’s cultural values. Perceptual filters can distort what individuals notice and how they make sense of what they notice through distortions in framing, predicting, or causal attributions (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988). In the play, Lupe applies causal attribution to Smith based on her label of him as a WASP rather than
as an executive interested in grooming her for future positions. Conversely, Smith applies causal attribution to Lupe based on his label of her as Latina, mother, and divorcée, rather than as an aspiring career professional.

A mechanism for discussing these perceptual filters might start with a vertical line drawn down the center of a whiteboard, SMART Board, or flip chart. Label this “Lupe’s Perceptual Filter.” Ask participants to list the aspects of the situation that they can see (as the audience) on the left-hand side and then draw arrows through the vertical line going toward the right to indicate what gets through Lupe’s perceptual filter. For example, on the left might appear statements such as these:

- Lupe is eating in her office
- Smith walks into her office
- She eats at her desk “like a secretary”
- Smith waltzes into her office
- Smith sniffs the air, wrinkles his nose, opens the window
- Smith says, “Sorry, I have this keen sense of smell . . .”

The first three statements would not get through Lupe’s perceptual filter, but they would get through Smith’s perceptual filter. The last three statements will get through Lupe’s perceptual filter. What does the word “waltzes” imply about Lupe’s perception?

Once Lupe’s filter is complete, the exercise could be repeated for Smith’s filter. Alternatively, participants could be placed into two groups, with one group assigned to create a perceptual filter chart for Lupe and the other to create a perceptual filter chart for Smith. Groups would present and discuss their work. This approach would require a larger allotment of time.

The discussion of different cultural values and scripts, and of different perceptual filters, transitions naturally into the exploration of the JSM that is detailed in the debriefing section of the article. Combined, they can offer a useful backdrop for the exploration of concepts such as microaggressions. Participants can be invited to find examples where those microaggressions happen during the play (e.g., when Lupe feels that her ideas are confiscated by others during meetings), what contributes to them, how they are experienced differently by Lupe and Smith, how the possible lack of intent to harm does not necessarily mean that no harm has occurred, and so on.

When participants struggle with the difference between perception and “reality,” a powerful way to illustrate the subjective nature of perception is to use the example of the “color of the dress” debate that became a hot Internet sensation. When someone posted online a photo from a wedding, an optical phenomenon caused some people to perceive the mother of the bride’s dress as white and gold, while others swore that it was black and blue. Suddenly, tens of millions of people, from teenagers to senators and heads of state, went to the Internet to debate, in the strongest terms, the “actual” color of the dress (Mahler, 2015). The very idea that the same stimulus (be it a person, a situation, an event, or a dress) can be perceived differently by different people can be a transformational experience for participants in the debriefing. If individual differences can lead us to disagree even about “objective,” physical phenomena, like the color of a dress, it becomes easier to understand how distortions in perception and interpretation that can happen when complex situations need to be considered during a performance appraisal.

The photo of the dress caused people to confront, emotionally, the full force of an optical phenomenon that until then they might only have considered from an abstract, detached, purely cognitive perspective.

The Justification-Suppression Model. The debriefing section in the main body of the article offers a detailed analysis of how the JSM may be used to understand the potential dynamics affecting Lupe’s performance appraisal, and be extended to members of other outgroups.