

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

**BELIEFS ABOUT DIVERSITY
TRAININGS: MAJORITY- AND
MINORITY-GROUP MEMBER
PERSPECTIVES**

A Thesis in

Psychology

by

Teresa J. Frasca

© 2020 Teresa J. Frasca

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Science

August 2020

The thesis of Teresa J. Frasca was reviewed and approved by the following:

Stephanie A. Shields
Professor of Social Psychology and Women's, Gender & Sexuality Studies
Thesis Adviser

Kisha S. Jones
Assistant Professor of Industrial/Organizational Engineering

Melvin M. Mark
Professor of Social Psychology

Kristin A. Buss
Professor of Psychology and Human Development and Family Studies
Head of the Department of Psychology

ABSTRACT

The goal of the current study was to identify how demographic characteristics affect attendees' perceptions of the motivations behind diversity trainings as well as their experiences during diversity trainings. Research suggests that majority-group members (e.g., White, heterosexual men) will experience threat and resentment towards trainings, whereas the limited work on minority-group experiences suggests that they will experience tokenism. Mechanical Turk workers (N=200) completed a survey in which they answered both closed and open-ended questions assessing how comfortable they expect to feel during diversity trainings, who they think benefits from diversity trainings, and to what extent they perceive protection against legal liability, pressure to conform to political correctness norms, and a genuine desire to improve diversity at their organization as a motivation to hold the diversity training they attended. Results show that, regardless of group membership, participants believe 1) diversity trainings are held to improve an organization's diversity climate and protect against legal liability, but not to meet political correctness norms; and 2) all attendees, but especially minorities benefit from trainings. In addition, greater diversity of participants' training groups was associated with stronger beliefs that each of the three motivations was applicable to their diversity training. Training group diversity also positively predicted perceptions of training efficacy, suggesting a potential expectancy effect. Finally, while identity-related concerns such as tokenism and group status threat were mentioned in qualitative responses, additional exploratory analyses reflected participants' beliefs that aspects of the training (e.g., number of topics covered, types of exercises used) more strongly influence attendees' experiences. This study contributes to the mixed findings around the influence of group membership on attendees' experiences and points to the need for further work to elucidate how membership functions in the training context.

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables.....	v
List of Abbreviations.....	vii
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	2
Methods.....	19
Results.....	29
Additional Exploratory Analyses.....	54
General Discussion.....	55
Limitations and Future Directions.....	60
Conclusions.....	66
References.....	68
Appendix A: Study Questionnaire.....	80
Appendix B: Results of Analyses Regarding Sexual Orientation Groups.....	89
Appendix C: Correlation Tables for Hypotheses 1b and 4a	91
Appendix D: Coding Methodology and Results of Addit. Exploratory Analyses..	92

List of Tables

Table	Page Number
Table 1. <i>Participant demographics.</i>	20
Table 2. <i>Group differences in participants' beliefs that their diversity training was held to protect their company against legal liability (item a of the CMS).</i>	31
Table 3. <i>Group differences in participants' beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms (CMS Political Correctness Scale).</i>	31
Table 4. <i>Group differences in participants' beliefs that their diversity training was held because the organization genuinely cared about improving its diversity (CMS Genuine Change Scale).</i>	32
Table 5. <i>Moderation of group membership on the political correctness – efficacy relationship.</i>	36
Table 6. <i>Exploratory moderation of group membership on the legal liability – efficacy relationship.</i>	36
Table 7. <i>Exploratory moderation of group membership on the genuine change – efficacy relationship.</i>	36
Table 8. <i>Themes in Hegemonic versus non-Hegemonic participants' perceived goals of diversity trainings.</i>	39
Table 9. <i>Group differences in perceived benefit of diversity trainings to participants' ingroup vs. outgroup.</i>	41
Table 10. <i>Themes in Hegemonic versus non-Hegemonic participants' ideas about who benefits from diversity trainings.</i>	43
Table 11. <i>Group differences in participants' predictions of own comfort versus other's comfort during a diversity training.</i>	47
Table 12. <i>Themes in Hegemonic participants' descriptions of what affects diversity trainings' comfort for themselves and others.</i>	48
Table 13. <i>Themes in non-Hegemonic participants' ideas about what makes diversity trainings more or less comfortable for themselves and others.</i>	51
Table 14. <i>Summary of confirmatory and exploratory results.</i>	56
Table B-1. <i>Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet protect their company against legal liability (item a of the CMS).</i>	89
Table B-2. <i>Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet social norms of political correctness (CMS Political Correctness Subscale).</i>	89
Table B-3. <i>Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held because the organization genuinely cared about improving its diversity climate (CMS Genuine Change Subscale).</i>	89
Table B-4. <i>Correlations of beliefs that a diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms and beliefs that a diversity training was effective.</i>	89
Table B-5. <i>Moderation of group membership on the political correctness – efficacy relationship.</i>	89
Table B-6. <i>Exploratory moderation of group membership on the legal liability – efficacy relationship.</i>	89

Table B-7. <i>Exploratory moderation of group membership on the genuine change – efficacy relationship.</i>	90
Table B-8. <i>Results of linear regression examining group differences in perceived benefit of D's to ingroup vs. outgroup in heterosexual and non-heterosexual participants.</i>	90
Table B-9. <i>Results of linear regression examining group differences in predictions of own comfort versus other's comfort in heterosexual and non-heterosexual participants.</i>	90
Table B-10. <i>Correlations between perceived diversity climate and beliefs that a diversity training was effective.</i>	90
Table C-1. <i>Correlations of group composition with CMS subscales & overall scores, regarding Hypothesis 1b.</i>	91
Table C-2. <i>Correlations of beliefs that a diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms and beliefs that a diversity training was effective, regarding Hypothesis 4a.</i>	91
Table D-1. <i>Group differences in strength of diversity climate in participants' companies.</i>	92
Table D-2. <i>Pearson correlations between aspects of diversity trainings, political group membership, and training experiences.</i>	93
Table D-3. <i>Results of linear regression examining group differences in perceived benefit of DT's to ingroup vs. outgroup in single-topic versus multiple-topic trainings.</i>	93
Table D-4. <i>Exploratory moderation of group membership on the number topics – benefits relationship.</i>	93
Table D-5. <i>Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet protect their company against legal liability (item a of the CMS).</i>	94
Table D-6. <i>Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet social norms of political correctness (CMS Political Correctness Subscale).</i>	94
Table D-7. <i>Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held because the organization genuinely cared about improving its diversity climate (CMS Genuine Change Subscale).</i>	94
Table D-8. <i>Group differences in perceptions of diversity climate.</i>	94
Table D-9. <i>Results of one-way ANOVA examining group differences in perceived benefit of DT's to ingroup vs. outgroup across types of exercises used in a training.</i>	94
Table D-10. <i>Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet protect their company against legal liability (item a of the CMS).</i>	95
Table D-11. <i>Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet social norms of political correctness (CMS Political Correctness Subscale).</i>	95
Table D-12. <i>Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held because the organization genuinely cared about improving its diversity climate (CMS Genuine Change Subscale).</i>	95
Table D-13. <i>Group differences in perceptions of diversity training efficacy.</i>	95

List of Abbreviations

Unabbreviated Term/Phrase	Abbreviation
Diversity Training.....	DT
Political Correctness.....	PC
Company Motivations Scale.....	CMS
Social Identity Theory.....	SIT

Introduction

As the workforce continues to diversify, organizations are struggling to help employees adapt to new work environments that often require interacting with dissimilar others. Lawsuits, viral social media campaigns calling for boycotts, and the increasing demand to demonstrate that companies value and foster diversity have caused organizations to scramble for solutions that show they have learned from their biased mistakes, and that future discrimination won't happen at their diverse, inclusive company.

Diversity trainings are a popular approach to cultivating this image and addressing bias in the workplace. Diversity trainings refer to “a distinct set of programs aimed at facilitating positive intergroup interactions, reducing prejudice and discrimination, and enhancing the skills, knowledge, and motivation of people to interact with diverse others” (Pendry, Discroll & Field, 2007). Despite good intentions, diversity trainings have had mixed efficacy in achieving these goals (Dobbin, Kalev, & Kelly, 2007; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Harrison & Klein, 2007). Compounding this issue, studies are often under-powered and context-specific, yet make broad claims. Most studies have been conducted in response to a specific training at a given company, reflecting a focus on micro- versus macro-organizational outcomes and processes with their limited sample size and generalizability (Nishii, Khattab, Shemla & Paluch, 2018; Kochan et al., 2003). In fact, a recent meta-analysis revealed that 69% of studies reported an N of 100 or less (Alhejji et al., 2016). Moreover, the demographic makeup of these samples reflects the inequalities being addressed in diversity trainings. That is, most study participants are majority-group (e.g., in the United States - White, male, or heterosexual) members, leaving the voices of minority (e.g., in the United States - non-White, non-male, or non-heterosexual) group members unrepresented in the literature and organizations (Bezrukova, Spell, Perry & Jehn, 2016). Thus, researchers do not

know how a critical portion of diversity training attendees respond to and view diversity trainings, nor the effects these views have on training outcomes.

As a first step in filling this gap in the literature, I surveyed the opinions of both majority- and minority-group member employees in the present study. I aim to identify differential experiences surrounding diversity trainings based on majority- and minority-group membership, with the goal of using the results to create testable interventions for future research.

Literature Review

I first review the existing literature on the effects of group membership in the workplace. I then discuss expectations for how majority- and minority-group members respond to diversity trainings, and conclude by framing this discussion in the broader context of cultural pressure to be politically correct and how this approach may affect attendees' experiences of diversity trainings based on their group membership.

I organize my argument in terms of Kurt Lewin's person-situation interaction framework (1935). I first consider one factor that crosses the *person-situation* boundary - namely, company motivations to hold a diversity training. I then move into a review of the *situation* factor of diversity climate, followed by a summary of the *person* factor of group membership.

I. Person-Situation Interaction - Perceptions of Company Motivations

Whether it be the business case, which argues that diversity improves organizational profitability, or the moral fairness case, which argues that diversity is a matter of human rights and thus should be a priority itself, organizations must have at least one motivation to hold a training (Robinson & Dechant, 1997; van Dijk et al., 2012). As the attendees and constituents of an organization, employees are likely to guess at or interpret the reasons behind the initiative, which in turn may influence their reactions to it. Much of the research on these perceptions of

diversity programming uses Signaling Theory, which, when applied to an organizational context, argues that organizations engage in behaviors or display beliefs to reduce discrepancies in information between themselves and their employees (Spence, 1973). Indeed, researchers have suggested that “we can think of diversity practices...to serve as an important signaling function about what the organization values and the behavior it expects from its employees” (Nishii et al., 2018, p. 64). By having a diversity training, organizations are sending a signal about something – however, it is employees’ interpretations of these signals that are particularly important.

While one employee may interpret a diversity training as a signal that the organization only cares about the bottom line, another employee may interpret it as a signal that the organization morally cares about diversity. In this way, understanding the factors that could influence these interpretations – such as group membership – is critical to understanding the effects of such signals. Previous work demonstrates that signals may be especially important to minorities, as they are likely to search for evidence that their workplace is not a discriminatory environment (Waight & Madera, 2011; Walker, Feild, Bernerth, & Becton, 2012). By contrast, previous research on majority-group member reactions to Affirmative Action policies, diversity initiatives, and diversity trainings themselves demonstrates that perceptions of the motivations behind diversity programming may cause resentment in their group (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004; Legault, Gutsell, & Inzlicht, 2011; Mack et al., 2002; Richardson, 2005). In this way, interpretations of the signal that merely *having* a diversity training sends may result in group-based differences in perceptions of the motivations behind trainings.

Examining diversity trainings’ representation in popular media reveals three such perceived motivations: 1) providing protection against legal liability, 2) conforming to social pressure to be politically correct, or 3) creating a genuine change in the organization to improve diversity

(Gassam, 2019; Calfas, 2018). Previous research on diversity trainings reflects similar trends in motivations, with common goals of diversity trainings often being to 1) improve diversity in managerial roles at an organization, 2) decrease the number of legal challenges an organization faces, and 3) improve organizational performance (Nishii et al., 2018). As is echoed in both the popular and academic discourse, trainings are viewed as having multiple motivations that reveal a potential desire to promote diversity as well as prevent damage. Once we understand how diversity training attendees view these motivations, we can understand how such perceptions influence training efficacy.

Created and thus motivated by the need to minimize legal liability after the Civil Rights Act of 1965, diversity trainings were a response to the increased presence of women and racial minorities in the workplace post-World War II (Anand & Winters, 2008). By proactively hosting a training, organizations could check off the box and “avoid costly and embarrassing lawsuits and negative publicity” (Anand & Winters, 2008, p.357). Trainings often covered the bare minimum of information needed to meet legal regulations, and even when not held as a preventative measure, served more as mandated responses to lawsuits than workshops meant to improve intergroup relations. Indeed, formalized personnel practices have been shown to decrease discrimination charges against organizations, and an increase in the number of discrimination lawsuits has also been associated with a later increase in the representation of minorities at an organization (Nishii et al., 2018). While the desire to avoid legal liability is understandable, it supports the amoral business case for diversity trainings - signaling to majority-group and minority-group members that diversity trainings are merely a formality, not an internally motivated desire for change.

Recent years have seen an increase in the social support of minority groups, creating morality-based norms for individuals to act in politically correct ways. Although backlash against

the term “politically correct” in some circles has created the connotation that it means acting in ways that are unnecessarily and overly sensitive regarding the potential to offend, the current study uses it in its initial form – namely, acting in a manner that avoids offending others (especially those who are societally disadvantaged) (Cambridge Dictionary, 2020). These norms have spilled over into customers’ expectations of organizations, creating the perception that companies are now not only *legally* responsible for educating their employees about diversity, but *socially* responsible. This social responsibility is enforced by social media communities and the power of viral internet campaigns. Within one day, a company such as Starbucks can be boycotted for an employee acting in a non-politically correct manner. In this way, social media has created an environment in which organizations experience strong external pressures to show that they care about diversity and act in politically correct ways, with real consequences for profits if they fail to do so. Hosting a diversity training is one way to demonstrate valuing diversity, and thus meet political correctness norms.

Employees are not naïve to the possibility that diversity trainings may be motivated by the desire to *appear* to value diversity, even if an organization does not morally value diversity. For example, one Starbucks employee who is a minority-group member described the company’s post-scandal training as “less than genuine” because senior management forced her boss to host it against his will (Calfas, 2018). Cases such as these imply that violations of political correctness norms affect not only consumers, but also employees and their perceptions of diversity trainings. Indeed, previous research has shown that framing the desire to reduce prejudice as externally motivated instead of internally motivated results in greater participant prejudice – specifically, in majority-group members (Legault, Gutsell, & Inzlicht, 2011). This suggests that framing trainings or even knowing that attendees may view trainings in terms of social obligations to be politically

correct may backfire on initiative goals. Therefore, diversity trainings may do more harm than good for majority-group members when framed in the context of external social pressure to reduce one's prejudices and act in politically correct ways.

Finally, attendees might also perceive diversity trainings to be motivated by an organization's genuine desire to improve their diversity. Merely holding a training is enough to improve minority-group members' perceptions of diversity at an organization (Waight & Madera, 2011). By contrast, majority-group members may interpret a diversity training not as a sign that their organization cares about outcomes that improve all employees' experiences, but that their organization cares about improvement in minority-group members' circumstances at a cost to majority-group members' (Shteynberg et al., 2010). In this way, a signal that tells minority employees they belong may be interpreted by majority-group employees as telling them that they do not. However, no research to my knowledge directly measures majority-group members' perceptions that diversity trainings reveal an internally motivated organizational interest in improving diversity.

These prior findings demonstrate that concerns about organizations' motivations behind diversity trainings may still be prevalent in employee populations today and may be especially relevant to determining how both majority- and minority-group members react to and experience diversity trainings. By creating a scale with several facets to measure perceptions of these motivations, I will clarify how legal liability, political correctness norms, and a genuine desire to improve diversity climate affect employees' reactions to diversity trainings.

Taking into account the origin of diversity trainings, the current social media climate and resulting pressure to conform to political correctness norms, as well as previous research on

Signaling Theory, I have nine hypotheses regarding the relationship between group membership and perceptions of company motivations to host a diversity training.

If (as anecdotal data from popular press suggest) attendees view trainings as forced, then I hypothesize that minority-group members will believe more strongly than majority-group members that legal liability is a motivation to hold the training. Moreover, if their organization is perceived as being diverse (as suggested by the demographic composition of the participant's training group), then participants will be less likely to perceive that the training was held to protect against legal liability. This is because participants might infer that an organization doesn't need a training to prevent discrimination if minorities are already equally represented.

Hypothesis 1a: Majority-group members will report significantly weaker beliefs than minority-group members that their diversity training was held to prevent legal liability.

Hypothesis 1b: For both majority- and minority-group members, the more demographically diverse a participant's training group is, the less likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to protect against legal liability.

If political correctness norms are seen as an important motivation for training, then minority-group members will less strongly believe so in comparison to majority-group members because of majorities' concerns about "walking on eggshells" and feelings of exclusion as a result of the increasing acceptance of diversity (White Men's Leadership Report, 2013; Anand & Winters, 2008). Further, if their organization is perceived to be diverse, then majority-group members' will be less likely to perceive that the training was held to meet political correctness norms, because they will believe that the organization's true value of diversity has resulted in the diverse representation in the organization. By contrast, if an organization is perceived to be diverse, then minority-group members will be more likely to perceive that the training was held to meet political correctness norms consistent with anecdotal data from popular press that

demonstrates minorities' cynicism around the motivations behind diversity trainings beyond upholding the organization's reputation.

Hypothesis 2a: Majority-group members will report significantly stronger beliefs than minority-group members that their diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms.

Hypothesis 2b: The more demographically diverse a majority-group member's training group is, the less likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to meet political correctness norms. By contrast, the more demographically diverse a minority-group member's training group is, the more likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to meet political correctness norms.

Regarding perceptions that organizations genuinely want to improve their diversity, I predict that if participants see a genuine desire to change the diversity climate at an organization as a motivation to hold a diversity training, then minority-group members will less strongly believe so in comparison to majority-group members, due to majority group members' perceptions that majorities are now being excluded in exchange for minorities' inclusion (White Men's Leadership Report, 2013). Moreover, if an organization is perceived as being diverse, then it will be more likely that both majority- and minority-group participants saw the training as motivated by a genuine desire to improve their organization's diversity climate, because their organization's current levels of representation are a result of it valuing diversity and seeking diverse workers already.

Hypothesis 3a: Majority-group members will report significantly stronger beliefs than minority-group members that their diversity training was held because the company genuinely wants to improve their diversity climate.

Hypothesis 3b: For both majority- and minority-group members, the more demographically diverse a participant's training group is, the more likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to improve their organization's diversity climate.

As an initial step towards investigating how perceptions of company motivations – specifically, companies’ motivations to hold diversity trainings to meet political correctness norms - influence diversity training experiences and outcomes, I will test the relationship between these motivations and efficacy perceptions. If a training was perceived as being held to meet political correctness norms, then it would be perceived as less effective, because it was externally motivated and thus held for superficial, not internalized, reasons. Moreover, if majority- and minority-group members perceive political correctness norms as a motivation to host a diversity training to different extents as I hypothesize above, then group membership will moderate the motivation – efficacy relationship.

Hypothesis 4a: For all participants, I predict a negative relationship between a participant’s beliefs that a diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms, and their beliefs that the diversity training that they attended was effective.

Hypothesis 4b: Group membership will moderate the relationship between beliefs that a diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms and beliefs that the diversity training was effective, such that this relationship will be stronger for minority-group members than majority-group members.

The remainder of my hypotheses are tested using qualitative analyses of open-ended questions. Due to the history of diversity trainings and prior research that suggests that legal liability, political correctness, and genuine desire for diversity climate change may be perceived as motivations for diversity trainings, I predict that participants will spontaneously generate these same goals for trainings, without having first seen my items with three motivations.

Hypothesis 5: Participants will list the following three concepts as goals of their diversity training: 1) providing protection against legal liability, 2) meeting political correctness norms, and 3) creating genuine change in the organization’s diversity climate. Patterns will be the same among majority- and minority-group members.

Exploratory qualitative analysis will be done to discover what additional motives may emerge, and if they differ based on group membership.

Finally, building upon the history of diversity trainings as a way to teach majority-group members how to not discriminate against minorities, I predict that all participants will perceive diversity trainings to benefit minorities and that these beliefs will be reflected in both the quantitative and qualitative components of this project.

Hypothesis 6: Participants will predict that minorities benefit more from diversity trainings than majority-group members, regardless of their own majority- or minority-group status, and will echo this belief in their qualitative responses.

However, as my literature review also demonstrates, little work examines how group membership influences perceptions of and reactions to diversity trainings. In the remainder of this review, I will separate the person-situation factors that have been found to affect perceptions of diversity trainings and argue for two divergent majority-vs-minority pathways towards perceptions of trainings. First, I will focus on how organizations' broader diversity climates create the *situation* factor. Then I will turn to a discussion of the *person* factor as what each attendee brings with them to a training (i.e., their group membership and resulting preconceived ideas about trainings), as well as how this interacts with the *situation* factor of environment to reinforce differing experiences in trainings. In sum, this rest of this review begins with a broad overview of organizational factors and ends with a more specific consideration of group membership. However, it is important to note throughout how the person and situation factors cannot be disentangled completely, reinforcing the necessity of examining group membership in this context.

II. Situation Factor - Context of Diversity Trainings

Diversity Climates

The legal, political, and institutional environments that organizations exist within affect how organizations approach diversity (Nishii et al., 2018). Just as political correctness norms may motivate organizations to hold a diversity training, political correctness norms may influence an organization's broader diversity climate. Diversity climate refers to employees' perceptions of the extent to which an organization "values and integrates diversity and supports it through fair employment practices" (Singh, Winkel, & Selvarajan, 2013, p.243). Thus, an organization that has norms and practices that communicate fair processes and a valuing of minority-group members would have a strong diversity climate, and an organization with norms and practices that demonstrate bias or a lack of interest in minority-group members and their experiences would have a weak diversity climate.

Group membership interacts with an organization's diversity climate to create differential experiences for minority- and majority-group members. For example, the gaps in absenteeism and sales performance between majority- and minority-group members have been shown to decrease in organizations with pro-diversity messages (an indicator of a stronger diversity climate; McKay et al., 2007; McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2008). Minority-group members have been shown to be especially impacted by incongruity between a company's diversity messages and its actual diversity climate. If a company purports that it values diversity, but its workforce and procedures do not reflect those values, this discrepancy negatively influences minority-group members' trust of the organization and makes the organization appear less attractive to minorities (Windscheid et al., 2016). Moreover, the relationship between an organization's diversity climate and the frequency of employees' positive work behaviors (such as helping other employees who are

absent) can be influenced by an employee's racial identification (Singh, Winkel & Selvarajan, 2013). In this way, the complex relationship between group membership and diversity climate can affect not only work outcomes such as attraction, retention, and prosocial work behaviors, but also reactions to initiatives such as diversity trainings. By applying theories about the function of social identities, we can predict how the person factor of group membership may function in contexts such as diversity trainings specifically, within an organization's diversity climate.

III. Person Factor - Group Membership in the Workplace

One consequence of diversity trainings is that they make employees' social identities more salient than usual, heightening awareness of group differences (Waight & Madera, 2011; Amoroso, Loyd & Hoobler, 2010). Therefore, it is critical to understand how employees may navigate diversity trainings based on who they characterize as having the same social identities. Social Identity Theory (SIT) is mostly commonly used to explain this process. SIT posits that people categorize themselves and others into groups of similar others, or an ingroup, and dissimilar others, or an outgroup, basing their pride and self-esteem on group membership (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In the context of diversity trainings, these groups are often defined based on topics that are discussed – specifically, race, gender, and sexual orientation. Thus, employees who attend diversity trainings categorize their fellow attendees into ingroup and outgroup members based on these demographic characteristics and attach a sense of pride to how their group is discussed in a training. As demonstrated by the research cited prior, this sense of group membership affects how minorities and majority-group members experience diversity initiatives, and is important to understanding how they experience diversity trainings in particular. Due to the dearth of research on minority-group members' experiences during trainings, first I will focus on majority-group

members'. Then, I will pull from other research regarding minorities' experiences with diversity initiatives more broadly to hypothesize about their experiences in trainings specifically.

Majority-Group Member Experiences

As continuing conversations in the field have pointed out, the majority of psychological research is conducted with majority-group members (Rad, Martingano, & Ginges, 2018; Henrich, Heine & Norenzayan, 2010). Due to this overemphasis on majorities' experiences, we know much more about their relationship with increasing diversity – specifically, that it is threatening to their position in society. Previous research suggests that two such sub-types of threat - group status threat and heightened political correctness concerns - may be particularly relevant to the study of this population and diversity trainings.

Group Status Threat

A facet of Social Identity Theory is that people use group membership to feed their own self-esteem and pride. They want to feel good about groups that they are a member of and do so by comparing their group to others (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Thus, any threats to a group that one is a member of represent a threat to one's self-esteem. Group status threat builds upon SIT to argue that, if another group is seen more positively than one's own, one's position in society and perhaps one's resources are threatened. Much research has demonstrated that when majority-group members in particular feel this group status threat, it results in negative outcomes such as increased discrimination towards outgroup members (Branscombe & Wann, 1994), increased support of anti-immigration policies and desire to interact with one's own ethnic group (Craig & Richeson, 2014b), and decreased support of diversity overall (Outten et al., 2012). It follows, then, that diversity trainings may heighten group status threat among majority-group members and trigger negative outcomes.

Increased diversity may be inherently threatening to majority-group members and cause group status threat, as it redistributes power that has been historically concentrated in their group. Inclusion initiatives can be perceived by majority-group members as win-lose scenarios that are threatening to their status, as “victories that afford gains (e.g. increased access or protection) to marginalized groups are perceived as losses (e.g. reduced sense of freedom) for dominant group members” (Brannon, et al., 2018, pg. 59). For example, majority-group members have been shown to view affirmative action as taking away jobs, opportunities, and spots at universities and giving them to minorities unfairly (Kravitz & Kleinberg, 2000). The majority-group members’ loss of a job is seen as the minority-group members’ gain. Diversity trainings may elicit similar responses – in fact, several studies have documented majority-group members’ feelings of threat and resentment around diversity trainings, messages endorsing the importance of recognizing minority experiences, and perceptions of increasing racial diversity (Dover, Major, & Kaiser, 2016; Vorauer & Sasaki, 2011; Morrison, Plaut & Ybarra, 2010; Craig & Richeson, 2018). Thus, any organizational initiatives or trainings that specifically work to better or even celebrate minority-group members’ experiences may be perceived as an economic threat to majority-group members. In addition to this economic threat, however, is the threat of social resource threat – namely, the social capital lost if one violates political correctness norms.

Heightened Political Correctness Concerns

Building upon feelings of economic threat, majority-group members may resent diversity trainings, as they may feel like they have to “walk on egg shells around women and minorities, choosing words carefully so as not to offend” (Anand & Winters, 2008, p. 361). The practice of inhibiting such politically *incorrect* behavior has been documented to cause majority-group members to resent their minority-group counterparts (James, Brief, Dietz & Cohen, 2001; Flynn,

1999). White men in particular have historically resented diversity initiatives, arguing that their group has been the recipient of an unfair amount of blame for inequalities (White Men's Leadership Report, 2013; Flynn, 1999). Given this resentment, it seems likely that majority-group members who attend a diversity training are not completely open to its purpose and teachings, a perspective that has been shown to improve training efficacy (Dobbin, Shrage, & Kalev, 2015). In this way, majority-group members may be particularly sensitive to political correctness during a diversity training in comparison to minority-group members. Overall, then, diversity trainings may make majority-group members uncomfortable because they make both social and economic threat extremely salient.

Minority-Group Member Experiences

In contrast to the body of work studying majority-group member experiences around diversity initiatives, knowledge of the impact of trainings on minority-group members is limited. What little research exists demonstrates a mixture of findings, with some studies showing that diversity trainings make minority-group members feel more included, others, that satisfaction is reduced, and other times, no effects are found (Waight & Madera, 2011; Shore et al., 2011; Bell & Kravtitz, 2008). Therefore, further clarification of minority perspectives on diversity trainings is needed. By including minority-group members in such research, we can understand the cause of such mixed findings and find ways to use this information to improve minority experiences in diversity trainings. This study acts as a novel step in discovering such information.

Previous research has suggested that minority-group members may have unique experiences during diversity trainings due to increased identity salience. Specifically, the minority-focused nature of diversity trainings results in a spotlight on minority experiences and identities, in turn increasing minority identification with their groups (Waight & Madera, 2011). While this

increased group identification has positive effects, such as providing a buffer against the consequences of discrimination, there are also negative outcomes to having a minority identity made more salient. For example, minorities are often still the numerical minority in a diversity training, despite joining the workforce in increasing proportions (Gravier, 2019). Thus, not only does the content of a diversity training remind a minority-group member that they are a minority, but being surrounded by majority-group members may further increase the salience of this paucity (van Knippenberg et al., 2004). Employees who are the sole member of a group or in the extreme minority may be especially vulnerable to being perceived as a representative of their group (also referred to as being a “token” member of that group) and in turn experience diversity trainings differently from non-tokenized majority-group members.

Tokenism

Tokenism, or “the experience of being a member of a subgroup that composes 15% or less of the whole group” has been shown to have a number of negative outcomes (Kanter, 1977). These outcomes include being isolated from the majority due to perceived differences, creating pressure to perform well so that one’s minority group is not perceived as incompetent, and experiencing pressure to act in a stereotype-confirming manner (Kanter, 1977). In this way, tokenism reinforces one’s minority identity as subordinate to the dominant majority via perceptions that one is the sole representative of an entire group of people. This threat can occur in contexts such as diversity trainings that often discuss stereotypes of groups of people, creating the perfect environment for tokenism to be emphasized.

In particular, diversity trainings may contribute to “boundary heightening,” where differences between groups are made more salient than similarities and minorities are reminded of their relatively lower societal status (Amoroso, Loyd & Hoobler, 2010; Jackson, Thoits, & Taylor,

1995; Waight & Madera, 2011). This heightening may be particularly likely during diversity trainings that focus on group differences, which is a cause for concern given the way in which majority-group members tend to view initiatives as zero-sum – namely, as their loss in freedom, and minority-group members’ gains. The benefits that marginalized group members gain from organizational initiatives and trainings have been found to induce negative reactions in majority-group members, as programs that endorse multiculturalism – which celebrate minority experiences - alienate majority-group members while improving the experiences of minority-group members (Plaut, Garnett, Bufoadi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011). Minority-group members, in addition to awareness of their token status, may also be aware of this negative outcome and thus further threatened and uncomfortable during trainings.

Compounding this threat, the combination of tokenism awareness and diversity messaging has been demonstrated to differentially impact the positive or negative nature of trainings. One study found that when minority-group members are tokenized in their work context and received an organizational message promoting diversity, diversity messages negatively impacted their performance and persistence on a task (Apfelbaum et al., 2016). Further, identity threat (such as tokenism) has been connected with decreased organizational trust (Emerson & Murphy, 2014; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). While several researchers have suggested that diversity trainings that focus on group differences increase tokenism and therefore increase identity threat (Schneider & Northcraft, 1999; Flynn, 1999), “more empirical support is needed to test the effect” (Emerson & Murphy, 2014). Thus, it is important to understand how the demographic composition of one’s diversity training and the messages diversity trainings deliver may interact to create unique experiences for minority-group members.

Building upon the heightened awareness of being in the numerical minority and reflecting the problem of mixed diversity messages, tokens may also consider company motivations in holding a diversity training when forming their opinion on it. As Windscheid and colleagues argue, organizations which signal that they have a warm diversity climate with their promotional materials yet do not reflect that diversity in their executive board are perceived as having low behavioral integrity – in essence, they “talk the talk but do not walk the walk” (2016). Such mixed diversity messages decrease the attractiveness of companies. It seems likely then that diversity trainings held for reasons that do not reflect high behavioral integrity or a genuine valuing of diversity would result in similar outcomes, such a decreased organizational trust and perceived colder diversity climates. It is critical for minority-group members not only to *see* the signal that an organization is trying to incorporate diversity trainings, but further understand the motivations *behind* it. This study will be one of the first, to my knowledge, to examine how these factors influence minority-group members’ experiences of diversity trainings.

Given the robustness of group status threat and available work on tokenism, I predict that both minority- and majority-group members will expect to be uncomfortable during diversity trainings to the same quantitative extent. However, I predict that their responses to the open-ended questions will reveal the role of group status threat and tokenism in majority versus minority participants’ reported comfort levels, respectively.

Hypothesis 7: Qualitative responses will reflect group status threat concerns for majority-group members, and tokenism concerns for minority-group members.

In addition to these hypothesized tests, I completed planned exploratory analyses to fully examine the relationships between group membership and perceptions of diversity trainings. They are reported at the end of the results section.

Methods

Participants

Previous meta-analytic work has found that the effects of diversity trainings tend to be small-to-medium (Kalinowski et al., 2013). Thus, a priori calculations in G*Power used a conservative effect size of 0.3 to estimate the number of participants needed to achieve a power of 0.8 for majority-minority group unmoderated comparisons. Calculations revealed that 176 participants would be needed, but 211 in total were recruited as 20% of eligible participants were expected to provide incomplete data or fail the attention checks based on my prior experience conducting research through MTurk.

In total, 324 participants responded to the posting on MTurk. Of these 324, a significant portion did not pass the 5-question screening ($n = 116$) and thus did not see the full survey and were deleted from the datafile prior to any analyses. These participants were not compensated for their participation, while all participants who did pass the screening were compensated, regardless of their eligibility beyond this criterion. Of those who were eligible to participate, data for participants who repeated an IP address ($n = 26$), did not complete the survey in full ($n = 43$), did not pass at least one of two attention checks ($n = 10$) and/or indicated that they were not native to the United States ($n = 5$) were compensated but deleted from the data file prior to analyses, leaving a final sample size of 195 participants.

As depicted in Table 1, the majority of participants self-identified as White, heterosexual, or male ($M_{\text{age}} = 33.36$, $SD = 8.75$). All participants reported being native to the United States and were required to have a 90% or above HIT approval rate on Mechanical Turk.

Table 1. *Participant demographics.*

Race/Ethnicity		Gender		Sexual Orientation		Political Ideology	
Asian (<i>n</i> = 16)	8.2%	Woman (<i>n</i> = 67)	34.4%	Bisexual (<i>n</i> = 33)	16.9%	Very Conservative (<i>n</i> = 24)	12.3%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native (<i>n</i> = 5)	2.6%	Man (<i>n</i> = 127)	65.1%	Gay (<i>n</i> = 2)	1.0%	Conservative (<i>n</i> = 28)	14.4%
Black/ African American/ Caribbean (<i>n</i> = 32)	16.4%	Transwoman (<i>n</i> = 1)	0.5%	Lesbian (<i>n</i> = 5)	2.6%	Somewhat Conservative (<i>n</i> = 12)	6.2%
Middle Eastern (<i>n</i> = 0)	0%	Transman (<i>n</i> = 0)	0%	Queer (<i>n</i> = 0)	0%	Moderate or Middle of the Road (<i>n</i> = 32)	16.4%
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander (<i>n</i> = 1)	0.5%	Non-binary, genderqueer, or agender (<i>n</i> = 0)	0%	Heterosexual or straight (<i>n</i> = 155)	79.5%	Somewhat Liberal (<i>n</i> = 19)	9.7%
Spanish/ Hispanic/ Latino (<i>n</i> = 3)	1.5%	No information given (<i>n</i> = 0)	0%			Liberal (<i>n</i> = 42)	21.5%
White/Caucasian (<i>n</i> = 129)	66.2%					Very Liberal (<i>n</i> = 38)	19.5%
Biracial/Multiracial (<i>n</i> = 6)	3.5%						
No given information (<i>n</i> = 2)	1%						
Total (<i>n</i> = 195)	100%		100%		100%		100%

Protocol

Participants were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk from August 6th, 2019 through August 8th, 2019. To the author's knowledge, no significant cultural events occurred during this period of time that would affect participants' responses.

The recruitment text described the survey as asking questions about perceptions of trainings in the workplace. Participants were told that if they did not qualify for the study, they would be informed by a pop-up message and unable to continue the survey. Participants then answered five questions assessing their experiences with diversity trainings in the workplace. In reality, the sole eligibility criteria for this study was that participants responded "Yes" to the question asking if they had attended a mandatory diversity training within the last year at their place of work. Participants who responded either "No" or "I don't remember" were informed that they didn't qualify and thanked for their time. All eligible participants were presented with the full consent form, informed that they would be paid \$1.56 upon completion of the survey, and if they consented to participating, began completing the full survey.

See Appendix A for all survey measures. Participants responded first to a set of questions assessing their perceptions of diversity trainings broadly and how they predicted others would react to diversity trainings. After these items, participants were instructed to answer the rest of the survey based on their own experiences during the most recent workplace diversity training they had attended within the last year. Upon completion of the survey, participants were debriefed and provided with a code to submit to the HIT for compensation.

Measures

Several items were included in the survey to provide data for future exploratory analyses and/or to reduce participant suspicion as to the goals of the study. The measures reported below correspond only to items that were used to test hypotheses (see Appendix A for all measures).

Comfort of Self vs. Others. Participants were instructed to think about diversity trainings broadly, drawing on any representations they've seen in the media or the experiences of friends, family members, or themselves. Participants then rated how comfortable they predicted *they* would feel during a diversity training on a scale from 1 (Extremely Uncomfortable) to 10 (Extremely Comfortable). Participants then completed the same measure predicting how comfortable "*others*" (intentionally left undefined so as to avoid social desirability concerns and to reflect broad ingroup-outgroup memberships) would feel so that a self-versus-other score could be computed by subtracting "other" scores from "self" scores. In this way, a negative score would imply that a participant thought others would be more comfortable than they would be, and a positive score would imply that the participant thought they would be more comfortable than others. Finally, participants responded to an open-ended measure asking what aspects of a diversity training would make them feel this predicted level of comfort or discomfort, and what aspects would make the imagined others feel their predicted level of comfort or discomfort.

Benefits to Self vs. Others. Participants rated the degree to which they felt that a diversity training would benefit their ingroup, prompted broadly as "people like you", on a scale from 1 (Not At All) to 10 (Extremely). Participants then rated the extent to which they predict others feel that diversity trainings benefit "people like them." A second self-versus-other score was calculated. A negative score would imply that participants think others benefit more from a diversity training than themselves, and a positive score would mean that participants think they

benefit more than others. Participants then responded to an open-ended question asking what aspects of a diversity training would make them feel that the training benefited people like themselves and would make others feel that the training benefited people like themselves.

Trainee Group Composition. Participants provided five ratings for how much variety they perceived in the 1) racial/ethnic composition, 2) gender composition, 3) sexual orientation composition, 4) religious composition, and 5) age composition of the group of people who attended their specific diversity training session on a scale from 1 (Very Little) to 7 (A Great Deal). Each domain was rated separately and participants could also report that they did not know. Originally, this measure included an option labeled “Not Applicable”, but this response was recoded to represent the lowest score on the scale (1) and all other responses were shifted one number up the scale. Participants’ average group composition scores were calculated by averaging their five separate scores ($\alpha = .79$). Participants were also asked to list other forms of training group diversity and rate how much variety was present in these characteristics, but only three of 195 participants provided additional forms (forms were: mental handicap status, endorsement of political correctness, and socioeconomic status). As so few participants provided additional reasons, these three responses were excluded from analyses using perceptions of training group composition.

Training Goals. An open-ended question asked what they thought their diversity training was trying to accomplish. There were no space limitations or requirements.

Company Motivations Scales. Participants rated the extent to which they believed legal, political correctness, and climate motivations for holding a diversity training applied to their own diversity training, on a scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree), with an option to select “Don’t Know.” Beliefs about legal motivations were assessed with one item (“My

company held this training to check off a box”). Beliefs about conformity to political correctness norms were assessed with two items (e.g., “My company held this training because it’s socially expected of them”; $r = .14, p = .05$). Finally, beliefs that the participant’s company held the training to genuinely improve diversity at their organization were assessed with five items (e.g., “My company held this training because they care about diversity”; $\alpha = .85$). Separate scores for each of these facets were calculated by averaging participant ratings for items within the facet only. Thus, a participant’s score on the political correctness motivation facet was calculated by averaging their responses on the two relevant items, and their score on the genuine change motivation facet was calculated by averaging their responses on the five relevant items. In addition, participants were provided with the opportunity to list additional motivations they could think of and rate them on the same scale as the eight provided motivations. These additional motivations were analyzed along with the rest of the qualitative data. Finally, this scale also included one of two attention checks embedded in the survey.

Diversity Climate. The diversity climate of a participant’s company was assessed using seven items from three factors of the Diversity Perceptions Scale (Mor Barak, Cherin & Berkman, 1998). Three items were drawn from the Organizational Fairness factor (e.g., “Managers here have a track record of hiring and promoting employees objectively, regardless of their race, sex, religion, or age”); two items from the Organizational Inclusion factor (e.g., “The company spends enough money and time on diversity awareness and related training”); and two items from the Personal Comfort factor, both of which were reverse-coded (e.g., “Diversity issues keep some work teams here from performing to their maximum effectiveness”). Participants rated their agreement with each statement by rating it on a scale from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 6 (Strongly Disagree). An overall diversity climate score was computed, such that

participant responses for all seven items were averaged ($\alpha = .75$). This section of the survey also included the other attention check, to be used to determine exclusion.

Training Efficacy. Participants rated how effective they thought the diversity training they attended was on a scale from 1 (Completely Ineffective) to 10 (Extremely Effective).

Participant Demographics & Group Membership Coding. Participants reported their age, race/ethnicity, gender identification, sexual identification, and whether they were native to the United States.

Additional aspects of diversity trainings. Finally, participants were provided with open-ended space to comment on any additional aspects of diversity trainings that were not covered in the content of the survey. There was no limitation or requirement for this question.

Data Analysis Plan

Group Membership Coding

Three separate dummy codes were created for each participant's race, gender, and sexual orientation. Within each demographic variable, participants with an identity that is in the minority in the United States population as a whole were coded as a 1, and those with majority-group status were coded as a 0. For example, a White man who identified as gay would receive dummy codes of 0, 0, and 1, respectively. In addition to these codes, an Intersectional Positioning dummy code was created, such that a participant with a majority-group identity in all three categories was coded as Hegemonic, or 0 (i.e., a heterosexual White man), whereas a participant with a minority-group identity in any of the categories was coded as non-Hegemonic, or 1 (i.e., a heterosexual, White woman; a gay, Black man; and a bisexual, Hispanic woman would all receive a code of 1). My use of "hegemonic" refers to hegemonic masculinity – a conception of masculinity in which men whose multiple privileged identities afford them power

over both women and other men. Hegemonic masculinity reflects a White, heterosexual, physically fit conception of masculinity, arguing that these men are highest in the social hierarchy (Connell, 1987). Thus, a Hegemonic versus non-Hegemonic comparison would compare participants with the most societally afforded power versus those with relatively lesser levels of power.

Impeding my ability to capture the qualitatively different experiences of having multiple, intersecting identities and their effect on experiences during and perceptions of diversity trainings is my forced reliance upon additive statistics. Intersectionality Theory argues that individuals hold multiple identities that interact with one another in non-additive ways to create unique experiences of privilege and oppression within our system (Crenshaw, 1991). With current statistical methods, I cannot represent how my participants' identities intersect to influence their experiences. For example, the results of factorial interactions between the race and gender dummy codes would not accurately depict how race and gender interact within one individual – these identities cannot be parsed out into separate, quantitative entities. As a participant in one of Lisa Bowleg's qualitative studies of intersectionality describes, "once you've blended the cake, you can't take the parts back to the main ingredients" (Bowleg, 2013, p. 758). The quantitative "main ingredients" of a participant's identity – namely, their race, gender, and sexual orientation – cannot be added together to create the "cake" of interactive results. The dummy codes I use here are to guide understandings of how group structures of power within each identity might reveal patterns in training experiences, but by the nature of intersectional identities, even these dummy codes cannot fully capture how those trends are related *only* to that singular identity. Future qualitative research is needed to delve into this area, but as I intended my study to capture diversity training attendees' perceptions *broadly*, I will not

(and cannot) speak to how the converging identities of my participants created unique experiences for them.

Quantitative Analyses

Quantitative analyses were conducted by regressing these dummy codes onto the relevant dependent variable. Throughout the results section, rows in tables labeled “Intersectional” demonstrate the results of tests comparing Hegemonic (White, heterosexual men) participants to non-Hegemonic (non-White, non-heterosexual, or non-men in some way) participants; rows labeled as “Race” demonstrate the results of tests comparing monoracial-White to non-monoracial White participants; rows labeled as “Gender” depict results of tests comparing self-identifying men to non-men; and finally, rows labeled as “Sexuality” depict results of tests comparing heterosexual to non-heterosexual participants on a given dependent variable.

While these dummy codes do allow for comparisons of participants with just one minority identity versus those in “double jeopardy” with two or more (Beal, 1969), the insufficient number of minorities to reflect various intersecting identities prevents in-depth analyses. Thus, the Intersectional Positioning dummy code acts as an overall consideration of the effects of minority identities and relative power in American culture. (Limitations of this approach are addressed in the Limitations and Future Directions section.)

Qualitative Analyses

Qualitative analyses were conducted in NVivo 12. Prior to importing the data into NVivo, the data file was split into two – one containing all Hegemonic participants’ responses, the other containing all non-Hegemonic participants’ responses to allow for the comparison of majority- versus minority-group member themes. Non-Hegemonic participants’ responses to the open-ended comfort levels question were coded first, then Hegemonic participants’ responses to

the same question were coded. Order was alternated such that, next, Hegemonic participants' responses to the perceived beneficiaries question were coded, then non-Hegemonic participants'. Finally, non-Hegemonic participants' responses to the open-ended question assessing perceived diversity training goals were coded, then Hegemonic participants' responses were coded. This alternation of coding was done to prevent the influence of one groups' complete set of codes on the other group's.

All analyses were conducted using the emergent coding method, as well as the First Cycle and Second Cycle approach (Saldaña, 2009). Emergent coding allows for the concepts to come from the data itself, instead of mapping a set of predetermined codes onto participant responses. Thus, in the First Cycle of analyses, I went through each participant response and created a code in NVivo with a short phrase to represent its theme. I did not restrict the number of codes that I created, and in doing so, had many specific codes that were similar to one another but still unique in a nuanced way. After coding all of a group's responses to one question (i.e., after having coded all of the Hegemonic participants' responses to the open-ended question about who trainings benefit), I completed another pass through the same group's data and grouped together responses that I determined to be conceptually similar. Finally, I completed a third pass through the same data and re-coded any passages that seemed to fit better into a different code than the one I had originally assigned.

For example, when analyzing Hegemonic participants' responses to the open-ended question about what makes diversity trainings uncomfortable, my First Cycle revealed (of many others) two specific codes: one in which participants mentioned that they thought diversity trainings made White people feel guilty, and another in which participants thought that White attendees felt like they were being blamed for issues around diversity. To me, these seemed

conceptually similar enough that I collapsed them under the heading of “Majority-Group Member Discomfort”. I repeated this Second Cycle of coding by collapsing the rest of my Hegemonic discomfort individual codes into broader themes, which resulted in several large themes with individual codes underneath them. I then combed through the Hegemonic discomfort responses once more and re-coded any passages that I assessed as belonging to different codes than the one I’d originally assigned. Only after completing this process for all of the Hegemonic participants’ discomfort question responses, did I begin the process for non-Hegemonic participants’ discomfort question responses. I chose not to have a second coder, as previous research has argued that when employing an emergent coding approach, a second coder does not add additional objectivity beyond a first coder (Blair, 2015; Zhao, Liu & Deng, 2013).

After completing all of the coding for both Hegemonic and non-Hegemonic participants’ coding, I then compared the names of the larger themes, and re-named the themes to be the same if I felt that they were conceptually the same across group membership. However, I did not re-name any of the individual codes beneath the larger themes in order to retain nuance of analyses. This process was repeated for analysis of all open-ended questions.

Results

A summary table of the findings is provided at the end of the results section (Table 14). Patterns of the results of the tests for each dependent variable are first described broadly, and then in terms of specifics for the race, gender, and intersectional positioning group comparisons. Post-hoc power analyses demonstrated a sufficient number of participants for comparisons of Hegemonic ($N = 70$) versus Non-Hegemonic ($N = 125$) participants, White ($N = 129$) versus non-White ($N = 66$) participants, and men ($N = 127$) versus non-men ($N = 68$). There was insufficient power, however, to compare the responses of non-heterosexual participants ($N = 40$)

to heterosexual participants ($N = 155$). Due to this large imbalance in sample size, the results of the tests comparing participants based on sexual orientation group membership are not discussed, although the findings are presented in Appendix B.

First I will address the *person-situation* factor of perceptions of company motivations to hold diversity trainings. Then, I will isolate the *person* factor of group membership and examine its influence on feelings about diversity trainings, the motivations behind diversity trainings, and the perceived efficacy of diversity trainings. Finally, I will incorporate the *situation* factor of diversity climates to investigate how it interacts with the *person* factor via exploratory analyses.

Hypotheses 1a-3b. As a reminder, I collected both open-ended qualitative data on participants' perceptions, allowing them to generate their lists of motivations, then afterwards, collected ratings of the relevance of different motivations that I provided. For ease of understanding, I will first report the results of the quantitative ratings, then the results of the qualitative analyses.

Hypotheses 1a, 2a, and 3a predicted that participants' group membership would affect the extent to which they saw each of the three motivations to hold a diversity training as relevant to their experiences. For all three motivations, group membership dummy codes were regressed on participant ratings of each motivation's relevance. Hypotheses 1b, 2b, and 3b predicted that group membership would influence the relationship between the composition of the training group and the perceived motivation to hold a diversity training.

Hypothesis 1a predicted that *majority-group members will report significantly weaker beliefs than minority-group members that their diversity training was held to prevent legal liability*. Results did not support this hypothesis, as strength in the belief that participants' diversity trainings were motivated by legal protection did not differ by group membership across all three group comparisons (all p 's > .25; see Table 2). Hypothesis 2a predicted that *majority-*

group members will report significantly stronger beliefs than minority-group members that their diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms. Findings did not support Hypothesis 2a, as group membership did not explain any additional variance in perceptions across all three group comparisons (all p 's > .17; see Table 3). Finally, Hypothesis 3a predicted that majority-group members will report significantly stronger beliefs than minority-group members that their diversity training was held because the company genuinely wants to improve their diversity climate. Again, findings did not support this hypothesis, as including group membership did not explain addition variance in perceptions of this motivation across all three group comparisons (all p 's > .60, See Table 4). Thus, overall it appears that group membership did not influence the strength of participants' beliefs about relevant motivations to hold a diversity training.

Table 2. Group differences in participants' beliefs that their diversity training was held to protect their company against legal liability (item a of the CMS).

Participant Group Comparisons	Majority-Group Mean (SD)	Minority-Group Mean (SD)	b	df	F^*	p	PRE	Lower CI	Upper CI
Intersectional	5.13 (1.77)	4.99 (1.88)	-0.14	186	0.25	.62	-----	-----	-----
Race	4.99 (1.85)	5.14 (1.83)	0.15	186	0.28	.60	-----	-----	-----
Gender	5.15 (1.71)	4.83 (2.06)	-0.33	186	1.32	.25	-----	-----	-----

Table 3. Group differences in participants' beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms (CMS Political Correctness Scale).

Participant Group Comparisons	Majority-Group Mean (SD)	Minority-Group Mean (SD)	b	df	F^*	p	PRE	Lower CI	Upper CI
Intersectional	4.56 (1.63)	4.86 (1.37)	0.30	192	1.89	.17	-----	-----	-----
Race	4.68 (1.54)	4.89 (1.33)	0.20	192	0.83	.36	-----	-----	-----
Gender	4.86 (1.47)	4.56 (1.47)	-0.30	192	1.83	.18	-----	-----	-----

Table 4. Group differences in participants' beliefs that their diversity training was held because the organization genuinely cared about improving its diversity (CMS Genuine Change Scale).

Participant Group Comparisons	Majority-Group Mean (SD)	Minority-Group Mean (SD)	<i>b</i>	df	<i>F</i> *	<i>p</i>	PRE	Lower CI	Upper CI
Intersectional	5.49 (1.29)	5.54 (1.16)	0.05	193	0.07	.79	-----	----	----
Race	5.53 (1.22)	5.49 (1.18)	-0.04	193	0.05	.82	-----	----	----
Gender	5.55 (1.14)	5.46 (1.33)	-0.10	193	0.28	.60	-----	----	----

Hypothesis 1b predicted that *for both majority- and minority-group members, the more demographically diverse a participant's training group is, the less likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to protect against legal liability..* This hypothesis was not supported. For minority-group members, Hegemonic, and White participants, all correlations were nonsignificant (all p 's > .39); only men's scores reflected a significant positive correlation, such that a more diverse group of attendees was associated with a stronger belief that a diversity training was held to cover legal liability, $r = .19$, $p = .05$ (see Appendix C for all correlations).

Hypothesis 2b predicted that *the more demographically diverse a majority-group member's training group is, the less likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to meet political correctness norms. By contrast, the more demographically diverse a minority-group member's training group is, the more likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to meet political correctness norms..* This hypothesis was partially supported. All group comparisons revealed a positive correlation between group composition and political correctness norms, such that a more diverse group of attendees was associated with a stronger belief that a diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms (all r 's > .26, p 's < .05). Thus, the hypothesize directional differences based on group membership were not found.

Finally, Hypothesis 3b predicted that *for both majority- and minority-group members, the more demographically diverse a participant's training group is, the more likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to improve their organization's diversity climate..* This hypothesis was supported. All group comparisons revealed a positive correlation between group composition and beliefs in the organization's genuine desire to change, such that a more diverse group of attendees was associated with a stronger belief that a diversity training was held because a company wanted to diversify their workforce and make their company a more welcoming environment for all (all r 's > .28, p 's < .01). In sum, group membership did not have an effect on the extent to which participants saw each of three motivations as applying to their own training, yet group composition appears to be associated with these perceptions.

The raw scores of each motivation can give us a sense if one motivation is more relevant than others. Indeed, when collapsing across group membership, participants rated the genuine desire to improve diversity at an organization as the most relevant motivation for hosting a diversity training ($M = 5.52$, $SD = 1.21$), followed by an organization's desire to protect against legal liabilities ($M = 5.04$, $SD = 1.84$) and pressure to conform to political correctness norms ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 1.47$). In this way, it appears that diversity trainings signal to attendees that an organization is motivated by intrinsic and extrinsic reasons to host them, but also that organizations truly care about improving diversity above and beyond extrinsic motivations.

Hypothesis 4a and 4b. Hypothesis 4a predicted that *for all participants, there will be a negative relationship between a participant's beliefs that a diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms, and their beliefs that the diversity training that they attended was effective.*

Hypothesis 4a was not supported. For all participants except heterosexual White men, there was a significant positive correlation between beliefs of political correctness as motivation and

beliefs about the efficacy of their diversity training, such that the more a participant believed their diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms, the more effective they believed their training to be (all p 's < .05, all group comparisons in Appendix C). Thus, Hypothesis 4a was not supported.

However, exploratory analyses revealed that some types of extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation do predict perceived efficacy in the hypothesized direction. There was a significant negative correlation between participants' perceptions that the training was held to prevent legal liabilities and a training's efficacy, such that trainings were perceived as less effective the more they were perceived to be motivated by a desire to avoid legal liability ($r = -.16, p = .03$). Therefore, at least one extrinsically motivated reason to hold trainings was not associated with improved perceptions of training efficacy. By contrast, exploratory analyses revealed a significant positive correlation between participants' perceptions that a training was held due to a genuine desire for change in organizational diversity and perceptions of the training's efficacy, such that trainings were perceived as more effective the more they were perceived to be motivated by a desire to improve diversity (all r 's > .58, all p 's < .01). The strength of this relationship might indicate an expectancy effect. Expectancy effects refer to the phenomenon wherein a participant believes that a certain outcome will arise from an intervention, and in turn reports that the outcome occurred (Supino, 2012). In this context, participants' beliefs that the diversity training was held to improve diversity at their organization were highly associated with their belief that the training was effective. Moreover, additional exploratory analyses presented at the conclusion of this manuscript further support the potential presence of an expectancy effect. However, it is also possible that trainings motivated by intrinsic desires to improve diversity may be run and received in different ways from those

motivated by extrinsic desires, affecting perceived training efficacy. Indeed, research suggests that intrinsic motivation facilitates the desire to learn and is tied to enhanced “persistence, performance, and productivity” in employees when paired with prosocial motivations (Grant & Berg, 2010, p. 2). Trainings (a prosocial intervention) that are perceived as being motivated by an organization’s intrinsic desire to improve diversity therefore might actually be more effective, or at least perceived as more effective. The equal possibility of these two explanations warrants further research into the role of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation in perceptions of diversity trainings, and the downstream consequences of those perceptions.

Hypothesis 4b predicted that *group membership will moderate the relationship between beliefs that a diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms and beliefs that the diversity training was effective, such that this relationship will be stronger for minority-group members than majority-group members*. To tease apart how group membership factors into these relationships between perceived motivations and training efficacy, several confirmatory and exploratory analyses were conducted. Hypothesis 4b was not supported. Results showed that group membership did not moderate this relationship (all p 's > .20; see Table 5 for all group comparisons).

Exploratory tests were then conducted to test whether group membership affects the relationship between the other two motivations as perceived training efficacy. Regarding the relationship between legal liability and perceived efficacy, results showed that group membership did not moderate the association between the two factors (all p 's > .51 see Table 6 for all group comparisons). Thus, it appears that regardless of one’s minority- or majority-group status, there was a negative association between perceptions that a training was held to protect against legal liability and its perceived efficacy. Similarly, results showed that the relationship

between perceptions of an organization's genuine desire to improve diversity and the perceived efficacy of the training was not moderated by group membership (all p 's > .09, see Table 7 for all group comparisons). Thus, it appears that regardless of one's minority- or majority-group status, the positive association between perceptions that a training was held because an organization truly wants to change its diversity and the training's perceived efficacy remained the same.

Table 5. *Moderation of group membership on the political correctness – efficacy relationship.*

Participant Group Comparisons	<i>Beta (of interaction)</i>	df	R²	<i>p</i>	Lower CI	Upper CI
Intersectional Positioning	0.14	190	.08	.20	-----	-----
Race	0.01	190	.08	.91	-----	-----
Gender	0.10	190	.09	.38	-----	-----

Table 6. *Exploratory moderation of group membership on the legal liability – efficacy relationship.*

Participant Group Comparisons	<i>Beta (of interaction)</i>	df	R²	<i>p</i>	Lower CI	Upper CI
Intersectional Positioning	0.05	184	.03	.58	-----	-----
Race	-0.06	184	.03	.51	-----	-----
Gender	-0.05	184	.04	.58	-----	-----

Table 7. *Exploratory moderation of group membership on the genuine change – efficacy relationship.*

Participant Group Comparisons	<i>Beta (of interaction)</i>	df	R²	<i>p</i>	Lower CI	Upper CI
Intersectional Positioning	0.17	191	.42	.11	-----	-----
Race	0.16	191	.41	.15	-----	-----
Gender	0.18	191	.42	.09	-----	-----

Hypothesis 5. Qualitative analyses were conducted using an emergent coding scheme to test Hypothesis 5, which predicted that in response to an open-ended question, *participants will list the following three concepts as goals of their diversity training: 1) providing protection against legal liability, 2) meeting political correctness norms, and 3) creating genuine change in the organization's diversity climate. Patterns will be the same among majority- and minority-group members.* The first pass of analyses resulted in 10 unique codes for Hegemonic participants and 8 unique codes for non-Hegemonic participants, which revealed a great deal of conceptual overlap. Codes were then condensed to create a final set of 7 codes for Hegemonic participants and 6 codes for non-Hegemonic participants. See Table 8 for all themes and examples of participant responses by group membership.

Indicating partial support for Hypothesis 5, the two most prevalent reasons for holding a diversity training mentioned by both Hegemonic and non-Hegemonic participants were to protect against legal liability, and to improve the diversity climate at an organization. However, contrary to Hypothesis 6, the perception that their diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms was only present in non-Hegemonic participants' responses, and was not particularly prevalent even within this group. In this way, two of the three hypothesized motivations were supported by the data, but one was not.

Despite this partial support of Hypothesis 5, the findings from analysis of the qualitative responses reflect the same ranking and perceived relevance of the motivations as was found in analysis of the quantitative responses. The most prevalent response for Hegemonic and non-Hegemonic participants (44% and 41% of responses, respectively) was the perception that diversity trainings were held to improve an organization's diversity climate, echoing the results

of the quantitative analyses. The second most prevalent perception, however, differs based upon group membership.

For Hegemonic participants, it was perceived as protection against legal liability (constituting 20% of their responses), whereas non-Hegemonic participants perceived it as increasing awareness of diversity and differences between groups (constituting 23% of their responses). Here, we can see that Hegemonic participants might focus more on the legal ramifications of trainings, whereas non-Hegemonic participants might focus more on the potential to learn from a training.

Again, in examining the third most commonly mentioned motivation to hold a diversity training, group membership reveals differences in perceptions. Hegemonic participants did mention that trainings might be held to increase awareness of a diversity training, but this third-place status (constituting 16% of their responses), in comparison to non-Hegemonic participants' second-place status, reveals that this motivation is less commonly reported for heterosexual White men as compared to participants with at least one minority identity. By contrast, non-Hegemonic participants list prevention against future discrimination in the workplace as their third most prevalent motivation (constituting 17% of their responses). Overall, these responses reflect how Hegemonic participants were more focused on the legal obligations to be met, whereas non-Hegemonic participants were more focused on the potential to reduce the number of negative outcomes that they or other minority-group employees could theoretically experience in their workplace.

Table 8. Themes in Hegemonic versus non-Hegemonic participants' perceived goals of diversity trainings.

Perceived Goal	Sub-themes of goals (% of group codes)	% Present in Hegemonic Data	Hegemonic Example	Sub-themes of goals (% of group codes)	% Present in non-Hegemonic Data	Non-Hegemonic Example
Improve Awareness of Diversity Issues		16%	<i>"I also think it was trying to accomplish making the workers more knowledgeable about diversity, the benefits derived from diversity, and how to work with a diverse group in an effective manner." (P20)</i>		23%	<i>"To bring awareness about the issues that a diverse population face." (P18)</i> <i>"I think it was trying to make us aware of all the differences out there in the world and how accepting we need to be." (P115)</i>
Improve Community Awareness of Diversity Issues		2%	<i>"The training was trying to promote diversity in both the workplace as well as the community in general." (P29)</i>		0%	
Improve Overall Diversity Climate	<i>Improve coworker interactions (15%)</i> <i>Improve customer interactions (2%)</i> <i>Improve environment (25%)</i> <i>Support other diversity programming (2%)</i>	44%	<i>"To help people work together regardless of any other factors." (P36)</i> <i>"They just want us to accept each other for who we are and not be afraid to work with somebody because you're uncomfortable with their gender or their race." (P42)</i> <i>"A possible situation with a customer – by customer I mean a business that buys our product. I work for a company that is mainly white men but we sell to a wide range of people." (P8)</i> <i>"I think the workplace was trying to make a workplace a more accepting environment." (P61)</i>	<i>Improve coworker interactions (13%)</i> <i>Improve customer interactions (5%)</i> <i>Improve environment (23%)</i>	41%	<i>"That people are different but we need to be understanding and accepting of those differences so we can work together better." (P35)</i> <i>"To make people work together regardless of their ages, races, religion and so on." (P42)"</i> <i>"It was trying to improve relations between clients/customers and employees." (P14)</i> <i>"Develop an appreciation and respect for diversity in our workplace." (P36)</i> <i>"To make the workplace more harmonious and teach employees to appreciate diversity." (P93)</i>

			<i>"To teach people that stuff like that isn't tolerated in our place of employment." (P62)</i>			
Improve Productivity in Organization		7%	<i>"I think the idea behind this training is to increase empathy...that will ultimately increase workplace comfort and happiness, and therefore productivity." (P30)</i>		4%	<i>"We are in the manufacturing industry so we have to understand each other to maintain our productivity." (P11)</i>
Protect Against Legal Liability		20%	<i>"It's honestly an attempt to lower the chances of a lawsuit." (P1)</i> <i>"It reduces liability. It's a dog and pony show." (P9)</i>		11%	<i>"I think this training, at least for my company, is done simply because it is required and it is protocol." (P17)</i> <i>"The training we figured was just for corporate to protect themselves." (P45)</i>
Prevent Future Discrimination/Incidents		9%	<i>"I think the training was trying to get ahead of any potential problems with diversity in my company's workforce." (P27)</i>		17%	<i>"Less violence, prejudice and racism in the workplace." (P33)</i> <i>"I think it was trying to prevent incidents in the workplace." (P60)</i>
Scare Employees		2%	<i>"Trying to intimidate people and scare them." (P57)</i>		0%	
Improve an Organization's Reputation		0%			2%	<i>"I think it was just something the company had to do to make themselves look better. The employees didn't need it personally." (P45)</i> <i>"I think it was trying to show the company was taking action to be inclusive." (P115)</i>

Hypothesis 6. Hypothesis 6 predicted that *participants will predict that minorities benefit more from diversity trainings than majority-group members, regardless of their own majority- or minority-group status, and will echo this belief in their qualitative responses.* Again, I first report the findings of my quantitative test of this hypothesis, and expand upon those findings with the results of my qualitative analyses.

Results supported Hypothesis 6. Both the Hegemonic participants ($M = -0.33$, $SD = 1.77$) and Non-Hegemonic participants ($M = 0.26$, $SD = 1.88$) predicted that minority-group members would benefit more from a diversity training than majority-group members, $b = 0.59$, $F(1, 193) = 4.52$, $p = .04$, $PRE = .02$, 95% CI [0.04, 1.13]. In comparing White and non-White participants, perceptions of group benefit did not differ based on group membership ($p = .47$), but in comparing men versus non-men, men predicted that minorities benefit to a lesser extent ($M = -0.20$, $SD = 1.84$) than did non-men ($M = 0.51$, $SD = 1.82$), $b = 0.72$, $F(1, 193) = 6.83$, $p = .01$, $PRE = .03$, 95% CI [0.18, 1.26]. Thus, these findings highlight the belief that minorities would benefit from diversity trainings more than or at least to the same extent as majority-group members. All benefit score statistics are reported in Table 9.

Table 9. *Group differences in perceived benefit of diversity trainings to participants' ingroup vs. outgroup.*

Participant Group Comparisons	Majority-Group Mean (SD)	Minority-Group Mean (SD)	<i>b</i>	df	<i>F</i>*	<i>p</i>	PRE	Lower CI	Upper CI
Intersectional	-0.33 (1.77)	0.26 (1.88)	0.59	193	4.52	.04*	.03	0.04	1.13
Race	-0.02 (1.59)	0.18 (2.30)	0.20	193	0.53	.47	-----	-----	-----
Gender	-0.20 (1.84)	0.51 (1.82)	0.72	193	6.83	.01**	.03	0.18	1.26

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$

To examine *why* participants provided their self-versus-other benefit ratings, emergent coding analyses were conducted. Analyses resulted in 14 codes for Hegemonic participants and 15 codes for non-Hegemonic participants, with some overlap between the two sets of codes. See Table 10 for a summary of the results.

Qualitative analyses did not support Hypothesis 6. Although 14% of Hegemonic participants' responses and 4% of non-Hegemonic participants' responses did express this belief, a far greater proportion of responses revealed that participants believe diversity trainings to benefit all attendees (24% and 38%, respectively). Thus, it appears that the belief that diversity trainings benefit minorities is less prevalent than the history of trainings and research on equal opportunity policies such as Affirmative Action would suggest.

Of interest, however, is the group-based difference in number of responses that describe *only* minorities versus *only* majorities as benefitting. There were 3.5 times as many responses from Hegemonic participants (14%) that solely minorities benefit compared to non-Hegemonic responses (4%). By contrast, the proportion of responses describing solely *majorities* as benefitting from diversity trainings is relatively equal, with 6% of overall responses in Hegemonic participants, and 5% of similar responses from non-Hegemonic participants displaying this belief. Group-based differences in perceptions disappear when stating that majorities benefit.

These differences – or lack thereof – reflect non-Hegemonic participants' greater beliefs that everyone benefits from trainings. Non-Hegemonic participants mentioned that solely majorities and solely minorities benefit from trainings in approximately equal proportion- 5% and 4%, respectively. However, within Hegemonic responses, minorities were described as being the sole beneficiaries of trainings 14% of the time, whereas majorities were described as being the

Table 10. Themes in Hegemonic versus non-Hegemonic participants' ideas about who benefits from diversity trainings.

Benefitting Party	% present in Hegemonic data	Hegemonic Example	% present in non-Hegemonic data	Non-Hegemonic Example
Society	2%	<i>"This training also promotes equality across all human aspects and helps people to learn to treat everyone with respect regardless of their background. Overall, this makes them a better person." (P29)</i>	0%	
Everyone	24%	<i>"I'm of the belief that diversity in the workplace, and thus the training, is a net positive for all involved because it allows you to learn a little more about how diversity is beneficial for companies, workers, and other factors." (P10)</i> <i>"I think in general all people benefit from diversity training (sic) whether they realize it or not." (P14)</i>	38%	<i>"I think diversity training[s] benefit everyone because it makes you more aware of the differences of those around you and can help someone form better relationships and make a better impression in the workplace." (P13)</i>
Majorities	6%	<i>"In both aspects the role playing that we do in the training offers and (sic) opportunity for people like me to see how people like myself can speak and act in more respectful manners. All the while, we are able to learn what it is like to be fell (sic) like someone else that is diverse from us...therefore, this is why the training benefits me and people like me." (P32)</i>	5%	<i>"I do feel, however, that someone who may be white would feel they benefited from it [diversity trainings] because it's giving them another perspective." (P112)</i>
Minorities	14%	<i>"I'm a white male so not so much for me." (P7)</i> <i>"They are minorities. These liberal programs are designed to benefit them." (P25)</i> <i>"I am not a minority so it has no effect on me and I treat all people with respect." (P57)</i>	4%	<i>"I'm a minority and a female so I feel that we are underrepresented in the workplace. Diversity training is specifically geared towards giving more opportunities to people exactly like me." (P63)</i>
New Hires	2%	<i>"I don't see the point of diversity training other than to make new hires more comfortable." (P2)</i>	0%	
Offenders	6^	<i>"I think the training only benefits a small fraction of the workforce that is constantly getting written up for saying/doing inappropriate things." (P1)</i>	0%	
Unaware	12%	<i>"I think those who grew up close-minded might help. It helps to also identify other cultures and believes in the work place since not everyone is the same or recognize the diversity they have in the workplace." (P55)</i> <i>"For other people, maybe they don't know how to act around other cultures and want to take steps not to offend people." (P2)</i>	4%	<i>"I think [diversity trainings] help others who are not used to being around different types of people. I think it gives them more open dialog (sic) and understanding of others." (P16)</i>

General Others	2%	<i>"I assume other people have some misguided belief that it benefits them, that since they're "all people," a workplace environment that is welcoming to "all people" benefits them as well (even though it doesn't benefit most, or all.)" (P30)</i>	9%	<i>"I think it can cause others to stop and think about what it means to be in a diverse work-place." (P52)</i>
Improves Knowledge, Not Actions	4%	2/50 <i>"It is hard to replicate real world situations in a hotel conference room. It is beneficial to know what to do but that does not always translate to the real world." (P8)</i>	1%	<i>"It was a lot of generic information and situations that may arise in the workplace. We never have any of these problems come up for ourselves." (P45)</i>
Most People	2%	1/50 <i>"I feel that most people will benefit to a small degree, but it's hard to change people's base natures." (P27)</i>	0%	
No One	12%	<i>"I think the majority of my coworkers view it as a waste of time. They don't teach us anything that we don't already know." (P31)</i> <i>"Overall, I don't think diversity training (sic) is that beneficial to the majority of people like them if I'm being honest. Most people won't change their ways depending on some training, and those that are acceptable in diversity don't need the training." (P59)</i>	5%	<i>"I think most people think diversity training is a joke. We know how to behave and it feels like being in kindergarten being told again how to behave and act." (P31)</i>
Those Open To It	2%	<i>"I think when they see how diverse a workplace is and why it is important that everyone see (sic) the value in each others (sic) differences." (P23)</i>	9%	<i>"I also think there are a few people who don't learn anything because they are not open to it going in or they feel like they already know enough and don't feel like it is necessary to try to learn anything new." (P17)</i>
The Participant	4%	<i>"I don't think that I necessarily learn anything new at the training but I do feel that the training reinforces the sensitivity issues that I need to be aware of as a manager." (P69).</i>	11%	<i>"I think this training would benefit me, as it has in the past, because it's nice to hear peoples (sic) perspectives from people who are different than me not just in race or outward appearances but to also hear of your fellow employees struggling with socioeconomic status. It greatly leads me to understand people better and I feel I have learned a lot from it." (P22)</i>
Participant Didn't	8%	4/50 <i>"I don't think it benefits me at all. It takes minority concerns and forces the majority to shape their behavior to accommodate them, which is ridiculously inefficient and misguided, and also unnecessary." (P30)</i>	4%	<i>"I don't feel like I get much, because of what is stated at these events is common sense...I don't gain much, because of the whole lack of diversity of opinion, ideas, etc." (P125)</i>
Customers	0%		2%	<i>"We learn from these examples and can work to make the environment comfortable for customers and employees." (P118)</i>

				<i>"99.99% of people working in my industry can benefit from these courses because we run into a lot of unique, different type[s] of customers everyday." (P30)</i>
Workforce	0%		2%	<i>"Developing your workforce and improving their skills through training, and also increase productivity (sic)." (P86)</i>
Group Status Threat	0%		2%	<i>"Others who are male and/or not a minority group may feel that giving more opportunities to minorities and females threatens the work available for themselves." (P63)</i> <i>"I live in a very conservative area and many of the people here have attitudes that diversity takes away jobs from them. Diversity training can show them different types of people are no different from them and are just working to take care of their families and are not a threat to their jobs." (P93)</i>
Manager	0%		1%	<i>"I am in a managerial position so it will help a lot." (P65)</i>
Unsure	0%		1%	<i>"I'm not sure who this benefits. I was raised to be kind to anyone regardless of what they looked like." (P80)</i>

Responses are out of 103 because 22 participants did not answer the question, provided nonsensical answers, or copied text from internet

only beneficiaries 6% of the time. This gap in perceptions is reflected by the overall proportion of responses that describe trainings as benefitting everyone, which was 38% of non-Hegemonic participants' responses but only 24% of Hegemonic participants' responses. Mirrored in these comparisons is the theme that non-Hegemonic participants believe trainings to benefit all attendees to a greater extent than Hegemonic participants.

From these analyses, it is clear that while group membership is not associated with differences in the perceptions of the motivations behind diversity trainings, it is still an important factor to consider when examining perceptions of who benefits from diversity trainings. The prevalence of beliefs about which groups are benefitting changes based on group membership and on the type of data being analyzed, which further justifies the necessity of considering group membership in the context of diversity trainings. Moreover, further research is needed to understand the different factors that might lead to everyone benefitting. Do minority-group members benefit because majority-group members are affected by trainings, or do both groups benefit equally and in the same ways? With these perceptions and questions in mind, I now turn to my examination of the reasons why participants may feel uncomfortable during diversity trainings.

Hypothesis 7. Previous research on group status threat and tokenism suggests that participants should report similar levels of discomfort in the quantitative measures. Building upon this expectation, Hypothesis 7 predicted that *qualitative responses will reflect group status threat concerns for majority-group members, and tokenism concerns for minority-group members.*

I first report the results of my quantitative tests of self-versus-other comfort levels, then elaborate on those findings with the results from my qualitative analyses.

In two of the three parallel group comparisons, as expected, ratings of self-versus-other comfort did not differ based on group membership. Specifically, for the intersectional positioning and gender group comparisons, there were no significant differences in comfort self-versus-other scores based on group membership (both p 's > .08). However, when racial group membership was regressed on self-versus-other scores, the magnitude of the self-versus-other difference was smaller for White participants ($M = 0.34$, $SD = 1.49$) than non-White participants ($M = 0.94$, $SD = 2.29$), $b = 0.60$, $F(1, 193) = 4.81$, $p = .03$, $PRE = .02$, 95% CI [0.06, 1.14]. White participants believed that they and dissimilar others would be closer in comfort level than non-White participants did. All comfort score statistics are reported in Table 11, demonstrating the general similarity between group comfort levels.

Table 11. *Group differences in participants' predictions of own comfort versus other's comfort during a diversity training.*

Participant Group Comparisons	Majority-Group Mean (SD)	Minority-Group Mean (SD)	<i>b</i>	df	<i>F</i>*	<i>p</i>	PRE	Lower CI	Upper CI
Intersectional	0.24 (1.43)	0.71 (1.99)	0.47	193	3.01	.08	-----	-----	-----
Race	0.34 (1.49)	0.94 (2.29)	0.60	193	4.81	.03*	.02	0.06	1.14
Gender	0.43 (1.66)	0.76 (2.09)	0.34	193	1.55	.22	-----	-----	-----

* $p \leq .05$

Results from the qualitative analyses of Hegemonic and non-Hegemonic participants' responses are presented separately in Tables 12 and 13. Regarding Hegemonic participants, a first pass of their data resulted in 32 unique codes, which were then condensed into 7 themes with sub-themes beneath them. These 7 themes broadly reflect themes that have been identified in the previous literature, and are listed with examples in Table 12 below.

Table 12. Themes in Hegemonic participants' descriptions of what affects diversity trainings' comfort for themselves and others.

Theme (% of group's overall codes)	Sub-themes (% of group's overall codes)	Description	Example
Trainer Characteristics (5%)	<i>Knowledge of presenter</i> (5%)	Trainer attributes (e.g., their race, gender, experience, role, or status) affect how comfortable a training is.	<i>"We have some of the best trainers in the field that are hired by the state...this makes the level of comfort high for me because they have been shown to be clearly productive." (P32)</i>
Training Characteristics (23%)	<i>Interactive approach</i> (5%) <i>Mandatory nature</i> (3%) <i>Inclusion-For-All approach</i> (2%) <i>Boring training</i> (2%) <i>Outcomes of training were measured</i> (2%) <i>Use of hypothetical scenarios</i> (2%) <i>Use of humor</i> (7%)	The way in the training approaches the topic of diversity, and other aspects of how the training is conducted, affect how comfortable a training is.	<i>"I also believe that the training would be done in a more casual and more informal style and that would make both me and other employees comfortable as well as the training feels more engaging at that point (and there is less time to think or feel uncomfortable due to lack of interaction and engagement)." (P69)</i>
Training Content (12%)	<i>Challenges stereotypes</i> (3%) <i>Makes people feel guilty or bad</i> (2%) <i>Is political</i> (2%) <i>Has the potential to offend</i> (5%)	The content that is covered by the training (e.g., racial or gender differences, the value of diversity) affect how comfortable a training is.	<i>"It's a very touchy and sensitive issue that can easily offend someone and hurt their feelings." (P22)</i>
Group Composition of Attendees (8.3%)	<i>Homogenous group</i> (2%) <i>Heightened difference salience</i> (2%) <i>Tokenism concerns</i> (3%) <i>Majority-minority group</i> (2%)	The demographic composition of group of people attending the trainings, whether it be more homogenous or heterogeneous, will affect how comfortable a training is, as it might make group differences and minority identities more salient.	<i>"It also might be uncomfortable for minorities who attend these meetings because they might feel like they are being singled out." (P29)</i> <i>"Some people work in non-diverse environments and the thought of being the minority can be uncomfortable." (P8)</i> <i>"I think it's stupid and only serves to underscore and highlight differences in people, making the work environment more tense and divisive." (P30)</i> <i>"This type of training highlights differences and makes us hyper-aware of our behavior, and is in some senses meant to make people feel bad about themselves. Or at least that aspect is unavoidable." (P30)</i>
Attendees' Previous Exposure to Content	<i>Already know information</i> (6.7%) <i>Depends on exposure</i> (5%) <i>Repeated nature</i> (3%)	The degree to which attendees have been previously exposed to the content covered in diversity trainings affects how comfortable a training is.	<i>"I feel comfortable because I know what to expect." (P62).</i> <i>"I think the level of comfort is all relative to each person and their personal experiences with diversity." (P24).</i>

(15%)			
Attendee Beliefs (20%)	<i>Belief in meritocracy (2%)</i> <i>Resentment (2%)</i> <i>Matches current beliefs (6.7%)</i> <i>Open-mindedness (5%)</i> <i>Personality induces comfort (2%)</i> <i>Waste of time (2%)</i> <i>Willingness to participate (2%)</i>	Attendee beliefs about the value of diversity and their personality characteristics make them more or less open to diversity trainings, which both in turn affect how comfortable they are during a training.	<i>“Personally, what makes me comfortable with it is that it by and large matches my own thoughts and ideas about what diversity in the workplace ought to be about.” (P10)</i>
Climate Surrounding Training (16.7%)	<i>Highlight importance of diversity (3%)</i> <i>Kind/helpful/professional climate (12%)</i> <i>Seen as a learning opportunity (2%)</i> <i>Familiar with attendees (2%)</i>	If a training creates an environment in which people are kind, professional, and familiar with one another, this will affect how comfortable the training is because it feels less risky to say something incorrect or have an opinion.	<i>“From my experience the diversity training is conducted in a very professional manner that is not offensive or uncomfortable at all. The people conducting and attending the training have always been very friendly, compassionate, and avoided making people feel uncomfortable. I believe these same aspects would make others feel this level of comfort because they would also feel welcomed at these training sessions, and feel that the training environment is very friendly.” (P20)</i>

*Ten participants did not answer the question, provided nonsensical answers, or copied text from internet.

Hegemonic participants' themes demonstrate partial support for Hypothesis 7, because they reflect an understanding of potential tokenism concerns for minority attendees, but lack an explicit reference to group status threat. For example, participant 29 describes how "It also might be uncomfortable for minorities who attend these meetings because they might feel like they are being singled out." Contradicting Hypothesis 7, however, Hegemonic participants did not describe group status threat. A few Hegemonic participants did briefly discuss their support of meritocracy, but did not connect this to concerns that an improvement in diversity at the organization would threaten their own standing or the resources available to them.

A first pass of the non-Hegemonic participants' responses resulted in 36 unique codes, which were then condensed into 7 themes with sub-themes beneath them. These 7 themes mapped onto several of the themes discussed in the Hegemonic responses, but also focused more on identity salience, as predicted. Themes are listed with examples in Table 13.

Analyses of non-Hegemonic responses did not support Hypothesis 7. Non-Hegemonic participants did explicitly discuss how uncomfortable it made them to be seen as a representative of their minority group - participant 24, for example, describes their tokenized experience, saying that "As a minority and usually surrounded by those who are majority it's not always comfortable when the person leading the training looks at me or says something they think I will identify with." However, the small percentage of responses that described tokenism concerns suggests that heightened identity salience is either not a major factor in training attendee's comfort levels, or that the trainings were able to reduce these concerns.

Building on this lack of support for Hypothesis 7, non-Hegemonic participants perceived that majority-group members would be particularly aware of their privileged status and sensit

Table 13. Themes in non-Hegemonic participants' ideas about what makes diversity trainings more or less comfortable for themselves and others.

Theme (% of group's overall codes)	Sub-Themes (% of group's overall codes)	Description	Example
Training Characteristics (21%)	<i>Interactive approach</i> (1%) <i>Informal atmosphere</i> (1%) <i>Mandatory nature</i> (1%) <i>Inclusion-For-All approach</i> (2%) <i>Boring training</i> (1%) <i>Warm trainers</i> (7%) <i>Way in which information presented</i> (3%) <i>Use of hypothetical scenarios</i> (1%) <i>Focuses only on surface diversity</i> (1%) <i>Ease of training</i> (3%) <i>Importance of diversity highlighted</i> (1%)	The way in the training approaches the topic of diversity, and other aspects of how the training is conducted, affect how comfortable a training is.	<i>"Having an informal, cordial and lay back (sic) atmosphere and encouraging participants to mingle with one another [would make it more comfortable]."</i> (P9)
Attendee Beliefs/General Comfort with Diversity (23%)	<i>Desire to learn about diversity</i> (9%) <i>General comfort with diversity</i> (10%) <i>Matches current beliefs</i> (3%) <i>Resentment around diversity</i> (1%)	Attendee beliefs about the value of diversity, their personality characteristics, and their general comfort talking about diversity and interacting with diverse others make them more or less open to diversity trainings, which in turn affect how comfortable they are during a training.	<i>"I would be comfortable because I would be discussing a topic I am familiar with and am open to learning more about."</i> (P52) <i>"I have grown up in a diverse environment so I feel comfortable about all cultures and races. I believe that if others had the same upbringing they would also feel comfortable discussing diversity and attending diversity training (sic)."</i> (P106)
Identity Saliency (6%)	<i>Common ingroup identity saliency</i> (2%) <i>Minority identity saliency</i> (1%) <i>Tokenism concerns</i> (3%)	If a training either induces a sense of common identity, or instead creates a heightened awareness of majority and minority identities, this will affect how comfortable attendees are during a training.	<i>"As a minority and usually surrounded by those who are majority it's not always comfortable when the person leading the training looks at me or says something they think I will identify with."</i> (P24) <i>"I felt uncomfortable as a black woman of a lower socioeconomic status, in a room full of people who sit on the opposite side of the spectrum. I felt incredibly uncomfortable, as I was watching a person of a different race pretend to be someone from my background. It is especially uncomfortable when no one, or very few people in the room look like you."</i> (P10)
Climate Surrounding Training	<i>Accepting/Open environment</i> (8%) <i>Depends on reason for training</i> (1%) <i>Fear of retaliation</i> (1%) <i>Focus on political correctness</i> (2%)	If a training creates an environment in which people are kind, professional, and familiar with one another, this will affect	<i>"From my experience in diversity training, the instructors have been very open-minded and have set the attendees at ease. There is no accusatory attitude that would make anyone feel uncomfortable."</i> (P93)

(15%)	<i>Signal of inclusion</i> (3%)	how comfortable the training is because it feels less risky to say something incorrect or have an opinion.	<i>"For the most part, the training is a place free of judgement...No one is called out in particular and everyone is welcome."</i> (P109)
Majority-group member discomfort (13%)	<i>Perception that training is aimed at majority attendees</i> (3%) <i>Fear of being seen as prejudiced</i> (3%) <i>White group status threat</i> (3%) <i>White guilt</i> (4%)	The perception that trainings were meant to highlight majority-group members' privilege or bias was perceived as making the diversity trainings more uncomfortable.	<i>"It's awkward being a white person and having to answer for the crimes and horrible things other white people do. It also makes me uncomfortable to have to think of myself as being biased and such."</i> (P18) <i>"I am a minority. The diversity training I experienced mainly deals on how people are supposed to deal with minorities. I feel they are mostly aimed at white people and how they should act."</i> (P1) <i>"If the person listening to the training is not considered a minority, they may feel threatened or uncomfortable with diversity training (sic)."</i> (P63)
Group Composition of Attendees (15%)	<i>Heterogeneous group</i> (3%) <i>Homogenous group</i> (3%) <i>Lack of power over others' outcomes</i> (1%) <i>Preexisting relationships with coworkers</i> (8%)	The demographic composition of group of people attending the trainings, whether it be more homogenous or heterogeneous, will affect how comfortable a training is, as it might make group differences and minority identities more salient.	<i>"...being familiar with my coworkers and having a good positive working relationships (sic) with them also makes being in the same environment during the diversity [training] more comfortable for myself as well as for them."</i> (P32)
Attendees' Previous Exposure to Content (8%)	<i>Previous exposure to content</i> (5%) <i>Expectations of content</i> (3%)	The degree to which attendees have been previously exposed to the content covered in diversity trainings affects how comfortable a training is.	<i>"I would feel this comfort because I've done plenty of them before and have a good sense of what the trainings entail."</i> (P3)

*Twenty-two participants did not answer the question, provided nonsensical answers, or copied text from internet

to feeling guilty, which has been reflected in prior research (Swim & Miller, 1999; Karp & Sannour, 2000). Specifically, non-Hegemonic participants described how majority-group members might fear being seen as prejudiced, feel guilty about their privilege, or feel threatened. Most often, they referenced White attendees as those who would be “at-risk” for these concerns, although occasionally non-Hegemonic participants simply referred to a broad group of “privileged” attendees. Thus, identity-based discomfort such as tokenism and group status threat indeed appears to be not only experienced by both majority- and minority-group members, but also something that both majority- and minority-group members are aware of in this context. However, the underrepresentation of these themes in comparison to other, more prevalent themes (such as training characteristics or attendee beliefs about diversity) does not support Hypothesis 7.

In sum, although tokenism and group status threat were present in participants’ responses, these themes did not constitute the majority of the factors that participants report as affecting comfort levels during diversity trainings. Of interest, however, is participants’ awareness of others’ identities, and how those identities might make others uncomfortable during diversity trainings. Specifically, majority-group members perceived minority-group members to feel tokenized, whereas majority-group members were perceived by minority-group members as feeling threatened or guilty. This holds interesting implications for how diversity training attendees might interact with one another. A minority training attendee might not bring up a discussion point during the training because they are afraid it will make majority-group members feel attacked; by contrast, majority-group attendee might be afraid to ask about minority experiences because they think it will make minority attendees uncomfortable – an avoidant approach that has been found to be prevalent in how Whites relate to racial minorities, as they

want to avoid appearing biased and making their non-White interaction partners uncomfortable (Judd et al., 1995). As these possibilities remain unexamined, this makes for an important area to study in future research. To this end, I conducted several exploratory analyses to examine the role of the factors that participants described as affecting their experiences of diversity trainings, but which I did not plan to test in the scope of this study.

Additional Exploratory Analyses

In the interest of brevity, the following section provides a very brief rationale for the additional exploratory analyses I conducted, with coding methodology and tables of the results provided in Appendix D. These analyses were motivated by conversations with committee members in light of the confirmatory results, as well as my continued reading of the literature. A brief description of exploratory findings is included in Table 14.

There are both *person* and *situation* factors that I did not investigate in the confirmatory analyses but that may predict different training outcomes where demographic group membership did not. For example, one *person* factor that I did not examine is political identification. Political identification, although often correlated with participants' racial, gender, and sexual orientation group membership (Pew Research Center, 2016), is unique in that it is not an identity that is covered in diversity trainings, nor an identity that is protected by workplace anti-discrimination laws. The different values that correspond with political identification (i.e., liberals' valuing of social justice versus conservatives' valuing of respect for authority; Swigart, Anantharaman, Williamson, & Grandey, in press) suggests that perhaps political group membership may reveal differences in perceptions of and experiences during diversity trainings, where other demographic memberships examined in this study did not. In addition, prior research has revealed the importance of studying *situational* aspects of diversity trainings such as training

group composition, the types of exercises used in a training, or aspects of diversity that were covered (Kalinowski et al., 2013; Bezrukova, Spell, Perry & Jehn, 2016). To explore the role of these variables, I adopted Kalinowski and colleagues' characterization of exercises as "active" (e.g., role plays or discussions) or "passive" (e.g., lectures or handouts), as well as their consideration of single-topic trainings (e.g., a training that only discusses race) versus multiple-topic trainings (e.g., a training that discusses race and gender; Kalinowski et al., 2013).

As is shown in the summary table below (as well as in Appendix D), the exploratory analyses did reveal new information about relationships between factors I did not consider in this study, and my participants' responses. These exploratory findings reveal interesting avenues for future research, and also shed light on the complexity of the confirmatory findings. Thus, I incorporate the implications of my exploratory findings in my general discussion as well as my Limitations and Future Directions section, before moving to my final conclusions.

General Discussion

The overall findings of this study suggest that there are fewer demographic group differences in reactions to and perceptions of diversity trainings than common conception and the limited previous literature suggest. The results also shed light on how an organization's signals about their diversity climate are perceived by majority- and minority-group members, and how specific aspects about the training in particular (such as number of topics covered or the types of exercises used) seem to be important to perceptions of trainings.

In terms of group membership, majority- and minority-group member responses showed that attendees generally view training motivations, efficacy, and organizational diversity climates in the same manner. Both groups reported that they felt slightly more comfortable than they believed others felt during trainings, and that diversity trainings benefit everyone, though

Table 14. *Summary of confirmatory and exploratory results.*

Hypothesis #	Brief Description of Hypothesis	Supported?	Description of Results
1a	Majority-group members won't endorse protection against legal liability as a motivation to hold diversity trainings to the same extent that minority-group members will.	Not supported	<i>Majority- and minority-group members endorsed protection against legal liability as a motivation to hold a diversity training to the same extent.</i>
1b	For both majority- and minority-group members, the more demographically diverse a participant's training group is, the less likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to protect against legal liability.	Not supported	<i>For all participants except men, there was no relationship between group composition and perceptions of legal liability as a motivation. For men, the more diverse their training group, the more they perceived the training to be held to protect against lawsuits.</i>
2a	Minority-group members won't endorse pressure to meet political correctness norms as a motivation to hold diversity trainings to the same extent that majority-group members will.	Not supported	<i>Majority- and minority-group members endorsed conforming pressures to meet political norms as a motivation to hold a diversity training to the same extent.</i>
2b	The more demographically diverse a majority-group member's training group is, the less likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to meet political correctness norms. By contrast, the more demographically diverse a minority-group member's training group is, the more likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to meet political correctness norms.	Partially supported	<i>For both majority- and minority-group members, the more diverse they perceived their training group to be, the more they perceived the diversity training to be held to meet political correctness norms.</i>
3a	Minority-group members won't endorse desire to create change in an organization's diversity as a motivation to hold diversity trainings to the same extent that majority-group members will.	Not supported	<i>Majority- and minority-group members endorsed genuine desire to change an organization's diversity climate as a motivation to hold a diversity training to the same extent.</i>
3b	For both majority- and minority-group members, the more demographically diverse a participant's training group is, the more likely it is that they will perceive the training to be motivated by a desire to improve their organization's diversity climate.	Supported	<i>For both majority- and minority-group participants, the more diverse they perceived their training group to be, the more they perceived the diversity training to be held to improve diversity at their organization.</i>
4a	There will be a negative relationship between the extent to which participants believe that their diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms, and how effective they perceived their training to be.	Not supported	<i>For all participants except heterosexual, White men, the more they perceived their training to be motivated by pressure to meet political correctness norms, the more effective they perceived it to be. There was no relationship between these perceptions for heterosexual, White men.</i>
4b	Group membership will affect the strength of the relationship between beliefs that a diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms and beliefs that the diversity training was effective.	Not supported	<i>Whether a participant belonged to a majority group or a minority group did not affect the relationship between their perceptions that their training was held to meet political correctness norms and the perceived efficacy of their training.</i>

5	Participants would list legal liability, political correctness norms, and a genuine desire to change diversity at the organization as motivations to hold diversity trainings.	Partially supported	<i>The most common perception for holding diversity trainings by far is that the organization truly cares about improving diversity. After this motivation, however, group differences emerge to show that majority-group participants perceive the trainings to be motivated by more legal protections, whereas minority-group members perceive the trainings to be motivated by the possibility to reduce discrimination in the workplace.</i>
6	Majority- and minority-group members will report that minorities benefit most from diversity trainings.	Partially supported	<i>For 2 of 3 group comparisons, participants agreed that minorities benefit more than majorities. However, in describing who benefits, participants most often suggested that everyone, not just minorities, benefit. Moreover, majority-group members demonstrated a more common belief than minorities that minorities benefit.</i>
7	Majority- and minority-group members will report being equally uncomfortable, but majority-group members' discomfort will be caused by group status threat whereas minorities' discomfort will be caused by tokenism.	Not supported	<i>For 2 of 3 group comparisons, majority- and minority-group members did not differ in the extent to which they believe they would be uncomfortable during a diversity training. Although all participants seemed aware of the possibility for group status threat and tokenism, they most often predicted that comfort would be affected by aspects of the training and how it was presented.</i>
Exploratory Finding #1			<i>Political identification did not predict perceptions of company motivations to host diversity trainings, but the more one identified as liberal, the more likely they were to report feeling more comfortable than others. They were also more likely to see a greater benefit to themselves than others.</i>
Exploratory Finding #2			<i>Participants who perceived there to be more diversity in their training group also tended to perceive the training to be more effective, reflecting a potential expectancy effect or positive effect of intrinsic motivation.</i>
Exploratory Finding #3			<i>There was no difference between participants in terms of perceived benefit to self versus dissimilar others, based on either the number of topics covered during a training, nor the type of exercises used. This relationship was not influenced by group membership.</i>
Exploratory Finding #4			<i>As the number of topics (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation) covered in a diversity training increased, perceptions that the training was externally motivated decreased. By contrast, increasing incorporation of active exercises was associated with increased perceptions that the training was externally and internally motivated.</i>
Exploratory Finding #5			<i>Organizational climates in which it was clearer the organization supports diversity were associated with increased perceptions that 1) a training was held to protect against legal liability and meet political norms, but 2) a weaker belief in only non-White participants that the organization held the training because they genuinely wanted to improve their diversity.</i>
Exploratory Finding #6			<i>Whether a participant belonged to a majority group or a minority group did not affect the relationship between their perceptions of the perceived efficacy of their training and their perceptions that it was held to protect against legal liability, nor their perceptions that it was held because an organization wanted to improve diversity.</i>
Exploratory Finding #7			<i>Perceptions of the extent to which an organization supports diversity were unrelated to perceptions of how effective the diversity training was.</i>

minorities more than majorities. The groups did not differ in perceived strength of their organization's diversity climates. By contrast, additional exploratory analyses revealed that other group memberships, such as political identification, may be more useful in predicting diversity training attendees' comfort levels as well as perceptions of who benefits from trainings.

Adding to this pattern, demographic group membership did not moderate the relationships between any of the motives for a diversity training and the perceived efficacy of a training. Majority- and minority-group members alike perceived the three motives to be relevant to their diversity training, and overall those perceptions were related to perceived efficacy. However, the correlations between motives and perceived efficacy were small, suggesting other factors may be more connected to perceptions of efficacy. Indeed, stronger relationships were found between perceived efficacy and non-group based aspects of participants' diversity trainings, such as the composition of the training group, the types of exercises used in the training, and the number of topics covered in the training.

Thus, in the present study, it seems that an organization's signaling about diversity values may operate similarly for all training attendees, regardless of group membership. This contradicts previous research that argues that only minority-group members, not majority-group members, perceive a diversity training as a sign that the organization genuinely cares about minorities (Waight & Madera, 2011). However, the high relevance score of the motivation to genuinely improve diversity at an organization, as well as this theme's prevalence in the open-ended responses, suggests that diversity trainings do send a signal about intrinsic motivations. This repeated finding supports the applicability of Signaling Theory in this context (Spence, 1973). Future research should clarify under which conditions an organization's signals are perceived equally versus differently, based on group status. As this study utilized participants

from a variety of organizations, not just one (which is more typical for studies of diversity climate), it cannot speak to the specific qualities of an organization and/or its diversity climate that might explain why the predicted group differences were not observed. Thus, more research is needed to identify the factors that influence the relationship between an employee's perceptions of motivations, experiences during their training, and group membership.

Reflecting the complexity of determining which factors affect employee perceptions, the results demonstrate that participants perceive multiple motivations simultaneously. Within the same training, a program may be perceived as a genuine organizational attempt to improve diversity climates some of the time, and at other times, merely a legal decision to protect against lawsuits and liability (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004; Nishii & Wright, 2008). Participants in the present study did demonstrate some discriminant perceptions of the other concepts associated with each of the motivations, however. Perceptions that a training was held to meet political correctness norms or to improve diversity in the organization were associated with increased perceived efficacy, reflecting the possibility of an expectancy effect (if getting employees to act in politically correct ways is a goal of the training). This could also reflect differences in the efficacy of diversity trainings based on intrinsically versus extrinsically motivated trainings. Perceptions that a training was held to protect against legal liability, however, were unrelated to efficacy, demonstrating that not all motivations are seen to have the same effects. Importantly, group membership did reveal more differences in the prevalence of themes in open-ended responses, and a few correlations revealed directional differences in relationships between motivations and efficacy. Thus, it is clear that group membership cannot be written off completely, but that further analyses are needed to uncover how it is operating in the context of these perceptions.

Limitations and Future Directions

Before turning to the implications and future directions suggested by the results of the present study, several limitations should be noted. First, it is possible that participant characteristics other than those measured could have affected the direction of results. For example, tenure at the participant's organization, their role in the organization, and the extent to which the participant works with others were not measured, all of which could affect their perceptions of their organization's diversity climate, their organization's motivations behind holding a training, their previous exposure to content about diversity and diverse others, and their views about diversity in general, as has been found in prior research (e.g., McKay et al., 2007). As this information was not collected, it is not known how these specific job and personal characteristics influence participants' experiences and change what is represented in the data. Future research into perceptions of organizational diversity climates and motivations behind diversity trainings should incorporate these variables, testing if they equally moderate relationships across group memberships, or influence relationships differentially based on group. Given prior research demonstrating the associations between an employee's tenure at their organization and their commitment to their organization (e.g., Wright & Bonett, 2002), as well as the association between an employee's commitment and the organization's diversity climate (e.g., McKay et al., 2007), it seems likely that these two variables are particularly promising avenues for future study.

Regardless of group membership, this study was also limited by potential common method bias, as all measures were collected at one timepoint. Participants' responses to questions later in the survey might have been influenced by their responses to earlier questions. For example, asking participants to rate how much they, versus dissimilar others, benefit from

diversity trainings might have influenced their responses to the Company Motivations Scales. In this vein, social desirability could have affected participants' responses, although previous research has found that using Internet-based collection methods can reduce participants' social desirability concerns and lead to more honest answers (Evans et al., 2003). To limit these effects, it was communicated several times throughout the survey that responses would be deidentified and that the study sought honest opinions. However, it is possible that participants still feared being perceived as biased, especially when asked about their organization's diversity climate and their beliefs about the efficacy, beneficiaries of, and comfort felt during trainings. Thus, it is possible that some participants did not provide fully honest answers. The honesty in responses (such as the repeated phrase that companies hold trainings "to cover their ass" (sic)), however, led me to believe that many participants were not restrained by social desirability concerns.

Building upon this bias is the possibility for inaccurate recall and retrospective biases. In order to qualify for the study, participants had to have attended a mandatory diversity training within the last year. Thus, it is possible that participants had to remember as far as a year back to provide responses to the questionnaire, and may not accurately remember how they perceived the training at the time they took it. Time may have minimized the strength of their feelings or perceptions as has been found in prior research (e.g., Koole, 2009), impacting the extremity of participants' responses and in turn the potential differences between groups. In addition, previous research has found a spillover bias in perceptions of diversity in groups (Daniels, Neale & Greer, 2017). In the context of diversity trainings, participants' perceptions that their training group has high racial diversity might have caused them to inflate their perceptions of their training groups' gender or age diversity. Considering the potential expectancy effect where participants perceived a training to be more effective the more diverse their training group was, it seems possible that

that this relationship could have been affected by participants' experiences of the spillover effect. However, several questions were included in the survey to aid participants in their recall and minimize the extent to which inaccuracy was present. Additionally, much previous work has shown that the factors that were mentioned by participants in their open-ended responses such as trainee characteristics, training characteristics, attendee beliefs, and the types of learning being assessed all influence training efficacy and the experiences attendees have throughout (Bezrukova Jehn, & Spell, 2012). In this way, participants' potential biases and lack self-awareness do not cause great concern in this study.

Regardless of the potential for the biased recall, using participants' training group demographic composition as a proxy for the levels of diversity at an organization is limited. In many organizations, it is common for the entry-level workforce to be diverse, while those in the C-suite remain largely male, heterosexual, and White (Larcker & Tayan, 2020). Training group composition in this sense can only speak to participants' immediate exposure to diversity, and not the overall diversity of an organization at different levels. Attending a training at an organization with low levels of diversity in the upper echelons, but with a diverse group of lower-level employees might facilitate false impressions of how diverse an organization actually is. Given the relationship between perceived training group diversity and training efficacy, future research should examine how such differences between training group diversity and overall organizational diversity might impact training efficacy

To this end, concepts that were reflected in participants' responses and in prior research but were not included in this study provide a promising avenue for future research. For example, both majority- and minority-group participants mentioned how a training's approach to diversity would affect their comfort levels. Indeed, previous research shows that trainings that adopt a

colorblind approach (purporting that one cannot “see” race) are preferred by majority-group members and make them more resistant to pro-diversity efforts, but actually make minorities expect to feel *more* uncomfortable, anxious, and distrustful of those using them (Awad, Cokley, & Ravitch, 2005; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008; Plaut et al., 2018). Therefore, a colorblind approach signals to majority-group members that group status threat may be valid, but also signals to minority-group members that the organization does not value their perspectives or experiences.

By contrast, the multiculturalism approach highlights that there are differences between majority-group members and minorities, and that these differences should be recognized and celebrated (Plaut et al., 2018). In this way, minority experiences and identities are made salient, which might be perceived as giving minorities privilege over majority-group members. Indeed, this strategy is often expected to be preferred by minorities but not by majority-group members, and has been found to make the latter group feel threatened and resentful towards minorities as well as excluded from discussions of diversity (Morrison, Plaut & Ybarra, 2010; Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi & Sanchez-Burks, 2011). From this perspective, diversity trainings that employ multiculturalism signal to minority-group employees that an organization values them but may also signal to majority-group employees that their discomfort is unimportant to the organization. Given these reactions to the approach a diversity training adopts, future research should examine how a training’s approach might influence perceptions of the motivations behind the training, and how group membership may affect perceptions of this relationship. The current study did not collect data on the approaches used in participants’ trainings, and therefore cannot speak to the effect of training approach on perceptions of motivations.

In addition, this study did not examine the other elements that influence an organization's diversity climate, such as other forms of diversity programming (e.g., mentorship programs, employee resource groups, or targeted leadership development programs) or perceived leadership support. If a diversity training is one program combined with others into a "diversity bundle" (Richard, Roh, & Pieper, 2013), then it seems likely that this could signal to employees that their organization genuinely cares about improving their diversity climate, which in turn would affect participants' perceptions of their organization's motivations. An interesting avenue for future experiments would be to test how an organizational strategy that employs a "diversity bundle" approach in comparison to diversity training alone influences participants' perceptions of the organization's diversity climate.

Building upon this, the current study did not attempt to measure the effect of other sources of signals, such as the leaders of an organization. Previous research has shown that inclusive leadership influences psychological diversity climate, which in turn affects employees' willingness to help other employees – particularly for racial minorities and women (Randel et al., 2016). Just as future research could test the effect of diversity trainings as part of "diversity bundles" instead of as the sole approach to diversity in an organization, future research could examine how leadership signals, in combination with diversity trainings, affect perceptions of motivations during trainings. Given the finding that inclusive leaders have an effect on minority employees', but not majority employees' behaviors, it is important to examine how group membership functions when both inclusive leadership and diversity trainings are adopted in an organization. Future research on the combination of strategies could reveal the unique contributions of diversity trainings and elucidate the relationships between group membership

and training experiences examined here, and suggests that trainings may be made more effective when offered in tandem with other diversity programs.

In regard to the implications for future avenues of research mentioned above, this study contributes to the small but growing literature that examines how group membership changes experiences of diversity trainings, and more specifically, how minorities experience such initiatives. Much of the research cited in this manuscript draws from reactions to policies such as Affirmative Action and minority experiences with diversity in organizations more broadly. While this type of research provides a strong top-level view of minority responses to diversity initiatives, it leaves a gap in the literature regarding the specifics of minority responses. By studying how minority-group members view diversity trainings, we can understand in more detail how the different components of diversity in the workplace affect minorities' experiences in organizations. With this information, we can then intervene to improve or emphasize the factors of different initiatives that reduce negative organizational outcomes for minorities. For example, one finding of the current study was that the more a participant believed that the diversity training was held to improve an organization's diversity climate, the more effective they thought the training was. Semi-structured interviews could investigate if diversity training attendees think this perspective affects their experiences during the training, and what participants themselves think about the connection between diversity climate and efficacy. Investigating this finding further would elucidate whether it truly is an expectancy effect or merely an indicator that trainings that are clearly motivated by more intrinsic reasoning are actually perceived as more effective than those motivated by extrinsic reasons. Additionally, results from this study demonstrate that participants perceive each of these three motives to be relevant to their diversity training. A lab experiment could manipulate the salience of each of

these motivations prior to a training, and assess how this emphasis impacts training outcomes and efficacy.

Future studies should collect perceptions of motivations as well as post-training outcome data to test if group membership also does not affect the relationship between motivations and actual efficacy, rather than perceived efficacy (which was measured in this study). Conducted this way, studies will answer the call for research situated in outcome-based data instead of mere reactions to diversity trainings, a focus that has been critiqued in the literature (Bezrukova, Spelly, Perry & Jehn, 2016). Only by measuring downstream consequences of diversity trainings can we actually know their effectiveness. Future research should continue to revisit the field in this way, lending studies external validity as well as reminding researchers of the reason we study diversity initiatives in the first place: to promote a better workplace in individuals' everyday lives.

Conclusions

The present research elucidated the relationships between the *person* factor of group membership, the *situation* factor of diversity climate, and framed them in the *person-situation* context of perceived motivations to host a diversity training. Adding to the mixed findings around the importance of group membership, results showed that more often than not, group membership did not differentially influence training attendee experiences and perspectives. Minority- and majority-group members alike believe that everyone benefits from trainings, but especially minorities, and both believe to the same extent that each of three motivations (to protect against legal liability, to meet pressure to act in politically correct ways, and to instill genuine change in the organization's diversity) applies to diversity trainings. By contrast, results suggest that the diversity within a group of attendees may have more of an impact on perceptions

of motivations than group membership alone, echoing findings from previous research (e.g., Bezrukova, Jehn, & Spell, 2012). Future research should further examine how group composition and attendee group membership interact, especially concerning experiences of tokenism and group status threat as the workforce grows increasingly diverse.

In conclusion, diversity trainings should not be abandoned for their mixed efficacy, but should be further examined for additional factors that influence trainee openness and experiences during trainings, including group membership. This study presented some of the first research to measure attendee perspectives across a range of training experiences, instead of in response to a specific training. Moreover, the current research was the first, to my knowledge, to examine how minorities in particular feel about diversity trainings they attended, instead of how they view their organization and its diversity initiatives overall. Continuing to examine the minority experience is imperative, as minority-group employees will soon become the numerical majority in the United States and the workforce (Craig & Richeson, 2014b). In the coming years, it will be important for researchers to adapt along with these changing demographics and potential accompanying changes in trainings themselves. Regardless, all attendees' experiences should be studied as a factor influencing the success of a training. Only by studying all attendees' experiences and working to understand and improve diversity trainings for both majority- and minority-group members, can we improve the efficacy of diversity trainings.

References

- Apfelbaum, E.P., Stephens, N.M, & Reagans, R.E. (2016). Beyond one-size-fits-all: Tailoring diversity approaches to the representation of social groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *111*(4), 547-666. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000071>
- Alhejji, H., Garavan, T., Carbery, R., O'Brien, F., & McGuire, D. (2016). Diversity training programme outcomes: A systematic review. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *27*(1), 95–149. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21221>
- Amoroso, L.M., Loyd, D.L., & Hoobler, J.M. (2009). The diversity education dilemma: Exposing status hierarchies without reinforcing them. *Journal of Management Education*, *34*(6), 795-822. doi: 0.1177/1052562909348209
- Anand, R., & Winters, M.-F. (2008). A retrospective view of corporate diversity training from 1964 to the present. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *7*(3), 356–372. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.34251673>
- Awad, G. H., Cokley, K., & Ravitch, J. (2005). Attitudes toward Affirmative Action: A comparison of color-blind versus modern racist attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *35*(7), 1384–1399. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02175.x>
- Beal, F. M. (1969). Double jeopardy: To be Black and female. *Meridians*, *8*(2), 166–176.
- Bell, M. P., & Kravitz, D. A. (2008). From the guest co-editors: What do we know and need to learn about diversity education and training?[Editorial]. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *7*(3), 301–308. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2008.34251669>
- Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K. A., & Spell, C. S. (2012). Reviewing diversity training: Where we have been and where we should go. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *11*(2), 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.0090>

- Bezrukova, K., Spell, C., Perry, J., & Jehn, K. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Articles and Chapters*. Retrieved from <https://scholarship.sha.cornell.edu/articles/974>
- Blair, E. (2015). A reflexive exploration of two qualitative data coding techniques. *Journal of Methods and Measurement in the Social Sciences*, 6(1), 14-29.
- Bowen, D. E., & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: The role of the “strength” of the HRM system. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(2), 203–221.
- Bowleg, L. (2013). “Once you’ve blended the cake, you can’t take the parts back to the main ingredients”: Black gay and bisexual men’s descriptions and experiences of intersectionality. *Sex Roles*, 68, 754-767. doi: 10.1007/s11199-012-0152-4
- Brannon, T. N., Carter, E. R., Murdock-Perriera, L. A., & Higginbotham, G. D. (2018). From backlash to inclusion for all: Instituting diversity efforts to maximize benefits across group lines. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 12(1), 57–90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12040>
- Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1994). Collective self-esteem consequences of outgroup derogation when a valued social identity is on trial. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24(6), 641–657. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420240603>
- Calfas, J. (2018). Starbucks corporate diversity training: Does it work?. *Time*. (n.d.) Retrieved December 19, 2019, from <https://time.com/5287082/corporate-diversity-training-starbucks-results/>
- Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2018). Hispanic population growth engenders conservative shift among non-Hispanic racial minorities. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9(4), 383–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617712029>
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2014b). On the precipice of a “majority-minority” America: Perceived status threat from the racial demographic shift affects White Americans’ political ideology. *Psychological Science*, 25(6), 1189–1197. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614527113>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.
- Daniels, D.P., Neale, M.A., & Greer, L.L. (2017). Spillover bias in diversity judgement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 139, 92-105.
- Dobbin, F., Kalev, A., & Kelly, E. (2007). Diversity management in corporate America. *Contexts*, 6(4), 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ctx.2007.6.4.21>
- Dobbin, F., Schrage, D., & Kalev, A. (2015). Rage against the iron cage: The varied effects of bureaucratic personnel reforms on diversity. *American Sociological Review*, 80(5), 1014–1044. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122415596416>
- Dover, T. L., Major, B., & Kaiser, C. R. (2016). Members of high-status groups are threatened by pro-diversity organizational messages. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 62, 58–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.10.006>
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2667087>

- Emerson, K. T. U., & Murphy, M. C. (2014). Identity threat at work: how social identity threat and situational cues contribute to racial and ethnic disparities in the workplace. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 20*(4), 508–520. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035403>
- Evans, D., Garcia, D., Garcia, D., & Baron, R. (2003). In the privacy of their own homes: using the Internet to assess racial bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 273–284.
- Flynn, G. (1999). White males see diversity's other side. *Workforce; Costa Mesa, 78*(2), 52–55.
- Gaither, S. E., Apfelbaum, E. P., Birnbaum, H., Babbitt, L. G., & Sommers, S. R. (2018). Mere membership in a racially diverse group reduces conformity, *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 4*, 402-410. doi: 10.1177/1948550617708013
- Gassam, J. (2019). 5 reasons why diversity programs fail. *Forbes*. (n.d.) Retrieved March 14, 2020 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/janicegassam/2019/03/31/5-reasons-why-diversity-programs-fail/#60e6b399637d>
- Grandey, A. A., Gabriel, A. S., & King, E. B. (2020). Tackling taboo topics: A review of the three Ms in working women's lives. *Journal of Management, 46*(1), 7–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319857144>
- Grant, A. M., & Berg, J. M. 2010. Prosocial motivation at work: How making a difference makes a difference. Forthcoming in K. Cameron and G. Spreitzer (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*. Oxford University Press.
- Gravier, E. (2019). For the first time in U.S. history, minorities make up the most new hires aged 25 to 54 – and women are leading the trend. (n.d.) Retrieved March 14, 2020 from <https://www.cnbc.com/2019/09/11/minorities-ages-25-to-54-make-up-most-new-hires-in-workforce.html>

- Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*(4), 1199–1228.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.26586096>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *33*(2–3), 61–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Jackson, P.B., Thoits, P.A., & Taylor, H.F. (1995). Composition of the workplace and psychological well-being: The effects of tokenism on America's Black elite. *Social Forces*, *74*(2), 543–557, <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/74.2.543>
- James, E. H., Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., & Cohen, R. R. (2001). Prejudice matters: Understanding the reactions of Whites to affirmative action programs targeted to benefit Blacks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(6), 1120–1128. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1120>
- Judd, C. M., Park, B., Ryan, C. S., Brauer, M., & Kraus, S. (1995). Stereotypes and ethnocentrism: Diverging interethnic perceptions of African American and White American youth. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 460–481.
- Kalinoski, Z.T., Steele-Johnson, D., Peyton, E.J., Leas, K.A., Steinke, J., & Bowling, N.A. (2013). A meta-analytic evaluation of diversity training outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*, 1076- 1104. doi: 10.1002/job.1839
- Kanter, R. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Karp, H. B., & Sammour, H. Y. (2000). Workforce diversity: Choices in diversity training programs & dealing with resistance to diversity. *College Student Journal*, *34*(3), 451.

- Kitroeff, N., & Silver-Greenberg, J. (2018, June 15). Pregnancy discrimination is rampant inside America's biggest companies. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/06/15/business/pregnancy-discrimination.html>.
- Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., ... Thomas, D. (2003). The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network. *Human Resource Management, 42*(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.10061>
- Koole, S.L. (2009) The psychology of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Cognition and Emotion, 23*(1), 4-41, doi: 10.1080/02699930802619031
- Kravitz, D. A., & Kleinberg, S. L. (2000). Reactions to two versions of affirmative action among Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 597–611.
- Kulik, C., B. Pepper, M., Roberson, L., & Parker, S. (2007). The rich get richer: Predicting participation in voluntary diversity training. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*, 753–769. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.444>
- Larcker, D.F., & Tayan, B. (2020). Diversity in the C-suite: The dismal state of diversity among Fortune 100 senior executives. (n.d.) *Stanford Closer Look Series*. Retrieved April 1, 2020 from <https://www.gsb.stanford.edu/sites/gsb/files/publication-pdf/cgri-2020-diversity-in-c-suite.pdf>
- Legault, L., Gutsell, J. N., & Inzlicht, M. (2011). Ironic effects of antiprejudice messages: How motivational interventions can reduce (but also increase) prejudice. *Psychological Science, 22*(12), 1472–1477. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611427918>
- Levinson, J., & Young, D. (2010). Implicit gender bias in the legal profession: An empirical study. *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy, 18*(1), 1–33.

- Mack, D.A., Johnson, C.D., Green, T.D., Parisi, A.G., & Thomas, K.M. (2002). Motivation to control prejudice as a mediator of identity and Affirmative Action attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(5), 934-964.
- McKay, P., Avery, D., & Morris, M. (2008). Mean racial-ethnic differences in employee sales performance: The moderating role of diversity climate. *Personnel Psychology, 61*, 349–374. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00116.x>
- McKay, P.F., et al. (2007) Racial differences in employee retention: Are diversity climate perceptions the key? *Personnel Psychology, 60*, 35-62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00064.x>
- Mor Barak, M., Cherin, D., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and personal dimensions in diversity climate: Ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 34*, 82–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886398341006>
- Morrison, K.R., Plaut, V.C., & Ybarra, O. (2010). Predicting whether multiculturalism positively or negatively influences White Americans' intergroup attitudes: The role of ethnic identification. Retrieved December 19, 2019, from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0146167210386118>
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109*(41), 16474. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211286109>
- Nishii, L. H., Khattab, J., Shemla, M., & Paluch, R. M. (2018). A multi-level process model for understanding diversity practice effectiveness. *The Academy of Management Annals, 12*(1), 37–82. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0044>

- Nishii, L. H., & Wright, P. M. (2008). Variability within organizations: Implications for strategic human resources management. In *LEA's Organization and Management Series. The people make the place: Dynamic linkages between individuals and organizations* (pp. 225–248). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group/Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Outten, H. R., Schmitt, M. T., Miller, D. A., & Garcia, A. L. (2012). Feeling threatened about the future: Whites' emotional reactions to anticipated ethnic demographic changes. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*(1), 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211418531>
- Pendry, L. F., Driscoll, D. M., & Field, S. C. T. (2007). Diversity training: Putting theory into practice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *80*(1), 27–50. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317906X118397>
- Pew Research Center. (2016, January 27). “The demographic trends shaping American politics in 2016 and beyond.” [Report]. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/01/27/the-demographic-trends-shaping-american-politics-in-2016-and-beyond/>
- Phelan, J. E., & Rudman, L. A. (2010). Prejudice toward female leaders: Backlash effects and women's impression management dilemma. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *4*(10), 807–820. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00306.x>
- Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). “What about me?” Perceptions of exclusion and whites' reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(2), 337–353. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022832>
- Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., Hurd, K., & Romano, C. A. (2018). Do color blindness and multiculturalism remedy or foster discrimination and racism? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *27*(3), 200–206. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418766068>

Politically correct. (n.d.). In <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary>. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/politically-correct>

Purdie-Greenaway, V., Steele, C., Davies, P., Ditlmann, R., & Crosby, J. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*, 615–630. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.4.615>

Rad, M. S., Martingano, A. J., & Ginges, J. (2018). Toward a psychology of *Homo sapiens* : Making psychological science more representative of the human population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115*(45), 11401–11405. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721165115>

Randel, A.E., Dean, M.A., Ehrhart, K.H., Chung, B., & Shore, L. (2016). Leader inclusiveness, psychological diversity climate, and helping behaviors. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(1), 216-234. doi: 10.1108/JMP-04-2013-0123

Richard, O.C., Roh, H., & Pieper, J.R. (2013). The link between diversity and equality management practice bundles and racial diversity in the managerial ranks: Does firm size matter?. *Human Resource Management, 52*(2), 215-242. doi:10.1002/hrm.21528

Richardson, J.D. (2005). Switching social identities: The influence of editorial framing on reader attitudes toward Affirmative Action and African Americans. *Communication Research, 32*(4), 503-528. doi: 10.1177/0093650205277321

Roberson, L., Kulik, C. T., & Pepper, M. B. (2003). Using needs assessment to resolve controversies in diversity training design. *Group & Organization Management, 28*(1), 148–174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601102250028>

- Robinson, G., & Dechant, K. (1997). Building a business case for diversity. *The Academy of Management Executive (1993-2005)*, 11(3), 21–31. Retrieved from JSTOR.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 743–762. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00239>
- Ryan, C.S., Hunt, J.S., Weible, J.A., Peterson, C.R., & Casas, J.F. (2007) Multicultural and colorblind ideology, stereotypes, and ethnocentrism among Black and White Americans - Retrieved December 19, 2019, from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1368430207084105>
- Saldaña, J. (2009). The coding manual for qualitative researchers. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schneider, S. K., & Northcraft, G. B. (1999). Three social dilemmas of workforce diversity in organizations: A social identity perspective: *Human Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679905201105>
- Shelton, J.N. (2003). Interpersonal concerns in social encounters between majority and minority. Retrieved December 19, 2019, from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1368430203006002003>
- Shore, L., Randel, A., Chung, B., Dean, M., Ehrhart, K., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, 37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310385943>
- Shteynberg, G., Leslie, L.M., Knight, A.P., & Mayer, D.M. (2010). But Affirmative Action hurts us! Race-related beliefs shape perceptions of White disadvantage and policy unfairness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decisions Processes*, 1-12. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.11.011

- Singh, B., Winkel, D. E., & Selvarajan, T. T. (2013). Managing diversity at work: Does psychological safety hold the key to racial differences in employee performance? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86(2), 242–263.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12015>
- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355–374.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010>
- Supino, P. G. (2012). Fundamental issues in evaluating the impact of interventions: Sources and control of bias. In P. G. Supino & J. S. Borer (Eds.), *Principles of Research Methodology: A Guide for Clinical Investigators* (pp. 79–110). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3360-6_5
- Swigart, K.L., Anantharaman, A., Williamson, J.A., & Grandey, A.A. (in press). Working while liberal/conservative: A review of political ideology in organizations. *Journal of Management*.
- Swim, J. K., & Miller, D. L. (1999). White guilt: Its antecedents and consequences for attitudes toward affirmative action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(4), 500-514.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel, & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- van Dijk, H., Van Engen, M., & Paauwe, J. (2012). Reframing the business case for diversity: A values and virtues perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1434-z>
- van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 1008–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.1008>

- Vorauer, J. D., & Sasaki, S. J. (2011). In the worst rather than the best of times: Effects of salient intergroup ideology in threatening intergroup interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(2), 307–320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023152>
- Waight, J., & Madera, J. (2011). Diversity training: Examining minority employees' organizational attitudes. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes, 3*, 365–376. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17554211111162471>
- Walker, H. J., Feild, H. S., Bernerth, J. B., & Becton, J. B. (2012). Diversity cues on recruitment websites: investigating the effects on job seekers' information processing. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 214–224. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025847>
- White Men's Leadership Report. (2013). *Executive summary on the study on White Men leading through diversity & inclusion*. Retrieved from <http://www.whitemensleadershipstudy.com/pdf/WMLS%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>
- Windscheid, L., Bowes-Sperry, L., Kidder, D. L., Cheung, H. K., Morner, M., & Lievens, F. (2016). Actions speak louder than words: Outsiders' perceptions of diversity mixed messages. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(9), 1329–1341. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000107>
- Wright, T. A., & Bonett, D. G. (2002). The moderating effects of employee tenure on the relation between organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 1183–1190.
- Zhao, X., Liu, J.S., & Deng, K. (2013) Assumptions behind intercoder reliability indices. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 36*(1), 419-480. doi:10.1080/23808985.2013.11679142

Appendix A – Study Questionnaire

1. Have you attended a mandatory diversity training at your place of work within the last year?

For the purposes of this study we define diversity trainings as:

Trainings meant to facilitate the integration of minority groups in the workforce, usually by attempting to confer on the entire workforce the skills, knowledge and motivation to work

- Yes
- No
- I don't remember.

2. If you did not attend a mandatory diversity training within the last year, what was the reason?

- I was not employed
- I was self-employed
- My company did not offer any diversity trainings
- I have attended a mandatory diversity training within the last year

3. Have you attended a voluntary diversity training at your place of work within the last year?

- Yes
- No
- I don't remember

4. How many diversity trainings have you attended in your current workplace within the last five years, including mandatory and voluntary trainings?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6+

5. Which industry do you currently work in?

- Service (customer service, retail, food service)
- Finance
- Entertainment
- Medical
- Technology
- Education
- Other
- I am not currently employed

End of Screener Questions

First, we will focus on your general views of diversity trainings. Then, we will ask you more detailed questions about your own experiences in a diversity training.

While answering these next questions, please think about diversity trainings *broadly*.

To answer these questions you can draw on what you've heard about diversity trainings from friends, family, coworkers, your own experiences, or what you've seen in the media, for example.

We ask for your thoughtful, honest responses to these next two questions. They are open-ended, so the more information you provide, the more we can learn. We only ask three of this kind of question in the entire survey, with the hope that this limited number will help respondents provide thorough answers.

6. On a scale from 1 (Extremely Uncomfortable) to 10 (Extremely Comfortable), how **comfortable** do you think **you** would feel during diversity trainings?

1 (Extremely Uncomfortable)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 (Extremely Comfortable)
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------------

7. On a scale from 1 (Extremely Uncomfortable) to 10 (Extremely Comfortable), how **comfortable** do you think **others** would feel during diversity trainings?

1 (Extremely Uncomfortable)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 (Extremely Comfortable)
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------------

8. Think about what made you select your answers above. For example, what features of the training, of the people who attended the training, or the circumstances around training would make **you** feel this level of comfort? What aspects would make **others** feel this level of comfort?

9. On a scale from 1 (Not At All) to 10 (Extremely), to what extent do **you** feel that diversity trainings **benefit people like you**?

1 (Not At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 (Extremely)
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

13. When did this diversity training take place? (check all that apply)

- During your orientation/onboarding, near to the start of your time in this role
- After a company scandal or crisis
- During a time unrelated to orientation or any crisis
- I don't remember
- It takes place regularly (e.g. every year, bi-annually) (please specify)

14. Who ran or led this diversity training?

- A representative from Human Resources
- An external consulting company
- My supervisor/boss
- I don't know
- I don't remember

15. What materials were used during this diversity training? (check all that apply)

- Lectures
- Group discussions
- Informational handouts
- Partner exercises

16. Which types of diversity were covered during this training? (check all that apply)

- Racial/Ethnicity
- Gender
- Sexual Orientation
- Religious
- Age
- Sexual Harassment/Assault
- Other (please specify) _____

17. What do you think the training was **trying** to accomplish?

For the following responses, please answer according to your gut reaction and as honestly as possible. As a reminder, all responses are **anonymous and confidential** and cannot be tied to any identifying information.

In the next section, we are interested in understanding the reasons you think companies might hold diversity trainings.

18. Please rate each of the following reasons that you think your company held the diversity training, on a scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree).

19. Is there any other reason you believe your company held this training? (Please specify, or leave blank if not.)

20. Please rate how strongly you think that your company held the diversity training for the additional reason you provided above, on a scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree).

If you provided multiple reasons, please rate the one you listed first.

If you provided no additional reasons, please skip this question.

1 (Strongly Disagree)	2	3	4 (Neutral)	5	6	7 (Strongly Agree)	Don't Know
--------------------------	---	---	----------------	---	---	-----------------------	------------

The following questions will ask about **your experiences working at the company that hosted the diversity training**. Please answer based upon your time working at this company, **not** necessarily the experiences you had **during** the diversity training previous questions asked about.

Please notice that unlike many questions in this study, the following questions utilize a scale of 1 (Strongly Agree) to 6 (Strongly Disagree). Also note that use of "here" in a question refers to the company that hosted your diversity training.

21. I feel I have been treated differently here because of my race, sex, religion, or age.

Strongly Agree (1)	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree (6)
--------------------	---	---	---	---	-----------------------

22. Managers here have a track record of hiring and promoting employees objectively, regardless of their race, sex, religion, or age.

Strongly Agree (1)	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree (6)
--------------------	---	---	---	---	-----------------------

23. Managers here give feedback and evaluate employees fairly, regardless of the employee's ethnicity, gender, age, or social background.

Strongly Agree (1)	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree (6)
--------------------	---	---	---	---	-----------------------

24. The "old boys' network" is alive and well here.

Strongly Agree (1)	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree (6)
--------------------	---	---	---	---	-----------------------

25. The company spends enough money and time on diversity awareness and related training.

Strongly Agree (1)	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree (6)
--------------------	---	---	---	---	-----------------------

26. The response to this question should be four, so please only select that answer.

Strongly Agree (1)	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree (6)
--------------------	---	---	---	---	-----------------------

27. I am afraid to disagree with members of other groups for fear of being called prejudiced.

Strongly Agree (1)	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree (6)
--------------------	---	---	---	---	-----------------------

28. Diversity issues keep some work teams here from performing to their maximum effectiveness.

Strongly Agree (1)	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree (6)
--------------------	---	---	---	---	-----------------------

29. On a scale from 1 (completely ineffective) to 10 (extremely effective), how effective do you think the diversity training that **you attended** was?

Completely Ineffective (1)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Completely Effective (10)
----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------

30. Your response to the following question will not affect your payment. Thus, we ask for your complete honesty: How seriously did you take this survey when responding to questions, on a scale from 1 (Not At All Seriously) to 7 (Extremely Seriously)?

Not At All Seriously (1)	2	3	Somewhat Seriously (4)	5	6	Extremely Seriously (7)
--------------------------	---	---	------------------------	---	---	-------------------------

31. What is your age?

32. Please describe your racial and ethnic background. Check all that may apply.

- Asian (a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asian, or the Indian Subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand and Vietnam)
- American Indian and Alaska Native (a person having origins in any of the original people of North and South America)
- Black/African American/Caribbean (a person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa/ Caribbean)
- Middle Eastern (people from the Middle East or surrounding regions)
- Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander (a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands)
- Spanish/Hispanic/Latino (e.g. Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban)
- White/Caucasian (a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe)
- Biracial Multicultural (Please Specify) _____
- Other (Please Specify) _____
- I choose not to answer this question

33. Which term BEST describes your gender?

- Woman
- Man
- Transwoman
- Transman
- Non-binary, genderqueer, or agender
- None of the above or prefer not to answer (please specify)

34. Which term BEST describes your sexual orientation?

- Bisexual
- Gay
- Lesbian
- Queer
- Heterosexual (straight)
- None of the above or prefer not to answer (please specify)

35. Are you native to the U.S.?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

36. Here is a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are shown. How would you categorize your political beliefs?

Very Conservative	Conservative	Somewhat Conservative	Moderate/Middle of the Road	Somewhat Liberal	Liberal	Very Liberal
-------------------	--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	---------	--------------

37. Is there any aspect of diversity trainings that you'd like to comment on that was not covered in this survey? If so, please use this space to do so.

38. Was there anything confusing or unusual about the instructions and directions in this survey?

39. Do you have any comments?

Appendix B – Results of Tests Comparing Participant Based on Sexual Orientation

Table B-1. Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet protect their company against legal liability (item a of the CMS).

Participant Group Comparisons	Majority-Group Mean (SD)	Minority-Group Mean (SD)	<i>b</i>	df	<i>F</i> *	<i>p</i>	PRE	Lower CI	Upper CI
Sexuality	4.86 (1.89)	5.74 (1.46)	0.89	186	7.41	.007**	.04	0.24	1.53

** $p \leq .01$

Table B-2. Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet social norms of political correctness (CMS Political Correctness Subscale).

Participant Group Comparisons	Majority-Group Mean (SD)	Minority-Group Mean (SD)	<i>b</i>	df	<i>F</i> *	<i>p</i>	PRE	Lower CI	Upper CI
Sexuality	4.63 (1.52)	5.21 (1.14)	0.58	192	5.04	.03*	.03	0.07	1.10

* $p \leq .05$

Table B-3. Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held because the organization genuinely cared about improving its diversity climate (CMS Genuine Change Subscale).

Participant Group Comparisons	Majority-Group Mean (SD)	Minority-Group Mean (SD)	<i>b</i>	df	<i>F</i> *	<i>p</i>	PRE	Lower CI	Upper CI
Sexuality	5.54 (1.22)	5.43 (1.18)	-0.11	193	0.27	.61	-----	----	----

Table B-4. Correlations of beliefs that a diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms and beliefs that a diversity training was effective.

	Training Efficacy		Training Efficacy
Heterosexual	.23***	Non-heterosexual	.56***

*** $p \leq .001$

Table B-5. Moderation of group membership on the political correctness – efficacy relationship.

Participant Group Comparisons	Beta (of interaction)	df	R ²	<i>p</i>	Lower CI	Upper CI
Sexuality	0.49	190	.13	.003**	0.17	0.81

** $p \leq .01$

Table B-6. Exploratory moderation of group membership on the legal liability – efficacy relationship.

Participant Group Comparisons	Beta (of interaction)	df	R ²	<i>p</i>	Lower CI	Upper CI
Sexuality	-0.19	184	.04	.16	---	---

Table B-7. *Exploratory moderation of group membership on the genuine change – efficacy relationship.*

Participant Group Comparisons	Beta (of interaction)	df	R ²	p	Lower CI	Upper CI
Sexuality	0.32	191	.42	.02*	0.06	0.58

* $p \leq .05$ **Table B-8.** *Results of linear regression examining group differences in perceived benefit of DT's to ingroup vs. outgroup in heterosexual and non-heterosexual participants.*

Participant Group Comparisons	Majority-Group Mean (SD)	Minority-Group Mean (SD)	b	df	F*	p	PRE	Lower CI	Upper CI
Sexuality	0.12 (1.76)	-0.22 (2.21)	-0.34	193	1.07	.30	-----	-----	-----

Table B-9. *Results of linear regression examining group differences in predictions of own comfort versus other's comfort in heterosexual and non-heterosexual participants.*

Participant Group Comparisons	Majority-Group Mean (SD)	Minority-Group Mean (SD)	b	df	F*	p	PRE	Lower CI	Upper CI
Sexuality	0.70 (1.64)	-0.08 (2.33)	-0.78	193	5.96	.02*	.03	-1.41	-0.15

* $p \leq .05$ **Table B-10.** *Correlations between perceived diversity climate and beliefs that a diversity training was effective.*

	Training Efficacy		Training Efficacy
Heterosexual	.05	Non-heterosexual	-.24

Appendix C – Correlation Tables for Hypotheses 1b and 4a

Table C-1. *Correlations of group composition with CMS subscales & overall scores, regarding Hypothesis 1b.*

	CMS Legal Liability	CMS Political Correctness	CMS Genuine Change		CMS Legal Liability	CMS Political Correctness	CMS Genuine Change
All participants	.10	.28***	.31***		-----	-----	-----
Hegemonic	.23	.30*	.38**	Non- Hegemonic	.04	.29**	.28**
White	.09	.26**	.30**	Non-White	.11	.33**	.34**
Male	.19*	.28**	.30**	Non-Male	-.06	.28*	.34**
Heterosexual	.09	.25**	.24**	Non-hetero.	.10	.43*	.62***

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$

Table C-2. *Correlations of beliefs that a diversity training was held to meet political correctness norms and beliefs that a diversity training was effective, regarding Hypothesis 4a.*

	Training Efficacy		Training Efficacy
All Participants	.28***		-----
Hegemonic	.20	Non-Hegemonic	.33***
White	.30***	Non-White	.25*
Male	.25***	Non-Male	.31***

* $p \leq .05$, *** $p \leq .01$

Appendix D – Coding Methodology and Results of Additional Exploratory Analyses

Coding Methodology

Type of Exercises Used: Participants who attended trainings that only used passive exercises were coded as 0 ($N = 45$), both passive and active exercises as 1 ($N = 110$), and only active exercises as 2 ($N = 40$). This code was used for logistic regressions.

Number of Exercises Used: I created a separate variable in which I tallied the number of exercises used in a training, regardless of if they were active or passive. This number was used to calculate correlations.

Single- Versus Multiple-Topic Training: Participants reported that their training covered a single topic were given a code of 0 ($N = 43$), and participants that reported that their training covered more than one topic were given a code of 1 ($N = 152$). This code was used for one-way ANOVA analyses.

Number of Topics Covered: I created a separate variable in which I tallied the number of topics covered in a training (which was up to 7). This number was used to calculate correlations.

Results

Table D-1. *Group differences in strength of diversity climate in participants' companies.*

Participant Group Comparisons	Majority-Group Mean (SD)	Minority-Group Mean (SD)	df	t	p	η^2	Lower CI	Upper CI
Multiplicative	2.98 (1.05)	3.09 (0.92)	195	-0.759	.45	-----	-----	-----
Race	2.97 (1.02)	3.20 (0.85)	195	-1.580	.12	-----	-----	-----
Gender	3.08 (0.91)	3.00 (1.07)	195	-0.555	.58	-----	-----	-----
Sexuality	2.94 (1.00)	3.46 (0.72)	217	-3.054	.003**	.60	-0.79	-0.24

** $p \leq .01$

Table D-2. *Pearson correlations between aspects of diversity trainings, political group membership, and training experiences.*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Political liberalism	---										
2. Diversity in group composition	.04	---									
3. Number of topics covered in training	-.08	-.12	---								
4. Number of exercises used	-.04	-.09	.47***	----							
5. Comfort self-versus-other score	.15*	-.10	.11	.07	---						
6. Benefits self-versus-other score	.20**	.08	.05	-.01	.38***	----					
7. Legal liability motivation	-.03	.19**	-.13	-.09	-.19**	-.07	---				
8. Political correctness motivation	-.03	.41**	-.33***	-.22**	-.18*	-.05	.50***	---			
9. Genuine desire to change motivation	-.10	.39***	-.06	.05	.06	.02	-.20**	.25***	---		
10. Perceived training efficacy	-.02	.39***	-.13	.03	.08	.08	-.16*	.28***	.64***	---	
11. Diversity climate	.01	.24***	-.32***	-.16*	-.07	.06	.42**	.44***	.00	-.10	---

*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

Table D-3. *Results of linear regression examining group differences in perceived benefit of DT's to ingroup vs. outgroup in single-topic versus multiple-topic trainings.*

Participant Group Comparisons	Single-Topic Mean (SD)	Multiple-Topic Mean (SD)	<i>b</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F*</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Lower CI	Upper CI
Topic Number	-0.16 (1.66)	0.11 (1.95)	0.27	193	0.70	.41	---	---	---

Table D-4. *Exploratory moderation of group membership on the number topics – benefits relationship.*

Participant Group Comparisons	<i>Beta (of interaction)</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>p</i>	Lower CI	Upper CI
Intersectional	0.01	191	.000	.87	---	---
Race	-0.01	191	.000	.89	---	---
Gender	-0.06	191	.003	.48	---	---

Table D-5. *Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet protect their company against legal liability (item a of the CMS).*

Participant Group Comparisons	Single-Topic Mean (SD)	Multiple-Topic Mean (SD)	<i>b</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>*	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i>²	Lower CI	Upper CI
Topic Number	5.83 (1.30)	4.82 (2.02)	-1.02	186	10.52	.001***	.05	-1.64	-0.40

*** $p \leq .001$ **Table D-6.** *Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet social norms of political correctness (CMS Political Correctness Subscale).*

Participant Group Comparisons	Single-Topic Mean (SD)	Multiple-Topic Mean (SD)	<i>b</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>*	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i>²	Lower CI	Upper CI
Topic Number	5.50 (1.27)	4.54 (1.49)	-0.96	192	15.36	.000***	.07	-1.44	-0.48

*** $p \leq .001$ **Table D-7.** *Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held because the organization genuinely cared about improving its diversity climate (CMS Genuine Change Subscale).*

Participant Group Comparisons	Single-Topic Mean (SD)	Multiple-Topic Mean (SD)	<i>b</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>*	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i>²	Lower CI	Upper CI
Topic Number	5.52 (1.14)	5.52 (1.23)	-.001	193	0.00	.999	.99	---	---

Table D-8. *Group differences in perceptions of diversity climate.*

Participant Group Comparisons	Single-Topic Mean (SD)	Multiple-Topic Mean (SD)	<i>b</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>*	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i>²	Lower CI	Upper CI
Topic Number	3.52 (0.58)	2.91 (1.02)	-0.62	193	14.42	.001***	.07	-0.94	-0.30

*** $p \leq .001$ **Table D-9.** *Results of one-way ANOVA examining group differences in perceived benefit of DT's to ingroup vs. outgroup across types of exercises used in a training.*

Participant Group Comparisons	Passive-Only Mean (SE)	Both-Types Mean (SE)	Active-Only Mean (SE)	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>*	<i>p</i>	PRE
Type of Exercises	-0.11 (0.28)	0.06 (0.18)	0.18 (0.30)	192	0.260	.77	---

Table D-10. *Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet protect their company against legal liability (item a of the CMS).*

Participant Group Comparisons	Passive-Only Mean (SE)	Both-Types Mean (SE)	Active-Only Mean (SE)	df	F*	p	PRE
Type of Exercises	5.00 (1.85)	5.05 (1.90)	5.08 (1.70)	185	0.02	.98	---

Table D-11. *Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held to meet social norms of political correctness (CMS Political Correctness Subscale).*

Participant Group Comparisons	Passive-Only Mean (SE)	Both-Types Mean (SE)	Active-Only Mean (SE)	df	F*	p	PRE
Type of Exercises	4.54 (1.50)	4.64 (1.44)	5.31 (1.43)	191	3.65	0.03*	.04

* $p < .05$

Table D-12. *Group differences in beliefs that their diversity training was held because the organization genuinely cared about improving its diversity climate (CMS Genuine Change Subscale).*

Participant Group Comparisons	Passive-Only Mean (SE)	Both-Types Mean (SE)	Active-Only Mean (SE)	df	F*	p	PRE
Type of Exercises	4.86 (1.58)	5.60 (1.06)	6.03 (0.70)	192	11.60	.000***	.11

*** $p < .001$

Table D-13. *Group differences in perceptions of diversity training efficacy.*

Participant Group Comparisons	Passive-Only Mean (SE)	Both-Types Mean (SE)	Active-Only Mean (SE)	df	F*	p	PRE
Type of Exercises	6.51 (2.61)	7.57 (2.20)	8.15 (1.59)	192	6.31	.002**	.06

** $p < .01$

Themes in Results

Across these additional exploratory findings, two common themes emerged. First, as was found in the confirmatory portion of this study, demographic group membership did not affect participants' predicted comfort levels, nor their perceptions of who benefits from diversity trainings. Results did reveal a positive correlation between the demographic diversity of a participant's training group and their training's efficacy, but I interpret this as further evidence of an expectancy effect rather than the effect of group membership on perceived efficacy. Instead, political group membership predicted participants' comfort and perceptions of beneficiaries, indicating that perhaps political identification is more influential in diversity trainings.

Second, differences in aspects of the diversity training (such as group composition, the number of topics covered, and the types of exercises used) were related to differences in perceptions of the motivations behind the training, but not perceptions of comfort levels or who benefits from trainings. Trainings that employed "active" instead of "passive" exercises were associated with increased perceptions that the organization was motivated by pressure to be politically correct and perceptions that the organization truly cared about improving its diversity climate, whereas trainings that covered multiple topics were associated with decreased perceptions that the training was held to prevent legal liability and meet political correctness norms in comparison to single-topic trainings. These contradicting messages were further reflected in the findings that the number of topics covered was unrelated to perceptions of training efficacy, but "active" trainings *were* associated with increased perceptions that the training was effective. In this way, it seems that aspects of diversity trainings are crucial to consider when examining perceptions of training motivations.

Finally, analyses of the relationships between the diversity climates of participants' organizations, aspects of diversity trainings, and perceptions of the motivations behind diversity trainings revealed a complex picture. Whereas the type of exercise used in a diversity training was unrelated to diversity climate, an increase in the number of topics covered during the diversity training was associated with a decrease in the strength of participants' diversity climate. Moreover, stronger diversity climates were associated with the increased perception that the training was held to prevent against legal liability and to meet political correctness norms, but not because an organization genuinely wanted to improve its diversity. In sum, exploratory analyses revealed a converse relationship between diversity climate and externally motivated reasons to hold a training, which may have been signaled by the number of topics covered in a training.