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ABSTRACT

In the United States, organizations are becoming as diverse as ever, a trend that many organizations believe is important (Avery, McKay, & Valpone, 2013), but one that may lead to lower performance (Joshi & Roh, 2009). Diversity climate has been shown to prevent this from happening (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009), yet recruiting for just that is yet to be well understood. This study explores how organizational signals of diversity climate work to attract people with differing types of racial identity based in Cross’ (1971) and Helms’ (1989; 1990) models of racial identity development. Further, as identities do not operate in a vacuum, this study seeks to examine how personality congruence with an organization operates in conjunction with racial identity to predict attraction to supportive or unsupportive diversity climates.
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Understanding Racial Identity and PO Fit in Applicant Attraction

Many organizations have realized the importance of diversity and how effectively management of it contributes to success. Whether it be to increase equal opportunity and fairness, to attract a broader clientele, or to build a wider pool of internal resources (Avery, McKay, & Valpone, 2013), recruiting a workforce with diversity in factors including age, race/ethnicity, gender, disability, and other facets is becoming a priority. Further, the diversity in our workforce only continues to grow (Richard, 2000), suggesting that organizations must understand how to attract people of differing backgrounds in order to gain access to top talent.

However, the abundant research on the effect of demographic diversity on performance has generally demonstrated that diversity may actually be damaging to performance. For example, Pelled, Eisenhardt, and Xin (1999) found that greater racial diversity in work groups was associated with greater levels of emotional conflict in the group, a construct that has been linked to lower performance in teams (Chun & Choi, 2014). In their meta-analysis on work team diversity, Joshi and Roh (2009) demonstrated that demographic diversity had a direct negative influence on work team performance. There are, however, some moderators that facilitate a positive relationship (Hebl & Avery, 2013; Hollenbeck, DeRue, & Guzzo, 2004; Joshi & Roh, 2009)—namely diversity climate (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009).

Diversity climate can be defined as “employees’ shared perceptions of the degree to which a firm is thought to utilize fair employee policies and socially integrate underrepresented employees into the work setting,” (McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2009; p. 768). Other researchers have similarly found that diversity climate is paramount to reaping bottom line benefits from diversity. For example, McKay, Avery, and Morris (2008) found that in companies with a less supportive diversity climate, Black and Hispanic sales employees sold much less than their White counterparts. However, in those stores that had a more supportive diversity climate, all
groups sold more on average, but Black sales associates outperformed White associates, and Hispanic associates sold as much as their White counterparts. McKay, Avery, and Morris (2009) further found that diversity climate was positively related to higher levels of sales growth, and McKay, Avery, Liao, and Morris (2011) demonstrated its positive relationship with customer satisfaction.

In order to foster such an environment, organizational scholars must understand how to recruit people who are going to contribute to a positive diversity climate. Recruitment “includes those practices and activities carried on by the organization with the primary purpose of identifying and attracting potential employees” (Barber, 1998; p. 5). Recruitment is an important step in shaping an organization’s climate, as it creates the pool of potential human capital from which the subsequent talent will come (Calrson, Connerley, & Mecham, 2002). Organizations interested in fostering diversity should consider specialized recruitment strategies. Employers may use signals of a diversity climate in an effort to try and reach audiences that share some of the values associated with such climates. Several studies have demonstrated that organizations who do so through the use of pro-diversity statements, photos of employees from diverse backgrounds, and employee testimonials on recruitment brochures and websites indeed enhance organizational attractiveness to possible applicants, regardless of their group membership (i.e., both majority and non-majority group applicants; Avery, 2003; Rabl & Triana, 2013; Walker, Feild, Bernerth, & Becton, 2012; Williams & Bauer, 1994).

Although recruitment interventions that portray diversity may increase interest among applicants, the presence of diversity does not in itself enhance the diversity climate of a company (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Hebl & Avery, 2013). Having more employees with stigmatized identities does not necessarily foster such an environment, and having more dominant group members does not necessarily hinder it; in fact, there is much variability in the abilities and motivations of
members of each racial group to contribute to a pro-diversity organizational climate. Thus, it is necessary for organizational researchers to take a more nuanced look at who will and will not contribute to such a climate. One factor that may influence the extent to which a person is able to do so is racial identity.

Racial identity development theorists assert that people at the highest stages of racial identity development are more open to, welcoming to, and curious about people from other groups and have higher social action orientation; however, people at the at lower stages tend to overvalue the White racial group and its culture and undervalue other racial groups and the cultures associated with them, not matter to which racial group they belong (e.g., Helms, 1990). Racial identity development may explain, for example, why some who would experience a raise in status and power from positive diversity climates and social justice orientations (e.g., people of color) are not joining organizations with such characteristics. Further, because most U.S. workers are White, and the White race remains dominant in power and status in the U.S., it is essential to understand how organizations can recruit for Whites who would be interested in serving as allies towards people of color, with interest in decreasing their own relative power and status to promote equality. Consistent with this, Chrobot-Mason (2004) states: “White managers with higher ethnic identity development may be more effective in creating a work environment in which differences are valued” (p. 9).

Despite the clear importance of positive diversity climate portrayals in driving applicant attraction, there are other aspects of organizations that impact whether or not a person would want to be employed there. Person-organization (PO) fit (i.e., the extent to which one’s personal characteristics are in line with an organization’s; Cable & Judge, 1996; Kristof, 1996) plays a complex role in the recruitment and attraction process and is driven by multiple qualities of the organization. Racial identity may be important in influencing the extent to which a person is
attracted to an organization with a strong diversity climate; however, other factors such as personality have also been shown to influence perceived fit (Ryan & Kristof-Brown, 2003) and applicant attraction to certain organizational characteristics (e.g., Judge & Cable, 1997). Thus, other aspects of an organization’s recruitment materials, such as the organizational characteristics that it displays (e.g., innovation, aggressiveness), also influence its power to attract the right people. Portraying diversity in an organization’s recruitment materials enhances the attractiveness of organizations regardless of group membership (Rabl & Triana, 2013; Uggerslev, Fassina, & Kraichy, 2012); however, the extent to which diversity climate attracts individuals when other organizational attributes are considered is unknown. It is therefore necessary to explore the competing and/or complementary role that diversity climate plays in influencing applicant attraction within the context of how the organization as a whole is depicted. Particularly, one’s racial identity may influence the extent to which the perceived diversity climate of the organization is a more important driver of attraction than the fit of one’s personality with the organization.

The contributions of this research are fourfold. First, racial and ethnic identity in the workplace has been examined primarily via continuous operationalization (e.g., Phinney, 1992), which fails to capture the more qualitative experience of racial identity. Rich, descriptive understandings of racial identity (as opposed to a simpler continuous, one-size-fits-all construct) have a history of prevalence in counseling psychology (Helms, 1990); however, organizational scholars have heretofore neglected to incorporate these types of models into the realm of work. The current study will extend the literature by incorporating a more qualitative, rich theory of racial identity into our current understanding of diversity recruitment. Second, the use of these distinct models requires exploration of attraction based on racial identity, PO fit, and diversity climate using separate Black and White samples. This allows for understanding the within group
variability of Black and White individuals as it pertains to how their racial identity development moderates the relationship between diversity climate and attraction. This is important, as not all majority or minority group members are necessarily attracted to diversity (Umphress, Smith-Crowe, Brief, Dietz, & Watkins, 2007). Third, this work will answer calls from Herriot (2004) to incorporate social identities into the applicant reactions literature and (Ployhart, Schmitt, & Tippins, 2017) to focus on the KSAOs that those attracted will bring to the table. Fourth, the current research will use residualized relative weights analysis (LeBreton, Tonidandel, & Krasikova, 2013) to extend our knowledge of the competing role of racial identity’s effect on how diversity climate signals affect attraction, as compared to PO fit’s effect on the same relationship.

**Perceived Diversity Climate and Recruitment**

**Diversity Climate.** Integral to understanding how to attract those with high racial identity is the perception of organizational climate. Hicks-Clarke and Isles (2000) called organizational climate “a strand of culture, defined as the perception of particular aspects of the organization, based largely on organizational rules, regulations and individuals’ interpretation of those rules and regulations” (p. 326). Schneider and Reichers (1983) also offer a compelling definition: “the influence of work contexts on employee behavior and attitudes, which are grounded in perceptions” (p. 63). This paper will focus on these definitions as they pertain to diversity climates in organizations.

The commonality between these two definitions is the shared perception and interpretation of organizational rules and contexts. A climate for diversity is “employees’ combined perceptions of the extent to which firm practices and social context are affected by group membership, as manifested in various forms of demographic difference (e.g., racial-ethnic, sex, age, etc.)” (McKay et al., 2008; p. 352). It indicates the extent to which the organization’s
rules and regulations support the inclusion of many races and ethnicities, genders, levels of ability, etc., as well as an environment in which the policies, practices, and norms are a reflection of those rules. Companies that have strong diversity climates demonstrate that they value identities that are traditionally marginalized in society.

**Perceived Diversity Climate and Attraction.** Organizations who wish to attract a more diverse employee base may use their web materials to signal a positive diversity climate. Past research has shown that perceptions of such are positively associated with attraction. For example, Williams and Bauer (1994) tested this using recruitment brochures and found that participants rated an organization with a statement detailing its commitment to diversity as being more attractive than one that had only a short equal opportunity employer statement. Similarly, Kim and Gelfand (2003) found that brochures that included information about a diversity initiative led to participants making more positive inferences about organizational life and reporting higher intentions of job pursuit, especially when the participants had high ethnic identity. Avery (2003) manipulated the representation of Black and White employees on recruitment websites and found that participants were indeed more attracted to the condition in which both managerial and subordinate positions were filled by Black (and White) employees, as opposed to the condition in which Blacks only filled subordinate positions. In order to transmit information about an organization’s diversity climate, the organization must send signals to potential job seekers in order to attract them, which they can do via recruitment publications.

**Signaling Diversity Climate.** Companies can send signals regarding their diversity climate to possible job applicants via their Internet presence. According to signaling theory (Spence, 1973), two parties who are about to enter into a transaction send signals to each other in order to reduce information asymmetry (Connelly, Certo, Ireland, & Reutzel, 2011). Translated to the organizational realm, those with little information about an organization base their
attitudes on the information that is available in order to make important decisions (Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991). In the present day, the easiest way for most job seekers to gain information about prospective employers is through technology, making employer websites crucial for information transmission.

Signals are important at all stages of the recruitment process, but are more important when applicants have less information about an organization (Braddy, Meade, Michael, & Fleenor, 2009; Rynes et al., 1991). Several studies have supported the claims of signaling theory in the context of recruitment. For example, Rynes and her colleagues (1991) found that applicants used information from recruitment materials and site visits to infer unknown things about an organization, including its gender composition. Goltz and Giannantonio (1995) found that participants were more likely to make positive inferences about an organization’s unknown characteristics when they viewed a friendly recruiter. In the context of this research, organizations can use their internet presence to signal that they have a positive diversity climate (or that they do not) via their web pages. Job seekers who are unfamiliar with the company, then, will use that information in their assessments of whether or not they would like to pursue employment with those companies.

Although diversity climate is important in influencing organizational attraction, organizations can also signal aspects of its general culture and climate to job applicants during the recruitment process. One of those ways is a person’s fit with the organization, also known as PO fit—a construct that is known to influence attraction (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011).

**PO Fit and Attraction**

Personal identities play an important role in a person’s application and decision-making processes regarding work attainment. These personal identities are defined as the aspect of “who
I am” that is attributable to a person’s self-concept (Brewer, 1991), and they can take the form of personal characteristics such as ability, personal goals and values, and personality, among others.

Personal identities influence how potential and current employees see themselves within the context of an organization. Organizational scholars study this phenomenon in the form of PO fit. PO fit is just one component of the broader field of person-environment fit, which also includes individual fit with jobs, vocations, work teams, and supervisors (Holland, 1997; Van Vianen, Stoelhorst, & De Goede, 2013). Specifically, PO fit refers to fit between the person and the entirety of an organization (as opposed to a job, vocation, etc.; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005).

There are several theories of PO fit, but the one best suited to the subject of organizational attraction is the one that acknowledges that aspect directly—Schneider's (1987) Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) framework. This particular theory implies a cyclical relationship between the culture that an organization has, those it attracts, and those who stay. Employees in an organization who have chosen to stay based on a good fit are those who select the new employees, and those new employees who do not fit in well will eventually leave, thus creating a homogeneous set of prominent characteristics and values. Schneider’s (1987) framework directly acknowledges the importance of PO fit to attracting and recruiting employees that will feel comfortable in an organization, are more committed and satisfied (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), and who will stay longer (Chatman, 1989). Other research has also directly demonstrated the connection between PO fit and attraction (Kausel & Slaughter, 2011; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), as well as job pursuit intentions (Cable & Judge, 1996).

Personality is one component of personal identity that affects PO fit. While evaluating organizations, job seekers engage in the identity matching process whereby they evaluate their own characteristics to understand how well they fit within the context of the organization of
interest (Herriot, 2004). Past research has demonstrated that people are more attracted to organizations with characteristics that match their personality traits (Burke & Deszca, 1982; Schein & Diamante, 1988). For example, Bretz and Judge (1994) studied the characteristics of organizational human resource departments and those of individuals. They found that job acceptance was associated with the similarity between those two sets of characteristics.

Whereas some types of fit concentrate on factors of similarity in terms of values or goal congruency (Kristof-Brown & Billsberry, 2013), it is also possible to consider personality or trait-based congruency (e.g., Ostroff, 1993). Personality is distinguished from values in that it conveys more of a person’s behavioral preferences rather than his or her beliefs regarding modes of conduct; in other words, “values are fundamentally aspirational or goal oriented, dealing with what a person wants to achieve, whereas personality is more descriptive, concerning how a person prefers to act or strive to achieve their goals” (Ryan & Kristof-Brown, 2003; p. 265). Further, personality is a good indicator of fit, as values tend to change more quickly and move towards alignment with an organization over time (Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970; Mortimer & Lorence, 1979). Past research has demonstrated that personality can be a stable predictor of applicant attraction (Judge & Cable, 1997). For the purposes of this study, PO fit is operationalized as a similarity between an individual personality and the culture of an organization, or what some call an “organizational personality” (Kristof, 1996, p. 6).

**PO Fit and Diversity Climate**

Both personality-based PO fit and perceived diversity climate have been shown to be important determinants in applicant attraction; however, the joint effects of these factors have not been considered, despite applicants having to weigh different aspects of an organization when assessing attraction.
Though perceived diversity climates influence attraction in general, the effect may be attenuated for those whose personalities do not fit the organization, whether they are majority or non-majority group members. On the other hand, those who do fit with the organization may experience a boost in attraction toward the organization when a diversity climate is present. Importantly, past research has found differences in PO fit between Black and White research participants (Lovelace & Rosen, 1996); however, this research was done using values-based PO fit, and race explained little variance. The hypothesized effect of PO fit on the relationship between diversity climate and attraction does not depend on the level of PO fit, regardless. Therefore, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 1**: PO fit will moderate the relationship between perceived diversity climate and attraction such that the positive relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction will be stronger for those with high PO fit and weaker for those with low PO fit in both Black and White samples.

Multiple theories of PO fit exist, but they all, including the ASA framework, share two assumptions: a person has a basic need to fit within an environment and thus makes decisions to put themselves in environments that match or are complimentary to their characteristics, and that the degree of fit within an environment has a positive relationship with outcomes such as health and job satisfaction (Lovelace & Rosen, 1996; Van Vianen et al., 2013) The current research seeks to understand the role that personality-based PO fit plays in attracting applicants when considered in line with racial identity. Importantly, how favorably applicants perceive the culture of an organization will affect their attraction levels (Cable, Aiman-Smith, Mulvey, & Edwards, 2000). Thus, it is important to consider who will perceive diversity climate signals as favorable and who will not. As mentioned previously, racial identity is a likely influence of such perceptions.
Racial Identity

PO fit and perceived diversity climate each play their own roles in attracting applicants, but these relationships may differ across groups. Further, there may be variability in how those relationships unfold within each racial group. Racial identity development may explain both within- and between-group differences in attraction to organizations with a pro-diversity climate.

Racial Identity, Perceived Diversity Climate, and Attraction. Previous studies have examined the effects of belonging to a stigmatized social group on attraction to diversity climate with mixed results. For example, McKay and colleagues (2007) found that diversity climate perceptions influenced turnover intentions more so for Black managers than for White managers, explaining 15% and 7% of the variance in intentions, respectively. Further, Linnihan, Konrad, Reitman, Greenhalgh, and London (2003) found that Asian American students, more so than White students, had higher intentions of seeking people from other racial backgrounds with whom to work and socialize, indicating the importance of diversity to the work environment for Asian Americans. Other more recent research on diversity climates demonstrated that the relationship between diversity climates and customer satisfaction in service organizations was stronger for those store units that had more minority representation (McKay, Avery, Liao, & Morris, 2011), suggesting that diversity climate had more of an effect on minority employees than on White employees. The authors of the study argue that those with stigmatized identities are more likely to face discrimination at work, rendering such individuals more appreciative of organizational intentions to mitigate those negative experiences.

These studies contrast with aforementioned research implying that perceived diversity climate has consistently similar effects on organizational attraction across groups (e.g., Rabl & Triana, 2013; Williams & Bauer, 1994), suggesting that moderators are key. Avery (2003) has found some support for the importance of moderators in determining the effect of race on
attraction to diversity climates. He found a main effect for diversity representation across races, but found that that White participants were similarly attracted to all conditions; for Black participants, on the other hand, diversity climate was more important when demographic diversity was present at both managerial and subordinate levels, rather than subordinate only. In another study regarding diversity climate and attraction, Kim and Gelfand (2003) demonstrated that ethnic identity interacted with diversity climate signals in predicting important recruitment outcomes. They found that those with stronger ethnic identities were more attracted to brochures that contained a diversity initiative versus one that did not, regardless of their race. Left unexamined, however, are the more qualitative developmental models of racial identity and their possible moderating effect on the relationship between perceived diversity climate and attraction. Further research on the nuances of racial identity is necessary in order to fully understand its effects on organizational attraction and diversity climates.

Racial identity may be an especially important construct in determining the power of an organization’s diversity climate signals to attract people who will be conducive to fostering a positive diversity climate. As will become clear in the following sections, the developmental models of racial identity all have in common the goal of identifying racism present in the environment and the self, overcoming said racism, and becoming an advocate for racial equality (Helms, 1990). Thus, those who are in earlier stages may give less weight to organizational signals of a diversity climate due to a lack of concern for or awareness of systematic and personal racism. Those who have moved to the advanced stages may be more influenced by it, as racial equality has become an important issue for which to fight to them. Organizations may also benefit from attracting those in the later stages of racial identity development, as these more racially actualized people may be helpful in creating and maintaining a supportive diversity climate.
Importantly, some stages of racial identity development interact with personal identities such that the relative importance of each fluctuates throughout the racial identity development process (Helms, 1990). This typically happens, as Helms (1990) posits, in line with changes in the group identity of the individual. For example, when a White person realizes that he has been participating in a system of oppression towards people of color, he begins to reject his own racial group; however, because he is not part of the oppressed group either, he cannot place his identity there and is left in a marginalized state. As the person now effectively belongs to neither group, his personal identity emerges as one of greater importance. These assertions are in line with self-categorization theory (Turner, 1985), an extension of social identity theory. When a person is strongly identified with a group, his or her behavior becomes in line with that of the group via *depersonalization*, a phenomenon whereby people lose their personal identity within that of the group. Thus, the degree to which a person identifies with the group in part determines the influence that his or her personal identity has on behavior: “Through depersonalization, self-categorization effectively brings self-perception and behavior into line with the contextually relevant in-group prototype, and thus transforms individuals into group members and individuality into group behavior” (Hogg et al., 1995; p. 261).

In the following sections, I will delve into the details of racial identity development according to Cross’ (1971) and Helms’ (1990) models. Within those paragraphs, I will intertwine the role that personal identities (i.e., personality-based PO fit) play in influencing attraction to an organization signaling a pro-diversity climate versus one signaling a less supportive environment, as dependent on a person’s stage of racial identity development.

**History of Racial Identity Research.** Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, and Smith (1997) define racial identity as “the extent to which a person normatively defines her or himself with regard to race” (p.806). Sellers and colleagues (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, &
Chavous, 1998) break racial identity down into two components: the significance that race has to a person and the qualitative meaning that it has.

Consistent with this two-part breakdown is the history of racial identity research. The construct of racial identity has been a heavily studied area in terms of the psychology of Black people (Sellers et al., 1998), and the research has been done primarily via two approaches: the mainstream approach and the underground approach (Gaines & Reed, 1994, 1995). The mainstream approach gives no regard to the specific groups which one is studying, approaching racial identity (mainly African American racial identity) as a specific example of a social identity. In other words, researchers in this group see racial identity from a social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) perspective. Scholars in this camp emphasize the ingroup and the outgroup in their explanations of identity. Research of this type began as a search for ways to explain prejudice (e.g., social identity theory; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and a general way to explain group identities (e.g., Phinney, 1992). A mainstream perspective is very useful in terms of how humans create group identities and behave across groups; however, it lacks information regarding the experiences of the different groups of people and the meanings that they attribute to their races and ethnicities.

A group of researchers in the late 1960s thus began to focus on this lacking aspect, beginning the era of the underground approach to racial identity. This approach gave voice to the uniqueness in experience and culture of African Americans (and other racial groups later on) in the United States. Researchers in this camp emphasize the role of culture and history, as well as the qualitative meaning that race has for Black people. Whereas the mainstream approach typically operationalizes racial identity as a continuous variable concerning how central or salient a person’s race is to him/her, underground models of racial identity are typically categorical in nature, whether they be typologies (e.g., Akbar, 1979) or stage/developmental
models (e.g., Cross, 1971). Underground approaches acknowledge the common task of overcoming the racism present in the environment, or “the reconciliation of the discrepancy between [the] African self and [the] American self” (Sellers et al., 1998; p. 21), and they explain the individual’s internal psychological process and interpersonal reactions to the racism present in society (Helms & Cook, 1999).

The most well-known and widely used underground model is that developed by Cross (1971) and adapted by Helms (1990)—the Nigrescence model, a five-stage developmental model of Black racial identity. Helms (1984) later created a parallel model for the development of White racial identity. Helms and Piper (1994) describe this racial identity theory as one that “deals with the process by which persons develop (or do not develop) healthy racial collective identities in environments in which their socially ascribed racial group has differential access to sociopolitical power” (p. 125), noting that the developmental stages differ for each race depending on whether a person is in an advantaged or a disadvantaged group. Thus, these models combine the effects of racialized oppression for both Blacks and Whites on identity development with models of individual self-actualization (c.f., Maslow, 1970). The Black racial identity models describe a kind of process whereby the person moves from an assimilation-like psychological state in which he idealizes White culture and rejects Black culture to a state in which he appreciates all racial groups and fights for their equality (Cross, 1971; Helms, 1990). Helms’ (1984) parallel model for the development of the White racial identity describes a process whereby the White person must grapple with racism inherent in himself and/or the environment in order to move to a psychological space in which he also appreciates all races and fights for equality.

Importantly, Helms (1990) mentions that age is relevant to the development of racial identity in that it is also developmental in nature, but it does not determine the progression of
racial identity development. Age is much more linear, and the process of racial identity development differs for each individual. Further, racial identity is fluid, meaning that individuals can progress and regress through the stages (also known as *statuses*), depending on individual differences and external factors. Individuals can also exemplify multiple statuses at once (Helms, 1995). Racial identity statuses are not mutually exclusive; rather, Helms advocates for a profile approach to racial identity, which she argued should lead to the usage of the term *statuses* instead of *stages*: “I intended the term *stages* to mean mutually interactive dynamic processes by which a person’s behavior could be explained rather than static categories into which a person could be assigned” (Helms, 1995; p. 183). Thus, as Helms indicates, racial identity development is not necessarily aligned with age.

Although the stages are neither linear nor mutually exclusive, there exists a small amount of evidence that these stages do roughly progress as Helms and Cross have theorized. For example, older White people tend to endorse more attitudes supporting racial equality and social activism, consistent with the later stages of the White racial identity model, whereas younger Whites endorse attitudes associated with earlier stages in the model, such as White superiority (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). Further, Demo and Hughes (1990) found that Black children and adolescents and Black adults had very different reactions to identifying strongly as a Black person, an attitude that is associated with more than one stage in the Black racial identity model. Children and adolescents were more in favor of Black separatism and had lower levels of interracial contact, representative of earlier stages, whereas adults tended to evaluate interracial interactions more positively, representative of later stages.

Although Sellers’ (Sellers et al., 1998) model of racial identity more commonly used in current racial identity research, the present study focuses on Cross’ and Helms’ developmental models for several reasons. First and foremost, this model emphasizes constructs that would be directly
tied to an individual’s ability to facilitate a diversity climate. For example, colorblindness, which is a perspective on diversity that sees differences as distractions from our similarity (Tynes & Markoe, 2010), is typically a component of earlier racial identity stages (Helms, 1990), and it is also associated with negative interracial interactions (e.g., Awad, Cokley, & Ravitch, 2005; Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000; Tynes & Markoe, 2010). These theories incorporate and explain feelings towards other races. The developmental models proposed by Cross and Helms focus on how people of both racial/ethnic minority and majority groups feel towards members of the opposite group in addition to their own. As the current study pertains to diversity climate, intergroup attitudes are paramount to predicting how individuals will understand, approach, and treat coworkers from other groups.

In addition, there are parallel models for White racial identity and Black racial identity. Researchers have used Sellers’ model for Whites in the past, simply removing any of the parts that do not pertain to the majority group, but there has yet to be a concerted effort to develop and identify aspects of White racial identity from other researchers (McDermott & Samson, 2005). Whereas one could argue that there are similarities between the racial identity experiences of racial/ethnic minority individuals, the same statement is less feasible for translating the experiences to majority individuals.

Last, Cross and Helms created processual models, which explain not only the feelings a person has towards his own and other races, but also how those feelings come to be and what pushes people towards a higher level in their racial identity development or holds them back. This aspect is important for understanding the mechanisms underlying racial identity’s influences on recruitment, among other work-related psychological processes.

Racial identity, however, is not the sole influence on these processes. Personal identities also influence the attraction one might feel towards an organization in a dynamic interplay with
racial identity. According to Helms (1990), personal identities tend to become more or less influential in predicting a person’s behavior within the context of racial identity, depending on the developmental stage of racial identity. Personal identity tends to become more salient when a person is in a diffuse racial identity status (i.e., feels that he or she belongs with no race).

In the following section, I will cover Cross’ and Helms’ models of Black and White racial identity in more detail. Each model is a developmental model, with the person beginning at a place of internalized racism from the messages that are sent through society. The stages progress to crises in which the individuals realize the errors of their ways, finally ending in understanding of race and its meaning, as well as an acceptance of all races and the drive to fight for equality. Further, I will incorporate personal identities into the discussion in the form of PO fit (see Figure 1 for theoretical model).

**Black Racial Identity**

**Preencounter.** The model of Black racial identity development (summarized in Table 1) begins with the *preencounter* stage. Individuals in this stage of development tend to identify with White people and White culture while rejecting Black culture. Cross, Parham, and Helms (1992) posited that this stage could manifest in one of two ways. The first, which the authors deemed *active*, includes the deliberate idealization of White culture and denigration of Black culture. People in this form of the preencounter stage actively separate their personal identities from other aspects of the self. Those who embody this type attribute anything that is positive to their or other Black people’s personal characteristics, whereas they attribute anything that is bad to their or others’ Blackness. The active mode of preencounter is associated with adverse mental health outcomes such as anxiety, depression, and low self-esteem (Parham & Helms, 1985b, 1985a).
The other form of the preencounter stage is deemed *passive*. This mode involves assimilating into White culture, with the goal of achieving higher status within the Black community and gaining acceptance within the White community. The authors describe those in this mode of preencounter as tending to believe in stereotypes and not challenging them. Further, those who find themselves here believe that social mobility is possible, but that it is up to individual efforts to move up in society (e.g., the myth of meritocracy).

Preencounter attitudes have been associated with perceptions of race climate, with those endorsing a higher amount of preencounter attitudes perceiving more favorable racial environments (Watts & Carter, 1991). This suggests that Black individuals who endorse such attitudes are idealizing and maintaining the status quo. Other research on constructs that are associated with the preencounter stage indicate that Black individuals in this stage would indeed choose an all-White, less diversity-supportive organization over one that endorses pro-diversity values. For example, Kim and Gelfand (2003) found that those who are lower in ethnic identity were less affected by diversity climates in recruitment advertisements.

Indeed, research on tokenism indicates that being the only one of a group is sometimes a benefit (e.g., Williams, 1995). Further, research on queen-bee syndrome (a term coined by Derks, Van Laar, Ellemers, & de Groot, 2011), whereby women distance themselves from other women in order to increase their own status and self-esteem through affiliation (Chattopadhyay, Tluchowska, & George, 2004; Derks et al., 2011), indicates that sole inclusion in a higher status group is sometimes seen as a sign of higher worth or being better than the rest of that marginalized group to the individual. For example, Derks and colleagues (2011) found that senior policewomen, when primed with reporting their experienced gender bias, endorsed more queen-bee syndrome attitudes (e.g., distancing themselves from other policewomen and denying the existence of discrimination) if they did not identify highly with women as a social group.
Those with stronger gender identification, however, reported an increase in motivation to provide more opportunities for women.

Further, preencounter attitudes include the belief that race matters little, or colorblindness (Tynes & Markoe, 2010). Although colorblindness is typically associated with Whites, people of color may also harbor colorblind attitudes, exemplifying a form of internalized racism (Neville, Awad, Brooks, Flores, & Bluemel, 2013). Tynes and Markoe (2010) found that those who endorsed more colorblind racial attitudes—Black participants included—were less likely to be offended by discriminatory theme parties on social media sites, suggesting a lower level of identification with Blacks and less of an inclination to fight for the equality of racial groups. Other research has associated colorblind attitudes with the denial of structural racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2002), as well as minimization of the role that race plays in racist interactions (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008). Chao (2006) found that colorblind attitudes were associated with lower levels of multicultural competence, and Awad, Cokley, and Ravitch (2005) found that they were associated with negative views towards affirmative action.

Thus, not only does the preencounter stage affect an individual’s attraction to an organization, but organizations employing individuals in this stage may be negatively affected in a number of ways. For example, those in the preencounter stage are likely to discourage the expression of cultures that they deem inferior to the dominant one (i.e., White culture). Further, research has demonstrated that colorblindness in Whites affects the performance of racial/ethnic minority employees in the form of diminished cognitive functioning (Holoien & Shelton, 2012) and psychological engagement (Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009). Those who endorse preencounter attitudes are also likely to endorse a colorblind ideology and resent their racial/ethnic minority counterparts who do not assimilate. Although this effect of colorblindness has not been tested with Black participants, it is likely that the same is true. In fact, the effect
may even be worse, as those on the receiving end of biased treatment may expect that an employee of color will empathize and understand better, thus leading to more disappointment if they do not.

Racial identity of employees is also likely to interact with the organization’s racial identity in some way. Chrobot-Mason and Thomas (2002) posited that not only do individuals have racial identities, but organizations have them as well. The two authors maintained that the match or mismatch between individual and organizational racial identities has important implications for diversity management and the retention of racial/ethnic minority employees.

Organizational racial identities span from monocultural, in which they endorse the belief that one culture (the dominant White culture) is best, to a multicultural perspective, in which diversity is viewed as something positive rather than something that hinders the organization (Sue, 1995). When a person has an earlier form of racial identity, Chrobot-Mason and Thomas (2002) suggest that one of two outcomes will occur, depending on the racial identity of the organization. Deemed a negative parallel interaction, the employee and the organization may both be at earlier stages of racial identity development, leading to a lack of pressure from either party for movement forward in racial identity. Further, the racial/ethnic minority employees will be expected to assimilate, and any diversity that is present in the organization will likely be and remain within the entry-level positions as tokens and will be less likely to contribute to such things as the creativity and innovation of the organization. If the organization is at a higher level in its racial identity, the authors suggested that this will lead to a progressive interaction, in which the multiculturalism of the organization will encourage personal development in the employee. The employee, however, may be uncomfortable in this type of environment, as the organization would bring attention to an aspect of the person to which he or she does not pay much attention.
People in the preencounter stage tend to prefer and idolize White culture and disregard and even denigrate Black culture. Thus, those in this stage are likely to prefer to be around people belonging to the higher status cultural group – White people. In fact, Parham and Helms (1981) have found that Black individuals in this stage of racial identity development prefer White counselors to Black ones. This phenomenon is likely to transmit to the recruiting realm as well, with people in this stage preferring to surround themselves with those in the dominant culture in their professional lives. Thus, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 2a:** Preencounter attitudes will moderate the relationship between diversity climate signals and organizational attraction such that Black individuals who endorse more preencounter attitudes will demonstrate a negative relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction, and Black individuals who endorse fewer preencounter attitudes will exhibit a positive relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction.

Those who are in the preencounter stage are described by Helms (1990) as separating their personal identities from their race and as more apt to attribute anything positive to personal identities and anything negative to Black identities. Those who endorse higher levels of preencounter attitudes make decisions from the standpoint that White is good and Black is bad, leaving little room for personality, amongst other forms of personal identity, to inform decision-making. In their efforts to assimilate into White culture and remove themselves from Black culture, the possibility of gaining higher status becomes more important than expressing their own personality within the organization of interest. Therefore, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 2b:** For Black individuals in the preencounter stage, racial identity will demonstrate a stronger moderating effect on the relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction than will PO fit.
**Encounter.** The next stage of racial identity development for Black individuals is the encounter stage. In this stage, the individual realizes that she cannot fully become a part of White culture and thus is forced to discover a new identity. This is typically brought on by an important event that shocks the person into this realization. This event causes her to realize that most Whites likely see her as Black, ergo inferior, and that she must begin creating a new racial identity based in her Blackness.

This stage is complex and ephemeral, making its measurement rather difficult (Helms, 1989); the encounter stage involves many phases, such as confusion and hopelessness, anxiety and depression, and the eventual culmination in anger and euphoria. Thus, some of the difficulty in its measurement stems from the multifaceted and transitory nature of the stage.

Those in this stage have rejected attempts at assimilating fully into White culture, and although they have not yet developed a Black identity, they are aware that they must begin to do so. Thus, their rejection of White culture and pivot towards Black culture is seen in the preferences regarding those with whom Black individuals in this stage choose to surround themselves. Indeed, prior research has demonstrated that Black individuals in the encounter stage are likely to prefer Black counselors to White ones (Parham & Helms, 1981). Denton's (1985) research demonstrated that this stage is associated with an increase of affiliative behaviors towards other Black individuals, suggesting that those in this stage choose to be around other Black individuals. In the realm of recruiting, this translates into a higher likelihood of attraction to an organization that is accepting of Black identities. Further, those in this stage do not necessarily reject White culture; in fact, members of this stage remain accepting to those Whites sensitive to Black cultural issues (Pomales, Claiborn, & LaFromboise, 1986).

Organizations employing those in the encounter stage may be affected in several ways. First, the diversity climate will be better off with individuals in the encounter stage, as opposed
to those in the preencounter stage. As mentioned earlier, this stage is associated with an increase in affiliative behaviors towards other Black people. Thus, this is likely to fall in line with a positive diversity climate, legitimizing the climate if it already exists. Those in the encounter stage do not see Whites as automatically negative either, especially those whose behaviors and values are in line with accepting Black culture, thus creating space for positive interracial interactions and an all-inclusive diversity climate. Further, the increased multicultural competence and recognition of racism is likely to create psychological space for individuals in this stage to be influenced by and eventually contribute to a positive diversity climate. Thus, individuals in the encounter stage are likely to create ample space for a supportive diversity climate to flourish, but they are not likely to be active contributors while remaining in this stage.

Individuals in the encounter stage begin to understand that race does indeed affect their lives, and that racism is present in the society that surrounds them. Said differently, those who enter the encounter stage are less likely to endorse colorblind attitudes. Thus, in contrast with the preencounter stage, those who endorse more values encoded in the encounter stage are likely to endorse lower levels of colorblindness, which in turn is associated with a higher likelihood of recognizing racism (Apfelbaum et al., 2008; Bonilla-Silva, 2002) and having negative reactions to it (Tynes & Markoe, 2010), along with having higher levels of multicultural competence (Chao, 2006). Thus, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 3a:** Encounter attitudes will moderate the relationship between diversity climate signals and organizational attraction such that Black individuals who endorse more encounter attitudes will demonstrate a stronger positive relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction to an organization, and those who endorse fewer encounter attitudes will demonstrate a weaker
positive relationship between diversity climate signals and organizational attraction.

Importantly, this stage is characterized by a diffuse racial identity (Helms, 1990). The individual has let go of attempts to fit with the White community, but she has not yet formed a Black identity. Identity theory (Stryker, 1968) posits that each person’s identities are arranged hierarchically, with salience determining the amounts that each identity motivates behavior. Because the person is unattached to either racial group at this point, it is likely that his or her racial identity will transition to a lower position in the hierarchy, and that the personal identity will transition to a higher position in the hierarchy. Thus, the personal characteristics of the person become more important at this stage. Therefore, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 3b:** For individuals in the encounter stage, PO fit will demonstrate a stronger moderating effect on the relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction than will racial identity.

**Immersion/Emersion.** Near the end of the encounter stage, a person will begin experiencing anger and simultaneous euphoria in regards to his race, pushing him into the *immersion/emersion* stage. This stage is characterized by a withdrawal into being Black and into the world of Black culture. This transition is a mental one, though if possible, a person in this stage physically sequesters himself in the Black community as well. The person changes his behavior to be in accordance with his vision how an “authentic” Black person should act. This typically means that the person’s behavior will reflect the stereotypes associated with Black people and culture. What is more, a person in this stage will judge other Black people based on these stereotypes as well. Those in this stage typically exhibit anger towards anything that propagates the racial hierarchy, which includes their previous selves, Blacks who have yet to have the same epiphany, and Whites.
A person in the immersion/emersion stage becomes effectively consumed with his or her Black identity, so much so that the personal identity typically is lost during this stage. Cross (1971) posited that those in this stage of racial identity development depict a characteristically high level of political and artistic energy, which is accompanied by high risk-taking and feelings of euphoria. Exemplary of this stage in the racial identity development processes was Malcolm X while he was with the Nation of Islam. During this part of his life, he adopted the beliefs of the Nation, which included the belief that Black people are superior to White people and that White people are evil, and he fought to bring Black people up in society (X & Haley, 1965; He later renounced the Nation and adopted values including racial equality).

In order to transition into the emersion part of this stage, Cross (1971) argued that a person must have the opportunity to cathartically release the emotions involved in this stage in a supportive environment, subsumed in the Black community. Examples of such activities include music, political action, exploration of African culture, and discussion of racial issues and experiences of Black elders (Helms, 1990). During this part of the immersion/emersion stage, a person develops a positive Black identity that is set apart from the stereotypic identity adopted in the beginnings of this stage. The person is able to step back and evaluate Black culture in a more evenhanded manner, reconciling both its strengths and weaknesses (as opposed to seeing it as all good or all bad, as in previous stages). The development of this new type of Black identity begins to take shape around the individual’s ideas of what being Black means to her, rather than basing self-worth on others’ definitions of what it means to be Black.

Research on this stage has demonstrated that immersion/emersion attitudes indeed affect perceptions of racial climate. Watts and Carter (1991) found that Black individuals who endorsed more immersion attitudes had more negative perceptions of race climate in organizations, suggesting that they are taking a more critical look at interracial relationships in their
organizations. Other attitudes associated with this phase, such as anti-White and pro-Black sentiments, have been shown to be indicative of the racial composition with which participants prefer to surround themselves. Demo and Hughes (1990) found that Black children and adolescents who strongly identified with their race (as opposed to Black adults who strongly identified with being Black) were more in favor of Black separatism and had lower levels of interracial contact.

Regarding this stage’s effects on behavior, Paige (1970) found that both pro-Black and anti-White attitudes—the combination of which characterize the immersion/emersion phase—were associated with militancy in the form of engagement in civil right riots. His data revealed anti-White sentiments to be predictive of preference for living in a Black neighborhood as well. Further, anti-White sentiments have also been linked to the self-reported percentage of friends who are White (Johnson & Lecci, 2003), suggesting that those with anti-White sentiment will be less likely to affiliate with White people and will prefer to be surrounded by in-group members. Thus, individuals in the immersion/emersion stage may actively change the diversity climate of an organization as well. This stage is characterized by the denigration of Whites and the approbation of Blacks, thus working in opposition to the mission of a strong diversity climate by working against harmonious and productive intergroup interactions. Further, this stage may negatively affect interpersonal treatment towards Whites as well as Blacks who do not hold the same views, especially those that the individual perceives to be assimilating into White culture.

The majority of this stage is associated with preference for Black culture and surrounding oneself with other Black individuals and dislike towards White people and culture; thus, a person in this stage is likely to prefer to be in places and situations in which other Black people are present and few, if any, White people are present. This has also been demonstrated in regards to counselor preference, with those in this stage preferring to see a Black counselor over a White
one (Morten & Atkinson, 1983; Parham & Helms, 1981; Ponterotto, Anderson, & Grieger, 1986). In the context of organization choice, those in this stage of the identity development process will likely choose an organization in which they can express their newfound Black identity. For these reasons, I predict that:

Hypothesis 4a: Immersion/emersion attitudes will moderate the relationship between diversity climate signals and organizational attraction such that Black individuals who endorse higher levels of immersion/emersion attitudes will exhibit a stronger positive relationship between diversity climate signals and organizational attraction, whereas those who endorse lower levels will demonstrate a weaker (but still positive) relationship between organizational attraction and diversity climate signals.

Further, those in this stage tend to lose themselves in their Black identity, effectively losing their personal identities in the meantime. Such high identification with a social group is associated with introjection, or the phenomenon in which members of a social group align their own personal responses with those that they think the group would have (Krueger, 2002). Those who see themselves as prototypical of certain social identity categories tend to see themselves in a depersonalized manner (Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994), thus diminishing the salience of the personal characteristics that they possess (Herriot, 2004). The Black identity becomes highly salient, and thus will motivate behavior more so than personal identity, according to identity theory (Stryker, 1968). Therefore, I predict that:

Hypothesis 4b: For those in the immersion/emersion stage of racial identity development, racial identity will demonstrate a stronger moderating effect on the relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction than will PO fit.
**Internalization/Commitment.** The penultimate stage, called *internalization*, involves the adoption of a positive Black identity based on the individual’s personal beliefs and his personally relevant definition of what being Black means to him (Cross, 1971; Helms, 1990). In this stage, he integrates both his personal characteristics with the role that race plays in his life, shifting the source of belongingness away from external ideas of what being Black should mean and towards a personally relevant definition. During this stage, the individual begins to reject racism and oppression of any form, and he is able to assess and negotiate his position within White society anew. Further, the individual in the internalization stage is able to establish relationships with White individuals whose ideas surrounding oppression are in line with his. He is also now able to analyze White culture for its merits and its weaknesses (as opposed to seeing it as purely good or bad, as in earlier stages).

The last stage—known as *internalization/commitment*—was present in Cross’ (1971) original model as a fifth and separate stage, although more recent writings on the theory have moved this stage to be encompassed within the internalization stage, becoming a second phase of it (Helms, 1989; Parham & Helms, 1985b). The primary distinction between the two phases lies in the behavioral component; the first phase is associated with a certain level of cognitive development, whereas the second is associated with behavioral culminations of those cognitive advances. It is because of the difficulty of distinguishing the motivations and the behaviors that the subsequent theorists chose to combine the stages as they did. This final phase is characterized by social activism related to eliminating all oppression and racism, regardless of the victimized group, and a small amount of evidence suggests that internalization is, in fact, associated with social activism orientation (c.f., Carter & Helms, 1987). Other research on the relationship between social identity and collective action has demonstrated that those identities that have become politicized (e.g., the development of an activist identity) are indeed associated with
higher levels of collective action (van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008). The internalization/commitment phase yields a lot of variation due to the individualized nature of it, or, as Helms (1990) put it, “Internalization frees the person to be” (p. 31). Further, those who reach this stage move beyond judging other people by their categorical memberships, thereby freeing other people to be as well.

Research on these stages has demonstrated that those in the internalization/commitment stage give more attention to the racial climate around them. For example, the internalization phase has been shown to be associated negatively with perceptions of racial climate in organizations, suggesting again that people in the higher statuses of Black racial identity development are taking a more critical look at their racial surroundings (Watts & Carter, 1991). More actively, employees who are in the internalization/commitment stage are likely to take actions to fight for a supportive diversity climate, making them ideal contributors to said climate.

Regarding the interaction between the organization’s and the employee’s racial identity, Chrobot-Mason and Thomas (2002) suggested that those in this stage may affect organizational life in one of two ways. If the organization is in an earlier stage of racial identity development, there will be a regressive interaction. This will lead to the dissatisfaction of the employee regarding his or her status and ability to contribute to the organization. An individual with an internalized racial identity is likely to make attempts at changing the organization’s racial identity—attempts that might result in even more frustration due to a wall of resistance from the organization and its employees. Thus, a person with an internalized racial identity is likely to leave the organization in this situation. If the organization is in a more advanced point in its racial identity development, there will be a positive parallel interaction. In this scenario, the individual contributions of racial/ethnic minority employees are recognized and valued, and a person with an internalized racial identity will feel able to express his or her true opinions and
will be more likely to feel valued by the organization, leading to higher levels of organizational commitment and engagement. The organization, then, is likely to benefit from the diversity that it has, leading to more creativity and innovation from it.

Further, because a person who has reached the internalization/commitment stages begins to endorse the beliefs that all races are equal and cultivates an appreciation for others who feel similarly, a person in this stage is likely to prefer an environment in which multiple races are present, and the people who are present embody similarly egalitarian values. Indeed, Demo and Hughes’ (1990) study on Black racial identity demonstrated that Black adults who identified strongly with their race (as opposed to younger Black people who identified strongly with their race, who are likely to identify in a manner consistent with the immersion/emersion stage) tended to evaluate interracial interactions more positively. Therefore, I predict that:

Hypothesis 5a: Internalization attitudes will moderate the relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction such that Black individuals who endorse higher levels of integration attitudes will exhibit a strong, positive relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction, whereas those who endorse lower levels will exhibit a weaker positive relationship between diversity climate signals and organizational attraction.

Further, the internalization/commitment stage is associated with an integration of personal and racial identities; however, a person in this stage strongly identifies with the Black racial group and associated political movements that enhance equality. Thus, the group identification, and especially the creation of a politicized identity, means that a person is more likely to impart importance to the diversity climate of the organization rather than his or her specific personality fit with it.
Hypothesis 5b: For those in the integration stage of racial identity development, racial identity will demonstrate a stronger moderating effect on the relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction than will PO fit.

White Racial Identity

The theory of White racial identity (summarized in Table 2) was conceptualized by Helms (1990) in order to create a parallel process of racial identity development to that of Black individuals. Similar to the model of Black racial identity developed by Cross (1971) and adapted by Helms (1989), Helms’ (1990) model of White racial identity development combines humanistic theory with acknowledgement of the role that intergroup relations play in individual racial identities. The Black person must go through stages of recognizing that Whiteness is not better than Blackness, separating himself or herself from Whiteness, embracing his or her Blackness, and eventually realizing that neither race is superior, then fighting for the equality of all races. Conversely, the White person must first develop awareness of the existence of other races and his or her own race. The White person then must recognize the racism that exists around and possibly within him or her and evaluate the mainstream values associated with Whiteness before then internalizing either a racist White identity or moving on to an individually-based one. The White racial identity, similar to the Black racial identity, culminates in true egalitarian values and a social justice orientation.

Helms (1990) posited that, for any given White person, “[t]he greater the extent that racism exists and is denied, the less possible it is to develop a positive White identity” (p. 49). She argued that White individuals have to admit to and overcome some type of racism, whether that be personal, institutional, or cultural (Jones, 1972, 1981), in order to develop a healthy racial identity. The White person must accept his or her Whiteness, the cultural
implications of it, and move towards a sense of identity that is set apart from a perceived superiority over other racial groups (Katz & Ivey, 1977).

Past research has demonstrated the predictive power of White racial identity. For example, it has been related to the endorsement of racist attitudes (Carter, 1990) and modern racism (Carter, 1990; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994), as well as reactions towards situations involving interracial interactions (Block, Roberson, & Neuger, 1995). White racial identity was also predictive of self-reported comfort with Black people in multiple types of social situations (Claney & Parker, 1989). In the organizational realm, Chrobot (1997) found that the White racial identity of managers predicted their attitudes towards interactions with other racial groups in the workplace, and many researchers have theorized that the racial identity development of managers is extremely important due to the impact it has on support of workers (Chrobot-Mason, 2004).

Instead of identifying as White, many Whites use the term “American” as a substitute for their race (Tran & Paterson, 2015), and White Americans are likely to claim ethnic ancestry in Census data collection (Lieberson & Waters, 1993). Further, many White high school (Perry, 2002) and college (Jackson & Heckman, 2002) students lack an understanding of Whiteness and describe its meaning as “nothing.” In order for a White person to understand that he or she is White and that that has meaning, the person has to encounter a Black person at some point. This is when racial identity development begins.

**Contact.** Currently, it remains very possible to exist entirely within White communities in parts of the United States; thus, a person can exist without entering the first stage of White racial identity for quite some time. Once the person does encounter Black individuals (whether that be in actuality or simply the idea of Black people), the White person enters the first stage of White racial identity development: the *contact* stage (Helms, 1990). This stage is characterized
by naivety and curiosity or trepidation towards the Black community. During this stage, the person has a vague awareness of his Whiteness and evaluates all people based on criteria derived by White people (e.g., appearance, standardized testing). Further, a person in this stage has very limited interaction with Black individuals, save for those who “seem White.” A White person in this stage might comment that he or she does not see race in others, or he may explicitly tell a Black acquaintance that she does not seem like a Black person. A White person in the contact stage generally sees interactions with Blacks as frightening, as most of the messages the person has received about Blacks are negative. After enough contact, however, the White person eventually must come to the realization that Blacks and Whites are being treated in fundamentally different ways.

Because a White person in the contact stage is just beginning to develop an awareness of Black people, she is likely to feel safest, whether implicitly or explicitly, in an environment with all Whites, due to her lack of understanding and the trepidation associated with interracial contact. Therefore, the person would be most likely to want to put herself in an organization with other White people. Further, those who are in the contact stage remain firmly tied to the mainstream White identity and experience some level of trepidation towards interacting with people from other races. Thus, this is likely to trump their personal identities when it comes to their organizational preferences, rendering racial identity more powerful than personal identities when it comes to choosing an organization.

Organizations employing people in the contact stage may experience blows to their diversity climate, should one exist. For example, those White people who harbor more colorblind attitudes tend to exhibit more racist behaviors, both implicitly and explicitly (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004). This behavior, in turn, has tangible negative effects on racial/ethnic minority employees. For example, the colorblindness of White individuals is associated with lower
cognitive functioning of Black or Asian interaction partners, an outcome that was mediated by higher levels of behavioral prejudice on the part of the White participants (Holoien & Shelton, 2012). Colorblindness in the White members of a department has also been associated with lowered psychological engagement in the racial/ethnic minority members of the department (Plaut et al., 2009). What is more, people in this stage are likely to judge others by the values of White culture, thus further threatening any supportive diversity climate that might exist.

Though it is possible to generate hypotheses regarding attraction to different diversity climates in the contact stage, measurement methods do not allow for parsing the contact stage from the second stage. In updating the theory and creating a psychometrically sound scale, Lee and colleagues (2007) found that the second stage collapsed into the contact stage. Further, the hypotheses for each stage would be the same. For the purposes of this paper, I will hypothesize about the two statuses jointly. First, however, I will introduce the second stage.

**Disintegration.** Once the person realizes that differential treatment exists based on race, he must grapple with such internal moral conflicts as the dilemma between democracy/meritocracy and racial inequality, as well as the dilemma between believing that each person should be treated according to her individual merits and Blacks being treated without considering said merits. Recognition of this and the development of a conscious, albeit conflicted, acknowledgment of Whiteness pushes the person into the disintegration stage.

Characterized by the beginnings of racial understandings, a person in the disintegration stage begins to question the reality of the beliefs associated with race that the person has been taught throughout his life (Helms 1990). For example, the person may come to think, *Perhaps Black and White people are not considered equals in this society, despite all of the talk saying so.* Further, the person begins to understand that other culturally prescribed knowledge, such as cultural scripts for interacting with Black people, are inaccurate and untrustworthy.
A person in this stage, as he is beginning to have misgivings regarding the racial realities he has been fed, begins to reject the mainstream notions held within White society. He is effectively an outsider to both Black and White racial groups at this point and begins to experience a certain cognitive dissonance between his self-perceptions of morality and the reality of how Black people are treated in society (Helms, 1990). Festinger (1957) posited that, to manage cognitive dissonance, one can change his behavior, change the beliefs present in the environment, or develop new beliefs. Helms (1990) suggested that these options hold true for those White people going through the disintegration phase. A person can choose to change her behavior by sequestering herself within the White community, a relatively easy thing to accomplish even today (Benjamin, 2009). Helms (1990) argued that this is the most likely scenario, and that this would lead to the adoption of individual racism and the propagation of cultural and institutional racism.

The White person in the disintegration stage can also attempt to change others to create a more equal environment. Helms (1990) suggested that those raised by liberal parents are likely to choose this option, but will often be unsuccessful in their attempts due to their naiveté surrounding racial issues. Further, they are likely to experience resistance from both Blacks and Whites. This may work to enhance the organization’s diversity climate, but in all likelihood, the naiveté associated with this stage renders the person in it likely to go about promoting diversity in the wrong ways. As a final option, they can develop new beliefs, which would likely include adoption of beliefs that White people are superior and that Black people are inferior, thus perpetuating their individual racism as well as cultural and institutional racism. In accordance with Helms’ (1990) theory, higher endorsement of disintegration attitudes has been associated with lower self-reported levels of multicultural competence in White counselors (Constantine, 2002).
The contact and disintegration stages are characterized by the disregard and lack of understanding of the ways in which race affects everyday life. Thus, these stages, similar to the beginning stages of Black racial identity development, are characterized by colorblindness. Available evidence suggests that, for White individuals, colorblindness increases interracial tension and works against the mission of equality (Neville et al., 2013). Indeed, as mentioned earlier, colorblind attitudes have been associated with a lower likelihood of being offended by discrimination (Tynes & Markoe, 2010), suggesting that equality among the races is not a top priority for those high in colorblind attitudes. Further, Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) have shown that colorblindness is associated with higher racial bias in White participants. Colorblindness has also been connected to lower cultural appreciation in White individuals (Spanierman, Poteat, Wang, & Oh, 2008), as well as negative outcomes for racial/ethnic minority people that come into contact with colorblind White people, such as the aforementioned psychological engagement in racial/ethnic minority employees (Plaut et al., 2009) and cognitive functioning of interaction partners (Holoien & Shelton, 2012). Colorblindness in Whites has demonstrated predictive power regarding fear of other races (Soble, Spanierman, & Liao, 2011; Todd, Spanierman, & Poteat, 2011), an aspect that may negatively affect interracial interactions in the workplace.

Organizations who employ individuals who are in the first two stages experience other negative consequences. For example, Block, Roberson, and Neuger (1995) found that those who endorsed more disintegration attitudes were less supportive of affirmative action, endorsed equality in the workplace less, were less supportive of equity interventions in the workplace, were less comfortable in interacting with Black colleagues in work and social settings, and harbored lower perceptions of workplace discrimination against Black employees. Further, the authors’ results suggest that those who endorse disintegration attitudes perceive more “reverse
racism” against Whites, as well as seeing successful Black employees as tokens, only there to make the organization seem more “diverse.” People in this stage are likely to prefer to sequester themselves within the White community; thus, even if the organization for which they work has racial/ethnic diversity, these individuals are not likely to foster a supportive diversity climate.

Each of these constructs suggests the avoidance of interactions with other races in many realms, including choice of organization. As such, those in the contact stage and the disintegration stage will feel the most comfortable in all-White environments. Those in the contact stage are just barely becoming aware of race as it pertains to them; for those in the disintegration stage, simply avoiding interactions with Black people is the simplest option, as it also allows the person to retain his or her belongingness within the mainstream White community. Further, recent research has demonstrated that there is a pattern amongst White individuals (but not Black individuals) in thinking that a lowering of racism towards Blacks will automatically lead to more racism towards Whites (Norton & Sommers, 2011), indicating that many Whites are reticent to move towards a society where Black people are treated as equal to Whites. Therefore, I predict that, in accordance with Helms’ (1990) prediction, White people in the contact or the disintegration stage will most likely prefer to surround themselves with other Whites:

**Hypothesis 6a:** Contact/disintegration attitudes will moderate the relationship between diversity climate and attraction such that White individuals who endorse higher levels will show a negative relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction, whereas those who endorse lower levels will demonstrate a positive relationship.

In the contact stage, a White person will still be fully enveloped and feel connected to the mainstream White community, making this a more important identity than that derived from his
or her personal characteristics. Further, the trepidation towards Blacks associated with this stage will overpower concern for personality fit with the organization, suggesting that racial identity stage would be a more influential determinant in the contact stage than personality would. Helms (1990) posited that personal identity would be a determinant in the behavioral path that a person in the disintegration stage chooses, albeit a small one; however, she was referring mainly to the household values in which the person was raised. As a person has three ways to overcome the cognitive dissonance, he will choose the one most in accordance with his personal characteristics (e.g., values). Those who are liberal, as Helms (1990) stated, will be more likely to surround themselves with other races and cultures, and thus will be more likely to choose multicultural, whereas those who are not will choose the more homogeneous White organization. However, it is most likely that people in this stage will choose to avoid interactions with Black individuals, and those with liberal political leanings may still choose to do so even while attempting to change the racial beliefs of others. Personality characteristics, on the other hand, will be less influential to both the manifestation of racial identity and organizational attraction. Therefore, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 6b:** For those in the contact and disintegration stages, racial identity will demonstrate a stronger moderating effect on the relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction than will PO fit.

**Reintegration.** During this stage, the White person consciously acknowledges his White identity. A person in this stage will likely internalize the cultural racism surrounding him, believing that Whites are the superior race and have earned their place at the top. This process can be interrupted with contradictory experiences, however. Helms (1990) theorized that a person in this stage would harbor leftover feelings of guilt and anxiety, which would then turn into fear and anger towards Black people. This fear and anger may or may not be conscious, as it
may sit just below the surface of consciousness. The person may react passively by removing herself from contact with Black individuals, or she may react actively by treating Black individuals as inferior (e.g., through violence or deliberate exclusion). Indeed, reintegration has been associated positively with endorsing racist attitudes for White men (Carter, 1990; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994) and White women (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994), as well as more negative reactions to interracial situations (Block et al., 1995). Important to note is the fact that it is easy for White individuals to maintain their presence in this stage in the United States. In fact, it is likely that a person will stay here, save for the occurrence of some jarring event to push the person past it (e.g., the Civil Rights movement, the more recent Black Lives Matter movement, painful or insightful encounters with Black or White people).

The fear, anger, and prejudice can be thought of in other terms as well. Modern racism, or the inclination to judge others in comparison to individualism and the Protestant work ethic (Sears & Henry, 2005), has been associated with higher levels of discrimination towards Blacks in organizational settings when coupled with justification from an authority figure (Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, & Vaslow, 2000). Aversive racism, in which individuals outwardly state beliefs of racial equality but harbor negative views toward people of color unbeknownst to them (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998, 2004), has been associated with the avoidance of contact with people of other races as well as discussions involving race. These two constructs both involve the internalization of racist attitudes, even when those attitudes might not be consciously present.

Each of these aspects renders a person in the disintegration stage not only likely to contribute less to a supportive diversity climate, but it is very possible that people in this stage are likely to damage any diversity climate within which they might reside. Further impacting organizations, each of these things may harm interracial interactions and lead to more relational conflict in the workplace, a construct known to inhibit performance (De Dreu & Weingart,
Block and colleagues (1995) further found that those who endorsed more reintegration attitudes had similar outcomes (mentioned above) in regards to organizational diversity-related life as those in the disintegration stage (e.g., less supportive of diversity policies, less comfortable interacting with Black colleagues, perceive more “reverse racism” against Whites).

People in the reintegration stage are on a path to internalizing the racism present in society and in the White culture within which they have grown up. Thus, people in this stage will avoid interacting with Black individuals, including in their choice of workplace. Therefore, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 7a:** Reintegration attitudes will moderate the relationship between diversity climate signals and organizational attraction such that White individuals who endorse higher levels will exhibit a negative relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction, whereas those with lower levels of reintegration attitudes will exhibit a positive relationship between the two.

Those who endorse more reintegration attitudes will be firmly attached to their belongingness within the White community, as they have internalized what are typically racist attitudes, including fear of interacting with other races. Further, belonging to the dominant racial group may instill a feeling of superiority; as social identity theory states, one purpose of social identities is to derive self-esteem and pride (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This will likely be a more salient characteristic for individuals in the reintegration stage, thus lowering the importance of personal identities when making their employment choices. Thus:

**Hypothesis 7b:** For individuals in the reintegration phase, racial identity will demonstrate a stronger moderating effect on the relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction than will PO fit.
**Pseudo-Independence.** If some event does indeed trigger a White person to move beyond the reintegration stage, she will enter the *pseudo-independence* stage, in which she begins to actively question the proposition that Blacks are innately inferior to Whites. This represents the first step in developing a positive White identity. Those who make it to this stage gain a certain curiosity about Black people and culture. They move to acknowledging the role that Whites have played in perpetuating racism, both deliberately and inadvertently. Indeed, research has demonstrated that the pseudo-independent status is negatively associated with the endorsement of racist attitudes (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). Further, the acknowledgement of the racism present in society inherently leads to lower colorblind attitudes, suggesting that those in this stage will be more apt to acknowledge and be offended by discrimination (Tynes & Markoe, 2010), to demonstrate lower racial bias (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004), and to exhibit higher levels of cultural appreciation (Spanierman et al., 2008). Therefore, people in this stage are likely to contribute to a positive diversity climate than those in earlier stages, although due to the reasons listed in the next paragraph, their contributions may be hit-or-miss.

A person in the pseudo-independent stage has some understanding of the role of Whites in perpetuating racism, but she still does not fully grasp the extent to which racism is institutionalized, and thus may continue to behave in ways that perpetuate the belief system (e.g., helping Blacks to assimilate into the White system, not understanding that the White system/ways may be inappropriate criteria or narrow criteria), and necessarily has further growth to accomplish in developing a positive racial identity. What is more, she may find it difficult to find White role models who emulate a positive White racial identity. Because of this and her curiosity and intellectual acceptance towards Blacks, she is likely to search for an organization that may harbor positive White role models and that also embraces Black employees. Thus:
Hypothesis 8a: Pseudo-independent attitudes will moderate the relationship between diversity climate signals and organizational attraction such that White individuals who endorse higher levels will exhibit a stronger positive relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction, whereas those with lower levels of pseudo-independent attitudes will exhibit a weaker positive relationship between the two.

A person in the pseudo-independence stage of racial identity development is no longer connected to the mainstream White ideas of race, and she has gained an intellectual appreciation and acceptance of Black people and is in commiseration with Blacks. However, she is not part of that group, and therefore is somewhat marginalized between the two races during this stage. The lack of identification with one group or the other would lead to the climbing of personal identity in the identity hierarchy, according to identity theory (Stryker, 1968). Thus, the personality of the person will likely be more important here.

Hypothesis 8b: For those in the pseudo-independence stage, PO fit will demonstrate a stronger moderating effect on the relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction than will racial identity.

Autonomy. Upon nurturing the newfound realizations and a new definition of what it means to be White, the person enters the autonomy stage. In this stage, she abandons all forms of racism, as she no longer feels threatened by other races and does not need to oppress or idealize racial categories. White people who reach the autonomy stage actively seek opportunities to learn from other cultural groups. Further, they also begin to develop awareness of other forms of oppression (e.g., sexism, homophobia) and begin to try and eliminate those as well. Importantly, Helms (1990) points out that the autonomy stage is an ongoing process, and that the behavior of
a person in this stage may not necessarily be perfect. Personal characteristics (e.g., irritability) will still remain, but the behavior associated with them will not depend on race.

Indeed, empirical research has been supportive of the notion of the autonomy stage and its association with preference for diversity. Block and colleagues (1995) found that White people who endorsed more autonomy attitudes reported more positive reactions to a variety of interracial situations, having the opposite responses to those listed in the disintegration and reintegration phases (e.g., more supportive of diversity-related organizational policy such as affirmative action, more comfort in interacting with Black colleagues, and perceived less “reverse racism”). Further, as Helms (1990) posits that the autonomy stage is associated with curiosity and liking of Black culture, other-group orientation is a key component of the autonomy stage. Avery (2003) demonstrated that White individuals high in other-group orientation exhibited low levels of attraction towards an all-White organization, but high levels when diversity was present. Those with low levels of other-group orientation demonstrated high levels of attraction to an all-White organization, but lower levels when diversity was present.

Also inherent within this stage is social responsibility. Smith, Wokutch, Harrington, and Dennis (2004) found that, in a majority-White sample, corporate social orientation was associated with higher levels of endorsing affirmative action rather than simply managing diversity. Further, older White people tend to endorse more autonomy attitudes, consistent with the idea that racial identity is more likely to be developed at a later stage in life (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994).

People in this stage are much less likely to be colorblind and are more likely to endorse a multicultural ideology. Plaut and colleagues (2009), in their study on the effects of colorblindness and multiculturalism on interracial partnerships, found that having White partners who were more multicultural in their approach to diversity was associated with higher levels of psychological engagement on the part of their racial/ethnic minority partners. Thus,
organizations who employ White individuals in the autonomy stage are likely to experience better outcomes from their racial/ethnic minority employees than those who employ White individuals in the earlier stages. Further, those in the autonomy stage are likely to embrace different cultures, leading to less ethnocentricity, and they are likely to support diversity initiatives, which in turn would make them the best majority group allies to employ for a diversity-friendly organization.

Because people in this stage actively seek other cultural groups from which to learn, they are likely to try to include people from other cultures and people with similar ideals in their everyday interactions. Therefore, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 9a:** White individuals who endorse higher levels of autonomy attitudes will exhibit a stronger positive relationship between diversity climate signals and organizational attraction, whereas those who endorse fewer autonomy attitudes will demonstrate a weaker positive relationship between the two.

Further, this stage is associated with a strong identification with the positive, multicultural White identity. It is associated with the acknowledgement of racism being a White problem and work towards eliminating it (Terry, 1977), attaching a political meaning to the identity. Because the White person in this stage associates more meaning with the identity (van Zomeren et al., 2008) and has solidly placed himself or herself within the realm of the White racial group, the salience of the racial identity will be higher than that of the personal identity. Thus, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 9b:** For White individuals in the autonomy stage, racial identity will demonstrate a stronger moderating effect on the relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction than will PO fit.
Method

Participants & Procedures

Participants were solicited via Qualtrics Panel. This website allows surveys to be distributed online to participants who then receive a payment in return. It also includes a service whereby a researcher can dictate the population(s) of interest. The population of interest for this study includes Black and White people, with the former being more difficult to find in most traditional participant pools. In total, there were 346 participants, of which 52% were Black and 48% White. In the Black sample, the average age was 37, and 28% were women. Most (75%) were employed full time and 6.5% part time. In the White sample, the average age was 58, with 44% being women, 55% being men, and 1% identifying otherwise. Most of the White participants (84%) were employed full time, and 5.8% were employed part time.

Participants accessed the survey through their Qualtrics Panel accounts. The survey began with a consent form, detailing the purpose of the study and any possible hazards of completing it. Continuation beyond the consent form page implied consent. Participants then completed screening questions to ensure ample amounts of Black and White participants. Half of the participants completed individual difference measures first, and the other half viewed the website and completed the dependent variable measures first. This allowed for checking order effects while also decreasing the risk of attrition that might occur if collecting data over multiple time points. The individual differences portion began with instructions stating that participant personality and social attitudes were being assessed and that there were no right or wrong answers. The questions were randomized, but included measures of racial identity (Racial Identity Attitudes Scale; Helms & Parham, 1985; White Racial Consciousness Development Scale; Lee et al., 2007) and PO fit (modeled after Ostroff, 1993) mixed with distractor scales.
from the International Personality Item Pool (Goldberg et al., 2006), the HEXACO personality measure (Ashton & Lee, 2009), and theories of intelligence and personality (Dweck, 1999).

Before participants began completing the DV measures, they were told that we were interested in studying how websites affect the job search process. The page instructed them to put themselves in the shoes of a job applicant before continuing on to view a company’s website. From that page, participants were directed to one of two fictitious websites, detailed below. The instructions indicated that participants should leave the website open while answering the survey questions. Participants first completed attention check items, then organizational attraction items, followed by the organizational characteristics orientation items, their own perceptions of the organization’s diversity climate (as a manipulation check), and finally, demographic items.

**Website**

The diversity climate manipulations in this study were delivered via a website created for a fictitious consulting organization, E. M. Astel (see Figure 2). Participants viewed one of two versions of this website. The two versions differed on several diversity characteristics. First, the homogenous, low diversity climate condition depicted five White employees on its cover page, whereas the high diversity climate condition depicted two racial/ethnic minority employees in the foreground and three White employees in the background. Second, the low diversity climate condition simply included the statement “E. M. Astel is an equal opportunity employer,” whereas the high diversity climate condition included a detailed statement regarding its commitment to diversity:

In addition to our commitment to our clients, E.M. Astel is also deeply committed to the diversity of our workforce. To that end, we have moved aggressively to seek creative ways to ensure diversity by recruiting, promoting, and developing careers for women and racial/ethnic minority group members. We value the contributions of a multi-ethnic workforce, and we have implemented programs that help teach all employees to recognize the strengths that individuals from
diverse backgrounds can bring to our company. At E.M. Astel, we believe that diversity is the cornerstone of our future.

The diversity statement, along with the control counterpart, has been adapted from studies done by Kim and Gelfand (2003) and Williams and Bauer (1994).

Third, the leadership of the organization differed for each condition. In the low diversity climate condition, the CEO, COO, CFO, and the president of consulting are White; in the high condition, the CEO and CFO are Black. Last, the awards page differed between the two in that the high climate condition included two diversity-related awards: “DiversityInc’s Top 50 Companies to Work For” and “Society for Social Activism and Transformation's Cultural Diversity Quality Standard Award.” The high condition also included three other awards; the low condition included three of the same non-diversity rewards (“Glassdoor Best Places to Work,” “Ernst and Young Entrepreneur of the Year,” and “Smart CEO Future 50”), as well as “Vault’s Best Companies to Work For Award” and “When Work Works Model Employer” standing. A pilot study of 42 MTurk participants indicated that these manipulations signaled different levels of diversity climate, \( t(36) = -2.79, p = .009 \), as indicated by the diversity climate scale detailed below. The high diversity condition yielded higher scores on the measure of diversity climate (\( M = 4.21, SD = 0.67 \)) than did the homogenous condition (\( M = 3.73, SD = 0.43 \)).

These websites were further intended to demonstrate certain organizational characteristics so as to examine each participant’s PO fit. One must have aspects of an organization with which to fit in order to measure PO fit. Using the list of organizational characteristics from Judge's and Cable's (1997) work on organizational culture (based on the work of O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991), I infused the website with indicators of organizational personality to underplay or emphasize certain characteristics. These indicators were identical for both websites. For example, the award sections include awards that signal
supportiveness (e.g., Consulting Magazine Excellence in Social & Community Investment Achievement Award), as well as employee testimonials that signalled the importance of teamwork (e.g., “Since starting at E. M. Astel, I have greatly enjoyed the 'same team' mindset that all of the associates embrace”). To assess the organizational characteristics communicated through the website, 74 MTurk participants in a second pilot study were asked to rate the website on a five-point scale regarding each of the organizational characteristics (see Table 3 for the characteristics, definitions, and scores).

Measures

**Objective PO Fit.** The congruence between the participants’ personalities and the organization’s were assessed by comparing measures of two constructs: organizational characteristics and personal orientation towards such characteristics, similar to the method used by Ostroff (1993). I created a measure of organizational characteristics based on definitions of the constructs written by (Judge & Cable, 1997), which included subscales for attention to detail, innovation, rewards orientation, aggressiveness, team orientation, supportiveness, outcome orientation, and decisiveness. Similar to that used by Ostroff (1993), the personality measure was modeled after the organization characteristics measure, creating commensurate personal orientation and organizational characteristics scales (see Table 3 for definitions of the characteristics, scores, alphas, and example items). Many fit scholars have argued that the measures of the characteristics of the individual and the organization must be commensurate in nature (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011). Both measures employed a five-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. A single objective PO fit score was created for each individual by comparing their orientation profiles to the organization characteristics profile and calculating a difference score (Ostroff, 1993).
**Black Racial Identity.** Racial identity was measured with different scales for Black and White participants. I used the Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (RIAS-B; Helms & Parham, 1985) to measure Black racial identity. Comprised of 50 items total, this scale contains four subscales: preencounter (14 items), encounter (4 items), immersion/emersion (8 items), and internalization (4 items; the remainder is comprised of filler items), with the responses based on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Although the original validation study of the RIAS-B yielded internal consistency coefficients of .76 (preencounter), .51 (encounter), .69 (immersion/emersion), and .80 (internalization/commitment), subsequent validation studies have indicated that each subscale relates differentially to constructs such as self-esteem (Parham & Helms, 1985a), cultural values (Carter & Helms, 1987), and counselor preference (Parham & Helms, 1981). In the current study, alphas ranged from .63 to .94, with an average of .78 (see Table 4). Interitem correlations averaged at .54, .31, .48, and .28 for preencounter, encounter, immersion/emersion, and internalization/commitment attitudes, respectively. Example items include “I believe that being Black is a positive experience” and “The people I respect most are White.”

**White Racial Identity.** White participants competed Lee and collegues’ (2007) revised version of the White Racial Consciousness Development Scale (WRCDS). This scale was originally developed by Claney and Parker (1989) to measure Helms’ (1984, 1990) theory of White racial identity development and predates Helms’ own measure of White racial identity, the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS; Helms & Carter, 1990). The original versions of both scales yielded questionable psychometric properties (Choney & Rowe, 1994), thus sparking the revised WRCDS.

The revised version consists of 40 items measuring four stages of the White racial identity development model (Helms, 1984, 1990). The responses are based in a five-point Likert
scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The contact/disintegration stage is measured by eight items, reintegration by 14 items, pseudo-independence by nine items, and autonomy by nine items. Alphas in the current study ranged from .81 to .91, with the average being .84 (see Table 4). Interitem correlations averaged at .34, .42, .38, and .34 for contact/disintegration, reintegration, pseudo-independent, and autonomy attitudes, respectively.

**Organizational Attraction.** Organizational attraction was measured using 10 items taken from the General Attractiveness and Intentions to Pursue subscales of Highhouse, Lievens, and Sinar's (2003) measure of organizational attraction. Participants responded on a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Example items from each subscale include “For me, this company would be a good place to work” and “I would exert a great deal of effort to work for this company.”

**Demographic Information.** Participants were asked to provide demographic information, including their gender, race and ethnicities, and work status.

**Diversity Climate Perceptions.** To determine the extent to which diversity climate was effectively manipulated, participants rated diversity climate using nine items from McKay, Avery, and Morris (2008). The items reflected actions that the organization might take, and the participants responded with the level of expectation that they had for the organization to perform each action using a five-point Likert scale (1 = very low expectations; 5 = very high expectations). Example items include “recruit from diverse sources” and “offer training to manage diverse populations.”

**Attention Check.** Attention check questions were designed to ensure that participants were looking at the websites and processing their content. Example items include “What is the name of the CFO of E. M. Astel?” and “How many people are on the front page of E. M. Astel’s website?” The second pilot test of 74 MTurk participants suggested that these questions
increased the power of the manipulation to a statistically significant degree; a hierarchical regression revealed a statistically significant interaction between website condition and attention check question condition on diversity climate perceptions, $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $F(1, 70) = 4.12$, $p = .046$. Within the diversity condition, those who were asked the questions perceived a more supportive diversity climate ($M = 6.45$) than those who were not asked question ($M = 5.76$), $t(33) = -2.92$, $p = .006$. Within the low diversity climate condition, there was no statistically significant difference between those who had website specific questions and those who did not.

**Results**

Descriptive statistics, intercorrelations, and alpha reliabilities for each sample can be found in Table 4.

**Manipulation Check**

Analyses began with a manipulation check to assess the effectiveness of the diversity climate manipulation on diversity climate perceptions ($\alpha = .96$). For the Black participants, there was a statistically significant difference between diversity climate signal conditions, $t(122) = -3.50$, $p = .001$. Those in the supportive diversity climate condition perceived a stronger diversity climate ($M = 4.05; SD = .70$) than did those in the no diversity climate condition ($M = 3.56; SD = 1.00$). White participants in the supportive diversity climate condition also perceived a stronger diversity climate ($M = 4.11; SD = .69$) than those in the no diversity climate condition ($M = 3.89; SD = .75$), although this difference reached only marginal statistical significance, $t(153) = -1.81$, $p = .070$.

**Moderated Hierarchical Multiple Regressions**

I conducted a series of moderated hierarchical multiple regressions (MHMRs) to test Hypothesis 1 and the “a” sections of Hypotheses 2 through 9. The independent variables were centered prior to creating the interaction terms in order to avoid problems with multicollinearity.
Categorical variables were contrast coded: low diversity climate was coded as -.5, high diversity climate was coded as .5; White was coded as -.5, and Black was coded as .5. Detecting interactions can be rather difficult due to low levels of power (Chaplin, 1991; Morris, Sherman, & Mansfield, 1986); therefore, I set the critical alpha level to .10, as past researchers have recommended when testing interactions with hypothesized patterns (Champoux & Peters, 1980; Cohen, 1988; Finn & Frone, 2004; McClelland & Judd, 1993). Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented in the tables below. No order effects were found; in other words, whether participants were exposed to the manipulation first or whether they were asked individual difference questions first was not related to any independent variable, dependent variable, or interaction of the focal variables in predicting attraction. I therefore did not include the order condition as a control in the analyses (Becker, 2005; James, 1980). The data met all assumptions for MHMR to a reasonable degree.

Hypothesis 1 (Table 5) asserted that those with high PO fit would have a stronger positive relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction, whereas those with lower PO fit would have a weaker relationship. An MHMR in which diversity climate condition and PO fit were entered into the first step and their interaction into the second determined that the interaction term predicted organizational attraction, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $B = -.11$, $p = .060$. Simple effects tests demonstrated that those high in PO fit were not affected much by the diversity manipulation, $B = -.12$, $p = .469$, whereas those low in PO fit were more attracted to the positive diversity climate condition, $B = .32$, $p = .05$. However, the pattern of the moderating effect was in opposition to the prediction (see Figure 3), therefore offering partial support for Hypothesis 1.

**Black Racial Identity.** The full results for the Black racial identity MHMRs can be found in Table 6. Beginning with the preencounter stage, I hypothesized that stronger endorsement of preencounter attitudes would predict a negative relationship, whereas low
endorsement of such attitudes would be associated with a positive relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction (Hypothesis 2a). There was a statistically significant main effect of diversity climate condition, with those in the high diversity climate condition reporting higher levels of attraction than those in the low diversity climate condition, $B = .39$, $p = .039$. Although the effect of the interaction was in the hypothesized direction, the interaction term was not statistically significant, $\Delta R^2 = .007$, $B = -.15$, $p = .269$. Thus, Hypothesis 2a was not supported.

I predicted that high levels of encounter attitudes would be associated with a stronger positive relationship between signals of a diversity climate and attraction, whereas those with low encounter attitudes would show a weaker positive relationship (Hypothesis 3a). Both higher encounter attitudes, $B = .15$, $p = .039$, and being in the high diversity condition, $B = .39$, $p = .036$, increased the reported levels of attraction. The relationship between diversity climate condition and attraction was not significantly different between the groups, $\Delta R^2 < .01$, $B = -.02$, $p = .884$, thus indicating a lack of support for Hypothesis 3a. I predicted a similar pattern of results in Hypothesis 4a, suggesting that stronger immersion/emersion attitudes would be associated with a stronger positive relationship, whereas weaker attitudes would be associated with a weaker relationship. Diversity climate condition emerged again as a main effect, $B = .39$, $p = .038$, but the interaction term did not, $\Delta R^2 = .001$, $B = .05$, $p = .765$. Thus, Hypothesis 4a was not supported.

Hypothesis 5a indicated that higher internalization/commitment attitudes would be associated with a strong positive relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction, whereas those with lower levels of such attitudes would exhibit a weaker positive relationship. Both main effects were statistically significant (internalization/commitment attitudes, $B = .49$, $p < .001$; diversity climate condition, $B = .39$, $p = .028$). As in the previous hypotheses, the
relationship appears to be similarly positive for all levels of internalization attitudes, \( \Delta R^2 = .005, B = -.21, p = .316 \). Thus, Hypothesis 5a was not supported.

**White Racial Identity.** Results for Hypotheses 6a through 9a are located in Table 7. I predicted that those with higher levels of contact/disintegration attitudes would show a negative relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction, whereas those with low levels would show a positive relationship (Hypothesis 6a). The main effect of contact attitudes was statistically significant, suggesting that higher contact attitudes were associated with lower attraction, \( B = -.22, p = .010 \). Although the relationships were trending positive and negative corresponding with low and high levels of contact attitudes, respectively, the interaction term was not statistically significant, \( \Delta R^2 = .009, B = -.21, p = .224 \). Therefore, Hypothesis 6a was not supported.

For Hypothesis 7a, I predicted that higher levels of reintegration attitudes would be associated with a negative relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction, whereas those with lower levels would demonstrate a positive relationship between the two. This interaction was statistically significant, \( \Delta R^2 = .05, B = -.45, p = .004 \). Simple slopes tests revealed that, both slopes being marginally significant, they fell into the predicted pattern: Those with high levels of reintegration attitudes were less attracted to the website signaling a supportive diversity climate, \( B = -.85, p = .124 \), whereas those endorsing fewer reintegration attitudes were more attracted to the higher diversity climate website, \( B = .81, p = .098 \) (see Figure 4). Thus, Hypothesis 7a was supported.

I predicted that those who endorse higher levels of pseudo-independent attitudes would demonstrate a stronger positive relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction, whereas those who endorse lower levels would have a weaker relationship (Hypothesis 8a). The main effect of pseudo-independent attitudes was statistically significant, \( B = .21, p = .009 \), and,
although the slopes fell into the hypothesized pattern, the interaction term was not statistically significant, $\Delta R^2 = .011$, $B = .21$, $p = .177$ (see Figure 5). There was, however, evidence of nonlinearity violation regarding the relationship between pseudo independent attitudes and attraction, although a follow-up hierarchical regression, in which the linear effect was entered in the first step and the quadratic term in the second, suggested that a curvilinear relationship did not predict incremental variance beyond the linear term, $\Delta R^2 < .01$, $B = .04$, $p = .448$.

For Hypothesis 9a, I predicted that participants who endorsed higher levels of autonomy attitudes would exhibit a stronger positive relationship between organizational attraction and diversity climate signals than those who endorsed fewer items related to autonomy. The analysis supported the existence of an interaction, $\Delta R^2 = .029$, $B = .38$, $p = .021$. The interaction pattern was as predicted (see Figure 6): Simple effects tests reveal that those endorsing lower levels of autonomy demonstrated a marginally statistically significant negative relationship between diversity climate condition and attraction, $B = -0.38$, $p = .123$, and those with higher levels of autonomy demonstrated a positive relationship between the two, $B = .44$, $p = .081$. Thus, Hypothesis 9a was supported.

**Relative Weights Analyses**

The “b” parts of hypotheses 2-9 required relative weights analyses to get an accurate estimate of how much racial identity attitudes’ moderating effect contributed to the explained variance in attraction compared to PO fit’s moderating effect. As predictors are often correlated, the standardized coefficients derived from multiple regression cannot be trusted in their power to compare the weight of each predictor in a model, as they do not attribute the variance to each predictor properly—relative weights analysis resolves the issue through the creation of a new set of orthogonal predictor variables, upon which one can regress the outcome variable (LeBreton et al., 2013; Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). Testing interaction terms requires that main effects be
controlled for or entered hierarchically, which negates the relative weights analysis assumption that variables contain no ordering (Budescu, 1993; Johnson, 2000). Thus, it was necessary to employ residualized relative weights analysis, in which one regresses the interaction term onto the main effects that comprise it and in doing so removes the main effect variance from the interaction term (LeBreton et al., 2013). This allows for the appropriate decomposition of variance by creating new regression terms that holds the same effects while being orthogonal to the main effect components.

To test the significance of the relative weights, 95% bias-corrected, accelerated confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated using 10,000 bootstrapped replications (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). See Table 8 for the results of the relative weights analyses, including their raw relative weights, the percentage of the overall $R^2$ that they explain, and their confidence intervals. In sum, I predicted that Black racial identity’s moderating effect on the relationship between diversity climate signals and attraction would be stronger than the moderating effect of PO fit for preencounter attitudes (Hypothesis 2b), weaker for encounter attitudes (Hypothesis 3b), and stronger for both immersion/emersion attitudes (Hypothesis 4b) and integration attitudes (Hypothesis 5b). Regarding White racial identity, I hypothesized that the moderating effect would be weaker than PO fit’s moderating effect for contact (Hypothesis 6b) and reintegration attitudes (Hypothesis 7b), weaker for pseudo-independence attitudes (Hypothesis 9b), and stronger for autonomy attitudes (Hypothesis 9b).

Before completing the relative weights analyses, I tested the full model for each racial identity status using MHMRs to determine the incremental variance explained by PO fit and racial identity as moderators (see Tables 9 and 10). After entering racial identity status, diversity climate condition, and PO fit into the first step, I entered the cross-product of PO fit and diversity climate and that of each racial identity stage and diversity climate. Across participants, the
average $\Delta R^2$ was .036, and they ranged from .002 to .088. For the Black racial identity model, the interactions yielded no statistically significant incremental predictive power beyond the main effects (see Table 9). Thus, it is not surprising that there were no differences between the variance explained by the interactions for the relative weights analyses (see Table 7). Thus, Hypotheses 2b, 3b, 4b, and 5b were not supported.

For White racial identity, the additions of the two interactions were statistically significant at each stage of White racial identity development (see Table 10). As can be seen in Table 7, neither interaction term’s relative weight for the contact stage (Hypothesis 6b) excluded zero, and thus were not statistically different from each other. In the reintegration stage, racial identity’s interaction with the diversity climate condition explained a considerable portion of the overall model variance, and the PO fit-diversity climate condition interaction term did not. The confidence interval surrounding the difference between the weights of each term included zero; however, the reintegration term was larger and supported, whereas the PO fit interaction term was smaller and unsupported. Thus, Hypothesis 7b was not supported. Neither pseudo-independent’s interaction with diversity climate condition nor PO fit’s interaction yielded relative weights CIs that did not contain zero—Hypothesis 8b was not supported. CIs for both autonomy interaction terms excluded zero. The CI calculated regarding the difference in weight between the two did contain zero; therefore, Hypothesis 9b was not supported. The relative weight of racial identity, however, was roughly twice that of PO fit, as hypothesized.

**Discussion**

The current study makes a significant contribution to not only the body of work on diversity recruitment, but the broader recruitment and organizational diversity literature as well. In this study, I introduced and demonstrated the impact of a contextualized developmental model of racial identity on organizational recruitment and included multiple influences on attraction
while doing so. Although the model of Black racial identity development did not have the anticipated effects, that of White racial identity was largely supported. In addition, the current study found that PO fit affected whether diversity climate was helpful or not in attracting candidates.

**PO Fit and Diversity Climate**

The current study established the moderating effect of objective, personality-based PO fit on how diversity climate signals impact attraction. Although I hypothesized that higher PO fit would strengthen the ability of diversity climate signals to attract candidates, it seems that it acts as a substitute instead. For those who had high PO fit, there was no difference, but for those who had low PO fit, their attraction was higher if they were in the high diversity climate condition, suggesting that those with high objective, personality-based PO fit will not be persuaded or dissuaded by diversity climate signals, but that those with low PO fit are more attracted to an organization when it signals a supportive diversity climate.

Although some research has found that racial/ethnic minority group members are more attracted to portrayals of diversity climate than majority group individuals, the current study demonstrated, along with other previous studies, that signals of a diversity climate are attractive to both types of groups. If one were to maintain a social identity theory perspective, this might be counterintuitive. Social identity theory suggests that individuals hold more favorable perceptions of people from their own group and denigrate people from other groups in order to raise their own self-esteem (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This would translate to majority group members being more attracted to organizations that favor their own group over others. What is more, optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991) posits that individuals from minority groups identify with their groups more than majority group individuals because minority groups allow for differentiation and thus contribute more to a sense of identity. Racial/ethnic minority group
members should identify more so with those identities and put more import on a climate that values those identities than racial/ethnic majority group members would.

The current study found that, as hypothesized, there was no statistically significant difference between Black and White participants on the moderating effect of PO fit on the diversity climate-attraction relationship, $\Delta R^2 = .004$, $B = .16$, $p = .224$. Past literature has also found that attraction is enhanced by diversity climate across the board (e.g., Avery, 2003; Kim & Gelfand, 2003; Williams & Bauer, 1994). This may reflect a redefinition of groups in the United States. For example, class and political party affiliation are becoming prominent sources of identity. Fielding and Hornsey (2016) demonstrated the power of progressive vs. conservative social groups and intergroup relations in terms of climate change. Jenke and Huettel (2016) argue that social identities actually compete with policy contents to determine how citizens feel about policy and their subsequent behavior. Political conservativism has been associated with resistance to change and opposition to equality (Jost & Amodio, 2012)—two things that inherently affect attitudes towards diversity.

These findings may also reflect an overall changing of the nation’s values to bring equality more to the forefront. Alternatively, the current study concerns overall diversity climate, not just racial diversity climate. Consistent with intersectionality frameworks (Cole, 2009), there is indeed much diversity within the White race (e.g., disability status, gender, sexual orientation, nationality). White individuals who belong to other stigmatized groups could theoretically be the driving force behind the effectiveness of diversity climate signals for White participants. Further research is necessary to narrow down the possible mechanisms.

Interesting to note is the power of this personality-based conceptualization of PO fit in predicting attraction. Although personality-based PO fit was once a productive area of research, it has fallen out of favor more recently (Kristof-Brown & Billsberry, 2013). I used this objective,
personality-based conceptualization of PO fit in order to retain participants’ need to weigh two
distinct constructs, one in the form of a personal identity, in contrast to the other in the form of a
social identity. In other words, other types of PO fit (e.g., values) would confound personal and
social identities as well as lead to likely overlap between congruency and value for diversity. The
current research suggests that objective, personality-based PO fit is something that we should
perhaps revisit as a field, as it was the largest driver of the predicted variance in many of the
relative weights analyses, and it was the only statistically significant predictor variable across
racial groups, diversity climate conditions, and racial identity statuses. What is more, it will be
important for those studying diversity recruiting to be cognizant of competing determinants of
attraction and whether or not it is beneficial to recruit individuals who contribute in terms of
diversity climate but who do not otherwise fit well in the organization.

For Black participants in this study, it seems that PO fit was indeed the largest
determinant of attraction. I discuss why racial identity may not have played a larger role below.

**Black Racial Identity**

For Black participants, diversity climate was consistently a predictor of attraction, and
two out of the four measured statuses predicted attraction. In line with previous literature,
diversity climate condition was positively related to attraction as a main effect, and encounter
and internalization/commitment attitudes had a small and moderate, respectively, positive
relationship with attraction. In all, the current study did not support the interaction between
Black racial identity and diversity climate in terms of affecting attraction. There are several
possibilities regarding why this might occur. For instance, the model of racial identity used in the
present study was originally created in the early 1970s and is highly contextualized. As it was
last updated in 1990—over 25 years prior to the writing of this manuscript—it may be that the
sociopolitical and cultural changes in the meantime have been such that the model no longer
applies as aptly. Indeed, more recent conceptualizations of racial/ethnic minority identity have
taken hold and proven to be useful predictors, the most prominent of which is that of Sellers and
colleagues (1998).

Sellers’ model, called the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI), is a static
model that focuses on the content rather than the process of racial identity. The original theory
and measure were created specifically about Black racial identity, but subsequent researchers
have adapted it to fit all races (e.g., Kern & Grandey, 2009). The original model contains four
dimensions: salience, centrality, regard, and ideology. Salience refers to the importance of race
in one’s identity in different situations, whereas centrality refers to how important race is across
situations (i.e., is more like a trait). Regard is broken up into public and private. Public regard
concerns how a person thinks others see his/her race, and private regard concerns how he/she
sees his/her race. Last, there are four types of ideology that a person can have about the Black
race. Nationalism refers to feeling that there is a unique cultural and historical experience shared
by all African Americans; the oppressed minority ideology focuses on a shared minority group
experience; an assimilationist ideology concentrated on the shared experiences of African
Americans with all Americans; and the humanist perspective focuses on commonalities with all
of humanity.

One reason that this model might be successful despite being only a few years younger
than Helms’ and Cross’ model is its acontextual and static nature. There is a lack of consensus
about the best way to conceptualize and measure racial identity—namely whether we should
look at is as a process model or as a content model and whether or not it should be group-specific
or not (Schwartz et al., 2014)—but there may be some benefit to studying the construct from a
content perspective. Helms’ and Cross’ model relies on the disparate experiences and valuation
of races, which are subject to change, whereas the psychological content of racial identity,
theoretically, is not. It may be that some aspects of the experiences of Black people have changed since the model was created and last modified, suggesting that the model should be refined to represent an updated reflection of Black racial identity development.

Although there has been some positive movement towards equality between racial/ethnic groups in the United States, much inequality remains. It has taken less obvious forms (e.g., microaggressions; Sue et al., 2007) but is just as damaging as explicit devaluation (Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Leskinen, Huerta, & Magley, 2011; Jones, Peddie, Gilrane, King, & Gray, 2013). Therefore, a more likely culprit behind the null findings in the Black racial identity model is the questionable psychometric properties of the RIAS-B. Two of the four subscales did not reach adequate levels of internal consistency in the current sample, and past studies have found the internal structure of the scale to be problematic (e.g., Yanico, Swanson, & Tokar, 1994). Helms’ own research using the scale offered, in some way, validity evidence in that the scale did predict such constructs as racial preference in therapist choice, self-esteem, and affect (Helms, 1990); however, it may be that its predictive validity could not make up for its lack of internal consistency and poor factor structure.

White Racial Identity

The current study generally offered support for the White racial identity model proposed above. Those with higher levels of contact attitudes were less attracted to the organization when it signaled a diversity climate, whereas those with lower levels reported more attraction to the more diversity-friendly cues; however, the interaction did not reach traditionally accepted levels of statistical significance. Despite that, these findings are mostly in line with research demonstrating that colorblind individuals (likely in the early stages of White racial identity) had more instances of behavioral prejudice (Holoien & Shelton, 2012), and their racial/ethnic minority departmental peers reported lower levels of psychological engagement (Plaut et al.,
White people in this stage might have negative associations with Black people and culture or be fearful of the cognitive dissonance that emerges when they come to the realization regarding differential treatment of Black individuals. This research supports that individuals in this stage are likely to solidify their beliefs that Whites are superior or to avoid Black people altogether in order to resolve the cognitive dissonance associated with disintegration.

Higher reintegration attitudes were associated with less attraction in the high diversity climate condition, whereas the diversity climate condition had the opposite effect on those with low levels of reintegration attitudes. These findings are in line with research demonstrating that reintegration attitudes are positively associated with racist attitudes among White men (Carter, 1990; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994) and White women (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994) and more negative reactions to interracial situations (Block et al., 1995).

Although the moderating effects of pseudo-independent attitudes failed to reach traditionally accepted p-value levels, the pattern of findings was consistent with predictions about people high and low in attitudes reflecting this status. Higher levels predicted a stronger positive relationship, whereas lower levels demonstrated a weaker relationship between signals of a supportive diversity climate and attraction. Accordingly, past research has demonstrated that people in this stage are more aware of racial inequality and appreciate it more, as well as defend it more (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Spanierman et al., 2008; Tynes & Markoe, 2010).

Autonomy attitudes presented a prominent moderating effect on the diversity climate-attraction relationship. Those endorsing more autonomy items demonstrated a stronger positive relationship, whereas the opposite was true for those endorsing fewer autonomy items. Autonomy attitudes have been associated with positive interracial attitudes and feelings regarding progressive organizational policies and practices (Block et al., 1995). Further, these
results are also in line with the construct of other-group orientation, which is theoretically high in those endorsing more autonomy attitudes (Helms, 1990). For example, Avery (2003) observed how other-group orientation impacted attraction to a racially and ethnically diverse organization over an all-White organization in both Black and White participants.

**Theoretical Implications**

The current study has important implications for research and theory on racial identity. First, most racial identity literature focuses on that of racial/ethnic minority groups, and the study of White racial identity has been somewhat neglected. This may be because race is not typically a strong part of a White person’s identity. For example, some research suggests that White Americans do not see themselves as “White” but as “American” instead (Tran & Paterson, 2015) or describe being White as nothing (Perry, 2002), making it difficult to ask participants about Whiteness. Indeed, as Mcdermott and Samson (2005) stated, “… [W]hite racial identity is more of a process than a descriptive” (p. 255). The White racial identity development model does not directly address salience of Whiteness in identity and thus may be a more accessible way to study White racial identity than, say, the MMRI described above. What is more, Whiteness is typically considered the “default” category of race (McDermott & Samson, 2005), thus rendering it an unmarked identity.

These results are important because racial identity has been shown to have strong implications for organizational diversity climates, among other outcomes. Block and colleagues (1995) found that endorsement of attitudes associated with earlier stages of White racial identity were associated with less support of affirmative action, equality in the workplace, equity interventions in the workplace, less comfort interacting with Black coworkers, and less perceived discrimination against Black employees in their organizations. Those endorsing attitudes consistent with the early stages also perceived more “reverse racism” against Whites. The current
study suggests that this might be avoided simply by recruiting the right people—indeed, Block and colleagues also report that those in the later stages report the opposite feelings towards racial/ethnic equality and policy. Further, those endorsing more autonomy attitudes also report more positive feelings towards corporate social responsibility in general (Smith et al., 2004).

What is more, other constructs associated with racial identity have been shown to affect organizations in important ways. Modern and aversive racism are associated with negative impacts on interracial situations at work, such as more discrimination towards Blacks (Brief et al., 2000) and avoidance of interracial contact and even discussion of it (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998, 2004). Multiculturalism in White people is associated with higher psychological engagement among racial/ethnic minority colleagues (Plaut et al., 2009).

The current study also highlights the variability in White racial identity and how Whites think of and interact with other racial groups. Understanding White racial identity is paramount to understanding racial inequality (McDermott & Samson, 2005). Racial identity was a key determinant in the effects of diversity climate on attraction in the current study, which supports the notion that White racial identity may be a driving force behind valuation and interpersonal treatment of other racial groups. Understanding why some Whites are less prejudiced and some more will help organizational scholarship move towards better solutions to racism in the workplace.

Interestingly note is the fact that attitudes derived from all White racial identity statuses save for reintegration yielded main effects on attraction. This could be due to a third variable problem. The websites were both consulting firms, indicating white collar, higher SES work. Those who are more educated are typically more liberal and higher SES (Schoon, Cheng, Gale, Batty, & Deary, 2010), and more other-group oriented (Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1996). Other researchers have found associations between cognitive ability at age 11 and liberal social
attitudes at age 33, partially mediated by education, and that education and occupational status positively predicted socially liberal attitudes (Schoon et al., 2010). Liberalism is also associated with being more open-minded, curious, and novelty-seeking (Carney, Jost, Gosling, & Potter, 2008; p. 807), as well as a higher capacity to adapt at a neurological level, demonstrating a greater ability to detect cues to adapt from responding out of habit (Amodio, Jost, Master, & Yee, 2007)—all factors associated with one’s affinity for and ability to interact with people from other backgrounds.

These factors would influence their racial identity status. Additionally, those who are more educated/higher SES tend to go be in white color work, whereas those who are low SES are more likely to see such work as elitist (O’Sullivan, 2016) and thus less desirable. Indeed, the pattern of results is consistent with that which one would predict—the two earlier stages of White racial identity were negatively associated with attraction, whereas the two later stages were positively associated with attraction.

**Practical Implications**

The results of this study present important implications for practitioners. Most pertinent is the benefit of signaling a supportive diversity climate. Specifically, if a person already perceived personality based fit, portraying diversity as well may not be detrimental to attraction. Results suggest that signaling a supportive diversity climate will only boost attractiveness, indicating that practitioners should aim for doing so. More importantly, however, the current study is a step in the direction of understanding how to build inclusive environments. This research suggests that recruitment advertisements are paramount to attracting the right kind of employee. Studies on diversity training suggest that there is much potential for null or negative effects (Bezrukova, Spell, Perry, & Jehn, 2016), perhaps due to attendees having less advanced racial identities. Training can certainly be a change agent, but the current research suggests that
organizations can start with the right people, decreasing the need for training and increasing the likelihood that it will have the desired effects when it is administered. Indeed, a recent meta-analysis on diversity training concluded that it works best when accompanied by a supportive diversity climate (Bezrukova et al., 2016), suggesting that transfer of training knowledge is allowed to happen.

Organizations who do decide to signal a positive diversity climate need to make sure they do so in an honest way. McKay (2005) warns that signaling an inclusive diversity climate should be accompanied by work climates that prove to be supportive of diversity, lest new employees feel tricked by the tactics. Windscheid and colleagues (2016) further demonstrated that organizations who claimed to be pro-gender diversity, but whose board was dominated by men, were seen as having less behavioral integrity, leading to lower attractiveness. However, signaling a positive diversity climate it is a step in the right direction, so long as it is done in the most honest way possible, and it will only benefit the subsequent racial/ethnic diversity of the organization (Hebl & Avery, 2013). White racial identity has been found to be predictive of racism (Carter, 1990), suggesting that attracting those with more advanced racial identity statuses may benefit organizations seeking positive intergroup relations. And it seems that doing so will come at no cost to deterring applicants—those who already have high PO fit will still be attracted, and those who have low PO fit will likely be more attracted to supportive diversity climates.

Limitations

Although the results of this study have important implications for the diversity recruitment literature, as well as the diversity literature and recruitment more broadly, it was not without faults.
First, as discussed earlier, the measure of Black racial identity possesses several undesirable psychometric characteristics. The current research may have suffered as a result. Second, due to practical constraints, participants completed all measures in one sitting. In order to ensure that the independent variable measures were not priming participants, I counterbalanced the design such that half of the participants completed the dependent variable measures first. Whether participants completed the independent or dependent measures first did not affect dependent variable responses. Unrelated measures were also mixed into the independent variables to distract from what could be considered sensitive content regarding interracial attitudes. Concerning the fact that all data collected were survey-based, common method variance could present an issue; however, the focus of the study was on interaction effects, which render common method variance much less worrisome. If a statistically significant interaction term is detected in such a situation, the effect is in fact more robust when common method variance is less of a concern (Siemsen, Roth, & Oliveira, 2010).

Although some hypothesized interaction terms did not reach traditionally accepted levels of statistical significance, the overall pattern of results suggests that the hypothesized interactions may be accurate and reflective of small effects that require more power. Most interaction effects explain between one and three percent of the variance (Champoux & Peters, 1980; McClelland & Judd, 1993), with an average of one percent for personnel selection studies (Aguinis, Beaty, Boik, & Pierce, 2005). Bing and colleagues (Bing, LeBreton, Davison, Migetz, & James, 2007) argue that interactions explaining even as little as one percent of the variance could be important, depending on the nature of the outcome variable and whether the pattern of the results match that which was hypothesized. Thus, the low power of detecting interactions may have been at work. Those interactions that did not reach statistical significance were in the hypothesized patterns but
were at significance levels of .20-.25. This suggests that more data might be needed to attain adequate power to detect small effects.

**Future Directions**

These models were developed using a Black/White binary and the interracial relations therein, which may lead one to wonder how they would apply to other racial/ethnic groups. Helms (1995) suggests that other racial/ethnic minority groups also experience deprivation as compared to the majority group; however, these experiences differ for each group given their history in the world and the United States. The overarching themes of overcoming racism, Helms (1995) argues, still apply to the broader set of racial/ethnic minority populations, even with their different experiences: “… [T]he general developmental issue for Whites is abandonment of entitlement, whereas the general developmental issue for people of color is surmounting internalized racism in its various manifestations” (Helms, 1995; p. 184).

Future research should also look into a broader array of organizations. The current study examined White-only and multicultural diversity climate manipulations for white collar work. Future research should investigate reactions to an all-Black organization. Indeed, this may be especially necessary for studying the immersion/emersion status of Black racial identity. Researchers would also do well to test the current model within the realm of blue collar work, as class may have been a confounding variable in the present study (Weaver, Crayne, & Jones, 2016).

What is more, I used an experimental design for this study. This is helpful in evaluating causal inference (Shadish & Cook, 2002) but provides less evidence about external validity. In order to better assess the latter, researchers should extend the current model by testing it in real-world situations. For example, a researcher interested in testing the generalizability might use the websites of various extant organizations, varying on diversity climate signals. Such research
would also benefit from a sample of actual job applicants. The current research included participants who were real workers in various fields and organizations, which contribute to its external validity. Future research should make such validity more of a focal point, however.

Racial identity in organizations is yet to be fully understood, especially in terms of its development. More research is needed on how individual racial identity affects the organization’s climate and bottom line, as well as interactions with colleagues. What is more, future research should assess the effectiveness of diversity training on racial identity. There have been mixed findings in terms of the effectiveness of diversity training (Bezrukova et al., 2016), and it seems that training targeted at the developmental statuses of racial identity may be especially effective due to the comprehensive outlining of the mechanisms through which individuals progress. For instance, diversity training could be customized based on where a person is in his or her racial identity development and ultimately be more effective due to their specific needs being met.

It is important to note that these models assume a very simplistic racial reality, when in truth there are many races left out. For example, many individuals with one Black and one White parent identify as Black, but we are unsure of how this might affect their racial identity development or if the process happens more quickly. Further, ethnicity is not taken into account. Many Latino/as identify as White, but their experience of Whiteness may differ substantially from those of White people, given their ethnic minority status in the US. Further, many Latino/as identify as Black, whereas some simply identify with their ethnicity. Thus, ethnicity should be considered in combination with race in future work. Further, other races and ethnicities were completely left out of the study (e.g., Native American/Alaska Natives, Asians). Helms (1990) touches on the subject of other races briefly, simply suggesting that the status of minority racial group member likely makes many characteristics of racial identity similar to Black racial
identity. However, she acknowledges that there are very different historical, political, and social contexts affecting other races, such as different stereotypes and historical relationships to Whites in the United States, suggesting that the model would not be completely generalizable to all racial/ethnic minority groups.

Future racial identity work should focus on treating the measurement of racial identity as a profile, in line with Helms’ (1990) recommendations. This is becoming more possible with the advent of latent class and latent profile analyses. Such work should also examine directly how racial identity of a team or members of an organization as a whole influences the diversity climate of that group, as well as whether or not racial identity can be developed or trained. Last, Schwartz and his colleagues (2014) propose that we combine process and content models of racial identity in order to reap the benefits of both. In other words, racial identity scholars should understand the aspects of what makes up racial identity, as in the MMRI model, as well as the process through which these aspects develop, as in Cross’ and Helms’ models. I would agree; thus, future research should attempt to understand both the process of and the content of racial identity in combination.

Conclusion

The current study examined racial identity, diversity climate, and PO fit, finding that for Whites, they interacted to predict organizational attraction. The racial identity of Whites proved to be a powerful predictor of how diversity climate influenced attraction, with those endorsing more advanced racial identity attitudes reporting higher levels of attraction to signals of a supportive diversity climate. Results have demonstrated that signaling more supportive diversity climates in recruitment advertising may, with no cost to attraction overall, help organizations become safer and friendlier places for diversity.
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## Appendix

**Table 1**
*Cross’ (1971) model of Black racial identity development – from Helms (1990)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preencounter</td>
<td>Identifies with White culture, rejects or denies membership in Black culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encounter</td>
<td>Rejects previous identification with White culture, seeks identification with Black culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Immersion/Emersion</td>
<td>Completely identifies with Black culture and denigrates White culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Internalization</td>
<td>Internalizes Black culture, transcends racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Internalization/Commitment</td>
<td>Internalizes Black culture, fights general cultural oppression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**
*Helms’ (1990) model of White racial identity development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Contact</td>
<td>Oblivousness to own racial identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Disintegration</td>
<td>First acknowledgment of White racial identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reintegration</td>
<td>Idealizes Whites/denigrates Blacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>Intellectualized acceptance of own and others’ race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Autonomy</td>
<td>Internalizes a multicultural identity with non-racist Whiteness as its core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Organizational characteristics (O’Reilly et al., 1991), their definitions and alphas, and ratings of E. M. Astel’s and participant self-ratings on a five point scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>E. M. Astel’s Score</th>
<th>E. M. Astel Alphas</th>
<th>Self-Rating Alphas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Promotes risk-taking, experimentation; does not promote being careful, stable, or secure</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to detail</td>
<td>Analytical, attentive to details, precise</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome orientation</td>
<td>Achievement-oriented, demanding, results-oriented, promote high expectations</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Aggressive, competitive, provide many opportunities</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
<td>Supportive, promote sharing information, praise good performance</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on rewards</td>
<td>High pay for performance, values professional growth</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team orientation</td>
<td>Team-oriented, promotes collaboration</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Values decisiveness, predictability, and low conflict</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The E.M. Astel scores and the E.M. Astel alphas were obtained in a pilot sample, and the self-ratings were those of the final focal sample.
### Table 4

**Variable descriptive statistics and their intercorrelations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (B)</th>
<th>SD (B)</th>
<th>α (B)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Mean (W)</th>
<th>SD (W)</th>
<th>α (W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DC Condition</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Order</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RIAS: Pre</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. RIAS: Enc</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RIAS: Imm</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RIAS: Int</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. WRCD: Con</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. WRCD: Reint</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. WRCD: Pseudo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. WRCD: Aut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PO Fit D</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Org Attraction</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Scores for the Black sample are shown on the right, and scores for the White sample are shown on the left. See table 3 for the alphas of the subscales that comprised the PO Fit d-score. DC Condition = diversity climate condition; RIAS Pre = preencounter attitudes; RIAS Enc = encounter attitudes; RIAS Imm = immersion/emersion attitudes; RIAS Int = internalization/commitment attitudes. WRCD Con = contact/disintegration attitudes; WRCD Reint = reintegration attitudes; WRCD Pseudo = pseudo-independent attitudes; WRCD Aut = autonomy attitudes. Diversity climate condition is coded low = -0.5 and high = 0.5. Order condition is coded manipulation and dependent variables first = -0.5 and individual differences first = 0.5.

†p < .10 *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 5
Hierarchical regression results for the interaction between PO fit and diversity climate predicting organizational attraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.32***</td>
<td>5.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Climate Condition</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Fit</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div Clim * PO Fit</td>
<td>-0.11†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>44.06***</td>
<td>3.55†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>44.06***</td>
<td>30.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 345$. Diversity climate condition is coded low = -0.5 and high = 0.5. Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented. ***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$, †$p < .1$, ††$p < .15$.
Table 6
Hierarchical regression results for the interaction between Black racial identity attitudes and diversity climate predicting organizational attraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preencounter</th>
<th>Encounter</th>
<th>Immersion/Emersion</th>
<th>Internalization/Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.22***</td>
<td>5.23***</td>
<td>5.25***</td>
<td>5.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Climate Condition</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>0.35†</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity Attitudes</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div Clim * RI</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>2.22††</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4.42*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.22††</td>
<td>1.89††</td>
<td>4.42*</td>
<td>2.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 179. Diversity climate condition is coded low = -0.5 and high = 0.5. Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented. ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05, †p < .1, ††p < .15
Table 7
Hierarchical regression results for the interaction between White racial identity attitudes and diversity climate predicting organizational attraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Reintegration</th>
<th>Pseudo-Independence</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.39***</td>
<td>5.38***</td>
<td>5.40***</td>
<td>5.39***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Climate Condition</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity Attitudes</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div Clim * RI</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.45**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>3.42*</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>8.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.42*</td>
<td>2.79*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 167. Diversity climate condition is coded low = -0.5 and high = 0.5. Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented. ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05, †p < .1, ††p < .15
### Table 8

*Relative weights analyses, including raw weights, percentage of the total variance explained, and confidence intervals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses and Interactions</th>
<th>Raw Rel. Weight</th>
<th>% R²</th>
<th>CI Lower</th>
<th>CI Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b. Preencounter X DC</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO X DC</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Encounter X DC</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO X DC</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Immersion X DC</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO X DC</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Integration X DC</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO X DC</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Contact X DC</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO X DC</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. Reintegration X DC</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO X DC</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b. Pseudo-Indep X DC</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO X DC</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b. Autonomy X DC</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO X DC</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* DC = diversity climate; PO = PO fit. Results are divided by the Black sample (2-5) and White sample (6-9). There were no statistically significant differences between the racial identity interaction relative weights and the PO fit interaction relative weights. *p < .05
Table 9
Hierarchical regression results for the interactions between Black racial identity attitudes, diversity climate, and PO fit predicting organizational attraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preencounter</th>
<th>Encounter</th>
<th>Immersion/Emersion</th>
<th>Internalization/Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Climate</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity Attitude</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Fit</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>0.56***</td>
<td>0.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Fit * Div Clim</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI * Div Clim</td>
<td>-0.24††</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>24.67***</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>24.60***</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>24.67***</td>
<td>15.52***</td>
<td>24.60***</td>
<td>14.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 167. Diversity climate condition is coded low = -0.5 and high = 0.5. RI = racial identity attitudes. Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented. *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, † p < .1, †† p < .15
Table 10
Hierarchical regression results for the interactions between White racial identity attitudes, diversity climate, and PO fit predicting organizational attraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Attraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.11††</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Climate Condition</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity Attitudes</td>
<td>-0.11††</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Fit</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Fit * Div Clim</td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI * Div Clim</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>8.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 179. Diversity climate condition is coded low = -0.5 and high = 0.5. RI = racial identity attitudes. Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented. *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, † p < .1, †† p < .15
Figure 1. Proposed relationships between diversity climate, racial identity, and PO fit and their influence on organizational attraction.
Figure 2. Recruitment websites for the fictitious organization E. M. Astel Consulting with differing diversity climates.
Figure 3. The interactive effects of PO fit and Diversity climate on organizational attraction.
Figure 4. The interactive effects of diversity climate and reintegration attitudes in White racial identity development on organizational attraction.
Figure 5. The interactive effects of pseudo-independent attitudes in White racial identity development and diversity climate on attraction to the organization.
Figure 6. The interactive effects of diversity climate and autonomy attitudes in White racial identity development on attraction to the organization.