

From stereotypes to structural inequality: How discrimination persists in society.

Daniel Becker*

Department of Social Work, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong, China

Introduction

Discrimination in society is not simply a matter of personal prejudice or overt hostility. It is often embedded in the structures that govern social life—education, employment, housing, health care, and the legal system. Stereotypes, once believed to be harmless generalizations, can snowball into mechanisms that justify exclusion and inequality. To understand why discrimination persists, one must connect the psychological origins of bias with the social structures that maintain privilege and oppression [1].

Stereotypes are mental shortcuts, often formed through culture, media, and socialization. While they serve cognitive efficiency, they frequently result in biased judgments. For instance, racial stereotypes such as portraying Black individuals as inherently aggressive or Latino communities as underachieving can influence hiring decisions, police profiling, and media narratives [2].

Gender-based stereotypes—such as the belief that women are naturally less rational or less suited for leadership—affect workplace dynamics and wage gaps. Similarly, the stereotyping of people with disabilities or LGBTQ+ individuals reinforces social exclusion. These preconceived notions create environments where individuals are judged not by their abilities or character but by the assumptions attached to their identity groups [3].

Structural inequality arises when discriminatory practices are embedded in the rules, norms, and operations of institutions. Unlike overt discrimination, which is easier to identify and condemn, structural discrimination is more insidious and persistent. It doesn't rely on individual intent but on outcomes and access [4].

For example, consider education. Students from marginalized backgrounds often attend underfunded schools, face biased disciplinary actions, and have limited access to college-preparatory resources. These disadvantages aren't the result of any one person's actions but are rooted in policies, zoning laws, and funding formulas that disproportionately impact communities of color [5].

In the labor market, structural inequality manifests in the form of unequal access to job networks, mentorship opportunities, and promotions. Research shows that identical resumes with names suggestive of a minority

background receive fewer callbacks. This suggests that even if employers do not consciously intend to discriminate, systemic factors favor some groups over others [6]. Laws such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and various gender equity measures were significant milestones. However, legal equality does not automatically ensure social equality. Discrimination has evolved; it is less about “No Blacks allowed” signs and more about the lack of upward mobility, wage disparities, and unequal health outcomes.

One critical example is mass incarceration in the U.S., which disproportionately affects African Americans. Despite equal legal standing, policing practices, mandatory minimums, and biased sentencing continue to impact communities of color more severely. Popular culture and media play a pivotal role in reinforcing stereotypes. Films, TV shows, and advertisements often perpetuate narrow depictions of race, gender, class, and sexuality. When these portrayals dominate public consciousness, they normalize biased perceptions [7].

Even children's books and cartoons can contain messages that subtly reinforce traditional gender roles or racial hierarchies. Without diverse and equitable representation, these cultural outputs serve to legitimize the unequal treatment of certain groups.

Implicit bias refers to unconscious attitudes that affect behavior without conscious intent. Studies using Implicit Association Tests (IAT) have shown that people can harbor racial or gender biases even when they explicitly endorse equality. These biases can result in microaggressions—subtle, everyday slights that reinforce exclusion. For instance, asking an Asian American, “Where are you really from?” implies perpetual foreignness. Or assuming a woman in a meeting is a secretary rather than a manager signals gender-based assumptions [8].

Over time, such interactions erode the confidence and participation of marginalized individuals, limiting their ability to thrive. To dismantle structural inequality, society must go beyond token diversity efforts. Education systems must teach critical thinking about identity, privilege, and history. Organizations must implement bias training, transparent hiring practices, and equitable promotion policies [9].

Policymakers should focus on equitable access to healthcare, education, and economic resources. For example, affirmative

*Correspondence to: Daniel Becker, Department of Social Work, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong, China. E-mail: danie@bkr.net

Received: 03-Jan-2025, Manuscript No. AAJPC-25-166655; Editor assigned: 04-Jan-2025, PreQC No. AAJPC-25-166655 (PQ); Reviewed: 18-Jan-2025, QC No. AAJPC-25-166655; Revised: 23-Jan-2025, Manuscript No. AAJPC-25-166655 (R); Published: 30-Jan-2025, DOI: [10.35841/aaipc-10.1.280](https://doi.org/10.35841/aaipc-10.1.280)

action policies, when well-designed, can counterbalance centuries of exclusion and provide marginalized communities a fairer playing field. Public accountability and community engagement are also essential. Social movements like Black Lives Matter and #MeToo have highlighted the need for change, pushing institutions to reevaluate their roles in perpetuating inequality [10].

Conclusion

Discrimination in modern society has evolved from blatant acts to complex systems of inequality rooted in stereotypes and institutional practices. Addressing this issue requires more than surface-level fixes; it demands a deep restructuring of societal values, norms, and operations. By recognizing how bias shapes systems and taking deliberate steps to reform them, we can move closer to a truly equitable society.

References

1. Heilman KM. Emotion and mood disorders associated with epilepsy. *Handbook Clinical Neurol.* 2021;183:169-73.
2. Cavicchioli M, Scalabrini A, Northoff G, et al. Dissociation and emotion regulation strategies: A meta-analytic review. *J Psychiat Res.* 2021;143:370-87.
3. Sicorello M, Schmahl C. Emotion dysregulation in borderline personality disorder: a fronto-limbic imbalance? *Curr Opin Psychol.* 2021;37:114-20.
4. Crowell JA. Development of emotion regulation in typically developing children. *Child Adolesc Psychiatr Clin.* 2021;30(3):467-74.
5. Mazefsky CA, Conner CM, Breitenfeldt K, et al. Evidence base update for questionnaires of emotion regulation and reactivity for children and adolescents. *J Clinical Child Adolescent Psychol.* 2021;50(6):683-707.
6. Cervetto S, Birba A, Pérez G, Amoruso L, et al. Body into narrative: Behavioral and neurophysiological signatures of action text processing after ecological motor training. *Neuroscience.* 2022 Dec 15;507:52-63.
7. Eddy CM. The Transdiagnostic relevance of self-other distinction to psychiatry spans emotional, cognitive and motor domains. *Front Psychiatry.* 2022;13:797952.
8. Rode G, Lacour S, Jacquin-Courtois S, et al. Long-term sensorimotor and therapeutical effects of a mild regime of prism adaptation in spatial neglect. A double-blind RCT essay. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med.* 2015;58(2):40-53.
9. Cecala AL. Using a classic paper by Bell as a platform for discussing the role of corollary discharge-like signals in sensory perception and movement control. *Adv. Physiol. Educ.* 2014;38(1):12-9.
10. Meltzoff AN, Decety J. What imitation tells us about social cognition: a rapprochement between developmental psychology and cognitive neuroscience. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* 2003;358(1431):491-500.