

PERCEIVED RACIAL DISCRIMINATION'S ASSOCIATION WITH PROCEDURAL  
JUSTICE AS MODERATED BY ORGANIZATIONAL EFFORTS TO SUPPORT  
DIVERSITY: A REPLICATION AND EXTENSION OF TRIANA & GARCÍA (2009)

by

Adoril Oshana

A thesis submitted to the faculty of  
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts in  
Industrial and Organizational Psychology

Charlotte

2022

Approved by:

---

Dr. George C. Banks

---

Dr. Jill E. Yavorsky

---

Dr. Scott Tonidandel

©2022  
Adoril Oshana  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

ADORIL OSHANA. Perceived Racial Discrimination's Association With Procedural Justice as Moderated by Organizational Efforts to Support Diversity: A Replication and Extension of Triana & García (2009). (Under the direction of DR. GEORGE C. BANKS)

Racial-ethnic minorities (i.e., those who do not identify as White alone, not Hispanic or Latinx) compose about 40% of the U.S. population. Social justice initiatives resulted in the government providing protections for such minorities in the workplace. In addition, organizations have enacted policies to foster a supportive diversity climate in their spaces. A supportive diversity climate has been found to result in a positive impact on employees' affective and achievement outcomes. Nevertheless, to the author's knowledge, employee perceptions of what specific efforts are viewed as a supportive diversity climate are not well-investigated; and replications of diversity studies in the organizational science literature are sparse. Therefore, Study 1 sought to partially replicate that of Triana and García (2009), who researched the association of perceived racial discrimination on procedural justice as moderated by perceived organizational efforts to support diversity. Of the two hypotheses chosen for replication in Study 1, one was supported: controlling for gender, age, minority status, work experience, student status, and employment status, higher perceived workplace racial discrimination was negatively associated with procedural justice ( $\beta = -.33, p = 0.001$ ). Study 2 used topic modeling to inquire into what U.S. employees perceive as organizational diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts (separately). Evidence showed participants perceived their organizations' diverse hiring, training/education, celebration of events, and employee resource groups as efforts to promote diversity; equal treatment of employees,

standardized organizational processes, employee voice, and pay equity as efforts to promote equity; and social events, employee voice, merit-based hiring, and discrimination intolerance as efforts to promote inclusion. The current study contributes to the literature by providing further support of the negative association of perceived racial discrimination and procedural justice in the workplace, along with a taxonomy of perceived organizational diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. Regarding practical contributions, organizations may in engage in similar efforts to signal a diversity climate but nevertheless should strongly take into consideration the types of efforts that actually result in diverse, equitable, and inclusive spaces.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my adviser Dr. George Banks for all his unwavering support throughout this project. I further thank Zachary Loomas and Andrew Tyner from the Center for Open Science for helping with the replication and pre-registration process for Study 1. Lastly, I thank my committee members Drs. Jill Yavorsky and Scott Tonidandel for their willingness to provide valuable suggestions for this project. This project was sponsored by the Department of Defense through an award to the Center for Open Science.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: STUDY 1 INTRODUCTION	4
2.1 Racial Discrimination	4
2.2 Organizational Justice	6
2.2.1 Procedural Justice	7
2.3 Organizational Efforts for a Supportive Diversity Climate	8
CHAPTER 3: STUDY 1 METHOD	12
3.1 Open Science Practices	12
3.2 Participants	12
3.3 Procedure	13
3.4 Measures	13
3.4.1 Procedural Justice	13
3.4.2 Perceived Workplace Racial Discrimination	14
3.4.3 Perceived Organizational Efforts to Support Diversity	15
3.4.4 Demographics	15
3.4.5 Pre-screener	15
CHAPTER 4: STUDY 1 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	17
CHAPTER 5: STUDY 2 INTRODUCTION	19
5.1 Organizational Efforts for a Supportive Diversity Climate	19
CHAPTER 6: STUDY 2 METHOD	21
6.1 Open Science Practices	21

6.2 Participants	21
6.3 Procedure	21
6.4 Measures	21
6.4.1 Perceived Organizational Efforts for a Supportive Diversity Climate	21
6.4.2 Demographics	22
6.4.3 Pre-screener	22
6.5 Statistical Analysis	23
6.5.1 Data Immersion	24
6.5.2 Data Cleaning & Preparation	24
6.5.2.1 Custom Words	24
6.5.3 Conducting the Analyses	25
CHAPTER 7: STUDY 2 RESULTS & DISCUSSION	27
7.1 Diversity Topics	27
7.1.1 Diverse Hiring	27
7.1.2 Training/Education	28
7.1.3 Celebration of Events	29
7.1.4 Employee Resource Groups	30
7.2 Equity Topics	31
7.2.1 Equal Treatment	31
7.2.2 Standardized Procedures	32
7.2.3 Voice	33
7.2.4 Pay Equity	34

7.3 Inclusion Topics	35
7.3.1 Social Events	35
7.3.2 Voice	36
7.3.3 Merit-based Hiring	37
7.3.4 Discrimination Intolerance	38
CHAPTER 8: GENERAL DISCUSSION	40
8.1 Theoretical and Practical Contributions	40
8.2 Limitations and Future Directions	42
8.3 Conclusion	46
REFERENCES	47
APPENDIX A: Study I Email Recruitment	75
APPENDIX B: Study I Phase I Survey	76
APPENDIX C: Study I Phase II Survey	87
APPENDIX D: Study I MTurk Recruitment	96
APPENDIX E: Study II Survey	97



## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Study I: Descriptive Statistics of Demographics and Study Measures	60
TABLE 2: Study I: Regression Results Using Procedural Justice as the Criterion	61
TABLE 3: Study I: Bivariate Correlation Matrix of Study I Variables	63
TABLE 4: Study II: Descriptive Statistics of Demographics	64
TABLE 5: Diversity Corpora: Custom Words Omitted From Analysis	66
TABLE 6: Equity Corpora: Custom Words Omitted From Analysis	67
TABLE 7: Inclusion Corpora: Custom Words Omitted From Analysis	68
TABLE 8: Diversity Topics	69
TABLE 9: Equity Topics	71
TABLE 10: Inclusion Topics	73

## CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The United States is composed of minority groups across different domains (i.e., sexual orientation, religious/spiritual beliefs, race, ethnicity, national origin, among others). For instance, about 40% identifies with a racial/ethnic group not inclusive of White alone, not Hispanic or Latinx (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). Due to major social movements, the federal government has enacted laws to prohibit discriminatory behaviors and to encourage inclusion in the workplace (e.g., Equal Pay Act of 1963, Civil Rights Act of 1964, etc.). When organizations effectively implement inclusionary policies and create environments that employees deem equitable, they benefit from positive outcomes such as decreases in turnover (Chrobot-Mason & Aramovich, 2013; Stewart et al., 2011), increases in innovation (Bassett-Jones, 2005), and greater productivity (Richard et al., 2004). However, despite the advances in the realm of organizational diversity and inclusion literature, there are gaps that are worthy of future research.

One gap is the lack of replication studies of diversity research, perhaps due to a lack of understanding of the utility of such studies (Köhler & Cortina, 2019). A replication study is one that investigates a phenomenon at least another time with either the same authors as the first time (dependent replication) or by a new set of authors (independent replication; Köhler & Cortina, 2019). One novel study by Triana and García (2009)—based on a sample of 181 U.S. employees—found that there is a negative association between perceived racial discrimination and procedural justice. The novelty of their study was the importance of perceived organizational efforts to support diversity.

Whereas it is well understood that organizations should value diversity and inclusion efforts, Triana and García's (2009) study was one of the few in the literature that examined the mitigatory effects of perceived organizational efforts to support diversity on the negative association between perceived racial discrimination and procedural justice (at an individual-level). The majority of researchers have investigated these efforts on positive outcomes (e.g, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, etc.; McKay & Avery, 2015). I aim to replicate Triana and García's (2009) findings, to further investigate perceived organizational efforts to support diversity, and to address possible sampling error.

A second gap is our understanding of the antecedents of a supportive diversity climate in organizations. Vast literature on diversity climate—or employees' perceptions of organizational efforts to implement a fair and inclusionary environment among diverse personnel (McKay & Avery, 2015)—already exists to demonstrate the outcomes of the said construct. Signaling theory has been used as a way to provide explanation (Connelly et al., 2011). Nevertheless, knowledge of the antecedents of diversity climate are limited which would provide knowledge of the functions of diversity climate along with the management of diversity in organizations (McKay & Avery, 2015). For example, researchers of one study found that formal diversity programs were associated with positive perceptions of diversity climate among employees (Herdman & McMillan-Capehart, 2010). Specifically, the variable of “diversity programs” was measured by asking participants whether their organization has a diversity policy and program, makes the effort to target and recruit minority employees, and incorporates perspectives of all employees (given diverse backgrounds and experiences) in decision-making (Herdman &

McMillan-Capehart, 2010). The authors noted that their measure was generic and that it would be worthy for future researchers to measure “diversity programs” in a more nuanced manner (Herdman & McMillan-Capehart, 2010). Diversity climate as a construct involves the perception of how employees view their organizations. Thus, the current study seeks to create a taxonomy of the specific organizational efforts and initiatives that participants perceive as constituting a fair and inclusionary environment.

The current study begins by reviewing the literature on racial discrimination in the workplace, organizational justice, and organizational efforts to support diversity. Next, I aim to conduct a replication study (Study 1) of Triana and García's (2009) original study by testing the original study's first and second hypotheses regarding the association between perceived racial discrimination on procedural justice and the moderator variable of perceived organizational efforts to support diversity. Then, I aim to collect open-ended responses from a separate, MTurk sample of U.S. employees to create a taxonomy of perceived organizational efforts/initiatives of a supportive diversity climate (Study 2). I will conclude with a discussion of the theoretical and practical implications.

## CHAPTER 2: STUDY 1 INTRODUCTION

In this section, I will address our current understanding of racial discrimination in organizational settings. I further delve into the literature on organizational justice and specifically discuss procedural justice. Finally, I discuss the literature on organizational efforts for a supportive diversity climate and describe signaling theory.

### **2.1 Racial Discrimination**

Discrimination may be defined as, “denying equal treatment to individuals because of their group membership,” and thus, racial discrimination would reflect the denial of equality based on one’s racial identity (Allport, 1954). Despite laws to deter it (e.g., Title VII of the Civil Rights Act), racial discrimination in the workplace continues to exist. For example, during the 2020 fiscal year, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) reported 67,448 discrimination charges, 22,064 (32.7%) of which were regarding race (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2021). Given the prevalence of racial discrimination, previous researchers have sought to understand its consequences. In their meta-analysis, Triana et al. (2015) demonstrated that perceived racial discrimination was negatively associated with job attitudes, physical health, psychological health, organizational citizenship behavior, and perceived diversity climate, and was positively associated with coping behaviors. Further, racial discrimination charges have led some organizations to pay fines worth millions of dollars (King & Spruell, 2001), clearly affecting the monetary success of these companies. On top of moral imperatives, it is also in the best interest for organizations to strive to end workplace racial discrimination.

Racial discrimination may not always be overt or intentional. Legally, disparate treatment and adverse impact have been used to explain some issues of racial discrimination in the workplace especially in selection procedures by using cognitive ability tests. Whereas disparate treatment is intentionally treating groups of differing social identities differently, adverse impact is organizational practices unintentionally affecting said groups with different outcomes. For instance, disparate treatment would be if an employer required drug tests for racial minority applications, but not from non-minority applicants (Avery et al., 2018). On the other hand, it would be adverse impact if, for instance, on average, racial minority applicants as a group scored less than non-minority applications on a cognitive ability test used for selection (Avery et al., 2018; Pyburn et al., 2008). As a means to determine adverse impact, the U.S. government has implemented the four-fifths rule in these contexts, such that selection for one group cannot be higher than four-fifths of the selection of another group. Subsequently, the use of minimum score qualifications (determining the lowest possible score an applicant can receive and still be selected; Kehoe & Olson, 2005), adverse impact ratios (Morris & Lobsenz, 2000), and adverse impact ratio significance testing (Roth et al., 2006) have also been used (Avery et al., 2018; Sackett & Lievens, 2008). Adverse impact and disparate treatment, thus, may be used to explain racial discrimination, at least in the context of personnel selection.

Some of the common ways of measuring racial discrimination in the workplace involve the use of survey, secondary (quantitative), and qualitative data. To illustrate, Roscigno et al. (2012) and Light et al. (2011) used closed, racial discrimination charges filed with the Ohio Civil Rights Commission for their studies. Ashe and Nazroo (2016)

made use of qualitative data to analyze racial discrimination in a British sample. In a similar vein, de Castro et al. (2006) noted the racial discrimination that some of their participants experienced in their sample of immigrant workers in Chicago. Finally, Triana et al. (2015) used 79 effect sizes for their meta-analysis of studies (from 1980 to 2013) measuring perceived racial discrimination, which predominantly used survey data. The current study will likewise measure perceived racial discrimination using a self-report survey measure.

## **2.2 Organizational Justice**

Given issues such as workplace racial discrimination, theoretical contributions have been made to explain employee perceptions of justice in organizations. Two theories worthy of discussion are distributive justice and procedural justice, which are the most predictive to organizational outcomes. Distributive justice pertains to the fairness of how organizational resources (e.g., pay, promotions, etc.) are distributed and how resolutions are made given disputes (Adams, 1965; Colquitt et al., 2005; Leventhal, 1976). On the other hand, procedural justice is defined as the perception of fairness of organizational processes that lead to decision-making (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Triana & García, 2009). Whereas research of the antecedents is limited, outcomes of the components of organizational justice have been investigated. That is, organizational citizenship behaviors, job satisfaction, and affective commitment are all related to the different components of organizational justice (based on the meta-analysis, consisting of field and lab studies, of [Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001]). More specifically, unfair procedural justice is the strongest predictor of counterproductive work behavior, work performance, affective commitment, and negative emotional reactions (Cohen-Charash &

Spector, 2001). Given its importance, further research of procedural justice may be warranted.

### ***2.2.1 Procedural Justice***

Leventhal's (1976) six rules provide a framework of one's determination of procedural justice. The rules include consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality (Leventhal, 1980). More specifically, perceptions of (procedural) injustice will result from a violation of the consistency rule ("lack of consistency in procedure"), bias-suppression rule ("unrestrained self-interest or devotion to doctrinaire views"), accuracy rule ("performance is evaluated on the basis of inappropriate information"), correctability rule (lack "of appeal [of] procedures that allow for review and modification of decisions at various stages of the allocative process"), representativeness rule (lack of representation of those "affected by the allocative process"), and ethicality rule ("allocative procedures violate personal standards of ethics and morality;" [Leventhal, 1976]).

Perceptions of racial discrimination may bring out perceptions of procedural injustice through the violation of certain rules. Triana and García (2009) argued that perceived racial discrimination would trigger violation of the consistency rule since fair treatment is not consistent across employees of differing races; bias-suppression rule because the discriminator(s) may favor in-group members due to social categorization (Turner, 1985) and similarity-attraction (Byrne, 1971); and accuracy rule because the discriminator(s) may treat others unfairly based on factors such as prejudices which are not based on "accurate information." As previously noted, procedural justice has important implications due its effects on organizational outcomes such as organizational



citizenship behavior and turnover, among others (Colquitt et al., 2001; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Triana & García, 2009), but, once again, the literature is scarce with regards to antecedents. For that reason, Triana and García (2009) aimed to investigate one type of antecedents, and—based on their arguments of procedural justice rule violations—argued that perceived racial discrimination should be negatively associated with procedural justice.

### **2.3 Organizational Efforts for a Supportive Diversity Climate**

Perceptions of procedural justice may be strengthened through organizational efforts/initiatives for a supportive diversity climate. As previously stated, (perception of) such efforts have been shown to mitigate the relationship between perceived racial discrimination and procedural justice (Triana & García, 2009). Psychological diversity climate—which is conceptually similar to “perceived organizational efforts to support diversity” referenced in Triana and García's (2009) study—concerns the perceptions of employees who determine whether their organization's diversity efforts promote a fair and inclusionary environment (McKay & Avery, 2015; Mor Barak et al., 2016). Not surprisingly, these types of efforts lead to positive work outcomes, such as greater job satisfaction, greater commitment to the organization, increased likelihood to remain on the job, and increased engagement in work (based on the meta-analysis of [Mor Barak et al., 2016]). Unlike the studies in the aforementioned meta-analysis, Triana and García's (2009) study was one of the few that investigated these perceived organizational efforts as a moderator variable to mitigate the negative outcomes of perceived racial discrimination on procedural justice. Usually, the outcomes studied are positive (i.e., organizational commitment, psychological safety, intentions to stay, etc.; McKay &

Avery, 2015). Diversity climate researchers have used signaling theory (Spence, 1973) as means to better understand a supportive diversity climate.

Signaling theory (Connelly et al., 2011; Spence, 1973) may serve to explain how employees perceive a diverse climate. The theory discusses that employees (and applicants) may turn to noticeable organizational cues in order to alleviate perceptions of uncertainty regarding the organization (i.e., information asymmetry; Bergh, Ketchen, Orlandi, Heugens, & Boyd, 2019). Within the context of diversity climate, there has been support for signaling theory to help explain the effects of organizational procedures and policies on the perceptions of whether an organization values diversity (Saks & McCarthy, 2006). Namely, signaling theory has been used to explain the perception of age diversity in an organization (Bieling & Dorozalla, 2014) along with the perception of inclusion of racial-ethnic minorities in an organization through the signal of diversity training (Waight & Madera, 2011). In addition, in a sample of South Korean employees, support was found for signaling theory to help explain how the lack of family-friendly policies and gender composition in the organization can be associated with gender discrimination (Kim et al., 2014); more specifically, the authors discussed that a larger representation of women and that a greater number of family-friendly policies may signal support for mothers and gender equality. In general, organizations may signal a diversity climate through their organizational policy and procedures, especially if these policies are formalized (Stainback, 2018). Nevertheless, there is limited research on the antecedents of diversity climate; meaning, what employees perceive as efforts for a supportive diversity climate (the focus of Study 2).

On the other hand, research on the outcomes of diversity climate is vast—once an organization effectively establishes an atmosphere of diversity climate, it will yield to positive outcomes. For example, better attendance, productivity, work quality, recruiting success, creativity, workgroup cohesiveness, etc., at the individual level; and market share, profitability, achievement of organizational goals, etc., at the organizational level (Cox, 1994; McKay & Avery, 2015). These outcomes would be met via employees' affective variables (e.g., satisfaction with job, identity with organization, etc.) and achievement variables (e.g., promotion, job performance, etc.) that would thus yield to their internalization of their organizations' missions (Cox, 1994; McKay & Avery, 2015). Taken together, similar to the original study, I hypothesize that:

*H<sub>1</sub>: Perceptions of racial discrimination at work will be negatively associated with perceptions of procedural justice at work.*

*H<sub>2</sub>: Organizational efforts to support diversity will moderate the negative association of perceptions of racial discrimination and perceptions of procedural justice at work.*

Triana and García (2009) investigated the association between perceived racial discrimination in the workplace and procedural justice along with the moderator variable of perceived organizational efforts to support diversity. The authors collected survey responses from participants across two time points 15 days apart (the independent and moderator variables in Phase I and dependent variable in Phase II). They recruited 261 employees from MBA and upper-division undergraduate business courses from a large public university in the southern U.S. Twenty-five participants were unemployed and subsequently removed (leaving 236), and 55 were removed afterwards because they did

not complete both phases of the study. Therefore, the final sample was 181 employees with an average age of 29 years old. Of the entire final sample, 77% were Hispanic, 57% were employed full-time (with an average work experience of eight years), 57% were MBA students, and 50% were women. My aim was to replicate the first and second hypothesis of their study and follow the same procedures.

## CHAPTER 3: STUDY 1 METHOD

### 3.1 Open Science Practices

Given that the current study is a replication study, to the extent possible, I tried not deviate from the original study of Triana and García (2009). Subject matter experts reviewed the study, and the original authors were contacted to provide their feedback. Lastly, the study was preregistered (study materials can be found here: <https://osf.io/56jqv/>).

### 3.2 Participants

The current study's sample was recruited from a large, research university from the southeast U.S. The city of recruitment consists of a population a little less than one million with 41.5% identifying as White, not Hispanic or Latinx, 35.2% identifying as Black or African American, and 14.3% identifying as Hispanic or Latinx as the top three largest racial groups in the city (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). To follow the original study, employed, upper-division undergraduates and MBA students were likewise recruited for the current study. However, based on a priori power analysis, 82 participants were needed to be recruited to achieve 90% power to detect 75% of the original effect size (or 119 participants to detect 50% of the original effect size) for Hypothesis 1. For the current study, the final sample size was 105 participants; the findings did not significantly differ between 82 and 105 participants. Inclusion criteria were that participants were employed adults aged 18 years and older, identified as either an upper-division undergraduate student or MBA student, and agreed to participate in both phases of the study. Refer to Table 1 for the sample's sociodemographic information and descriptive statistics.

### **3.3 Procedure**

Study 1 composed of two phases, Phase I and Phase II. To follow the recruitment procedure of the original authors, the plan was to invite participants at the end of their (business) class so that those who wanted to participate could stay afterwards to complete the Phase I questionnaire. The aim was to physically provide them with the questionnaires and nondescript envelopes for them to mail back their survey responses within 15 days. Furthermore, the plan was to ask for the participants' email addresses in the Phase I questionnaires to email the second phase of the study to them after the end of the 15 days. Given the COVID-19 pandemic, I had to modify Phase I's data collection procedure to online formatting. Recruitment took form in two manners: I emailed the university's College of Business faculty to recruit their students for the study and used the university's listserv to reach the desired sample size. In both cases, I invited participants to complete the Phase I questionnaire via a Qualtrics survey link and, on the Qualtrics platform, they were presented with the online consent form. Using the email addresses the participants provided in the Phase I questionnaire, I emailed the Phase II Qualtrics survey link to the participants after 15 days of Phase I completion. Upon the completion of the entire study, I compensated the participants with \$5 Amazon gift cards (sent to their email addresses). I treated all participants in accordance with the American Psychological Association's code of ethics (American Psychological Association, n.d.). The Department of Defense sponsored this study through an award to the Center for Open Science.

### **3.4 Measures**

#### ***3.4.1 Procedural Justice***

During Phase II, the dependent variable was measured using a modified version of seven items from Colquitt's (2001) measure. The items were modified for better comprehension. For example, an original item was, "The following items refer to the procedures used to arrive at your procedural justice. To what extent have you had influence over the procedural justice arrived at by those procedures?" Instead, the directions were, "The following items refer to your organization's procedures and treatment of you. To what extent:" and an example item was "Have you had influence over your organization's treatment of you?" Participants responded to the self-report measure with a five-anchor scale ranging from 1 (*to a small extent*) to 5 (*to a large extent*). Internal consistency was  $\alpha = 0.89$  for the original study (Triana & García, 2009) and  $\alpha = 0.87$  for the current study. Colquitt (2001) reported that the measure had discriminant validity (especially given the different forms of justice not inclusive of procedural justice: distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice) in a university and field sample.

### ***3.4.2 Perceived Workplace Racial Discrimination***

This independent variable was measured during Phase I using eight items of the Workplace Prejudice/Discrimination Inventory (James et al., 1994). Participants responded to the self-report measure with a six-anchor scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). Example items included: "At work I am treated poorly because of my racial/ethnic group" and "At my present job, some people get better treatment because of their racial/ethnic group." Internal consistency was  $\alpha = 0.88$  for the original study (Triana & García, 2009) and  $\alpha = 0.89$  for the current study. James, Lovato,

and Cropanzano (1994) reported that the measure had convergent validity in a sample of minorities in the workplace.

### ***3.4.3 Perceived Organizational Efforts to Support Diversity***

Following the original design (Triana & García, 2009), during Phase I, five items were used from multiple scales to measure the moderator variable. Two items were used from the Organizational Diversity Inventory (Hegarty & Dalton, 1995). An example item was, “Managing diversity helped my organization to be more effective.” One item (“My organization spends enough money and time on diversity awareness and related training”) was used from the Diversity Perceptions Scale (Mor Barak et al., 1998). Lastly, two items were used from Triana and García (2009): “My organization puts a lot of effort into diversity management” and “My organization values diversity.” Participants responded to the self-report items with a six-anchor scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). Internal consistency was  $\alpha = 0.84$  for the original study (Triana & García, 2009) and  $\alpha = 0.86$  for the current study. Indeed, a clear disadvantage of the measure is that it has not been psychometrically validated.

### ***3.4.4 Demographics***

Participants were asked to provide their demographic information during Phase I. The demographic information included: gender, race/ethnicity, employment status (part-time or full-time), work experience (years), student status (undergraduate or graduate), and age. Overall, the demographic information were treated as control variables.

### ***3.4.5 Pre-screener***

Because the university’s listserv recruitment method did not have the option to specifically invite upper-division, undergraduate and MBA students among the general



student body, a pre-screener was added at the beginning of the Phase I questionnaire to verify if the participants met inclusion criteria. The first question asked, “Are you a current MBA student, or a current undergraduate student (who has completed at least two years of college)?” If yes, participants indicated their student status (upper-division, undergraduate student or MBA student). The next and last question asked for their employment status (unemployed, part-time, full-time). Participants were only able to proceed with the study if they answered “Yes” to the first question and indicated a part-time or full-time employment status.

## CHAPTER 4: STUDY 1 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Bivariate associations are reported in Table 3. At the bivariate level, perceived workplace racial discrimination was negatively associated with procedural justice ( $r = -.46, p < .01$ ), exactly mirroring the original study (Triana & García, 2009). In addition, perceived organizational efforts to support diversity was positively associated with procedural justice ( $r = .41, p < .01$ ), similar to the original study ( $r = .22, p < .01$ ).

A three-step, hierarchical multiple regression model was employed to test the hypotheses. The control variables of gender, age, minority status, work experience, student status, and employment status were entered in Step 1 ( $R^2 = .09, p = 0.22$ ). Perceived workplace racial discrimination and perceived organizational efforts to support diversity were entered in Step 2 ( $R^2 = .35, \Delta R^2 = .26, p < 0.01$ ); this step was significant. Controlling for gender, age, minority status, work experience, student status, and employment status, higher perceived workplace racial discrimination was negatively associated with procedural justice ( $\beta = -.33, p = 0.001$ ), thus supporting Hypothesis 1 and replicating the original study's first hypothesis (Triana & García, 2009). An interaction between perceived workplace racial discrimination and perceived organizational efforts to support diversity was added for Step 3 ( $R^2 = .36, p < 0.01, \Delta R^2 = .011$ ); these variables were mean-centered in order to test for moderation. Unlike the original study ( $\beta = .14, SE = .07, p \leq 0.05$ ), the interaction was not significant ( $\beta = -.33, SE = .06, p = 0.21$ ). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported and did not replicate the original study's second hypothesis.

The results of Study 1 provide further evidence of the importance of perceived racial discrimination on procedural justice especially given that the results remained significant with a different sample than the original study (Triana & García, 2009). That is, when an employee perceives racial discrimination in the workplace, they will also more likely perceive that the procedures used to make decisions in their workplace are not fair. Even though Hypothesis 2 was not significant, it is worth noting that perceived organizational efforts to support diversity as an independent variable was significantly, positively associated with procedural justice in both Step 2 ( $\beta = 0.34, p < 0.001$ ) and 3 ( $\beta = 0.56, p < 0.001$ ). Even though a supportive diversity climate may not necessarily mitigate negative perceptions of racial discrimination on procedural justice (at least in this study), it is still important enough to provide at least some perception that the decision-making within the organization is fair. What employees perceive as organizational efforts for a supportive diversity climate will be discussed in the following study, Study 2.

## CHAPTER 5: STUDY 2 INTRODUCTION

### **5.1 Organizational Efforts for a Supportive Diversity Climate**

Organizational diversity efforts may help mitigate discriminatory perceptions (e.g., racial discrimination) and result in a supportive diversity climate. For instance, organizations have sought to create diverse workforces, improve relations between diverse group members, and increase inclusion within their spaces through diversity staffing practices, diversity training/intervention efforts, and mentoring programs (Roberson, 2019). Researchers have found that minority job seekers are more attracted to organizations with minority representation that also value diversity policies (Avery & McKay, 2006; Goldberg, 2005; Ng & Burke, 2005). These recruitment practices have also been found to be effective with non-minorities such that they are also more attracted to organizations that value diversity (Williamson et al., 2008). Furthermore, organizations have resorted to diversity awareness training through awareness of personal biases (e.g., via the Implicit Association Test), among others. However, the effectiveness of such training, or intervention, methods are limited (Roberson, 2019). Lastly, for the career development of women and racial/ethnic minorities, organizations have created formal mentoring programs consisting of a relationship between a more-experienced employee mentoring a less-experienced one (Creary & Roberts, 2017; Kram, 1988). There is some research support for these types of programs, such as organizational commitment and career satisfaction (Allen et al., 2004). Nevertheless, critics have also discussed cross-gender and cross-race mentoring barriers that limit their effectiveness (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Evidently, the relationship between diversity efforts and

diversity climate is convoluted (Herdman & McMillan-Capehart, 2010), and research on what employees perceive as a supportive diversity climate is not widely investigated. Understanding such perceptions will hopefully address this gap. Thus, leading to the following research question:

*RQ1: What U.S. organizational activities are perceived as efforts for a supportive diversity climate?*

## CHAPTER 6: STUDY 2 METHOD

### 6.1 Open Science Practices

Study 2 study materials, data, and R code are available here: <https://osf.io/3m4kr/>

### 6.2 Participants

A total of 151 participants were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Inclusion criteria were that participants were employed adults aged 18 years or older who resided in the United States. Participants were compensated \$1.00 for their participation in the study. Refer to Table 4 for the sample's sociodemographic information and descriptive statistics.

### 6.3 Procedure

I posted the study's recruitment message on MTurk. Prospective participants were directed to the study's Qualtrics link if they chose to participate in the study. There, upon meeting study eligibility, they were presented with the consent form. If they chose to proceed, they were then presented with the questionnaire of the study. At the end of the study, they were each presented with a random ID number for them to input back into MTurk; the ID number was used to verify study completion (for compensation) while also keeping their identities anonymous.

### 6.4 Measures

#### *6.4.1 Perceived Organizational Efforts for a Supportive Diversity Climate*

Participants were asked to respond to three open-ended items:

1. Diversity is defined as, “the condition or quality of being different, or varied” (“diversity,” n.d.). What initiatives/efforts does your organization engage in to promote diversity?
2. Inclusion is defined as, “the practice of integrating all people and groups” (“inclusion,” n.d.). What initiatives/efforts does your organization engage in to promote inclusion?
3. Equity is defined as, “the quality of being fair or impartial” (“equity,” n.d.). What initiatives/efforts does your organization engage in to promote equity?

These questions were all presented in one page to the participants, who were asked to provide at least 300 characters of responses for each of them. The questions—along with the entire Study II questionnaire—were pilot tested by a group of doctoral students for comprehension and feedback purposes.

#### ***6.4.2 Demographics***

The demographic information participants were asked to provide were gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, disability status, age, employment status (part-time/full-time), work experience (years), work industry, hierarchical level in organization (e.g., intern, manager, supervisor, etc.), and highest level of education completed.

#### ***6.4.3 Pre-screener***

A pre-screener was included at the beginning of the study, before the consent form was presented, to determine eligibility. Participants were asked about their employment status, U.S. residency status, and their age. They could only proceed with

the study if they indicated they were employed part-time or full-time, were U.S. residents at that time, and if they were 18 years or older.

## **6.5 Statistical Analysis**

The open-ended responses for each question were analyzed through topic modeling. Unlike other disciplines (i.e., computer science), organizational science is limited with the use of computer-aided text analysis techniques such as topic modeling (Banks et al., 2018). Topic modeling is an alternative data analytics approach to the traditional methods used in organizational research that is used to extract themes from a collection of texts (Schmiedel, Müller, & vom Brocke, 2019). Whereas the usage of deductive, quantitative methods is prevalent in organizational research (e.g., survey research), topic modeling allows the researcher to gain insight through qualitative means with a large amount of text (Schmiedel et al., 2019). Topic modeling was chosen over more traditional qualitative approaches because it takes the advantage of both human insight and machine learning (i.e., relative fast analysis of a larger text corpora) for exploration (Banks et al., 2018); traditional qualitative approaches generally require more resources and also do not scale well (Tonidandel et al., 2021).

The underlying assumption of topic modeling is that there are latent variables (topics) that are to be discovered. The researcher determines the labels and defines the topics that the algorithm helps emerge (by attributing a probability statistic to each word and grouping the words together). Given the importance of the variable of organizational diversity efforts within Triana and García's (2009) study, the current study addresses the aforementioned limitation by creating a taxonomy of such efforts perceived to be made by organizations.



### ***6.5.1 Data Immersion***

Prior to conducting the topic modeling analyses, I engaged in multiple steps to familiarize myself with the data and to prepare the data for analyses. First, I read each participant's responses to the three open-ended questions multiple times. I noted possible themes to consider along with potential custom words (see below) to be removed for the topic modeling analyses. I also made note of any documents that seemed to require additional data cleaning. Second, I manually coded about 25% of the data (primary-cycle coding; Tracy, 2013)—38 of the 151 documents for each of the three text corpora—as another way to gain understanding of the data and to consider plausible themes for the topic modeling analyses.

### ***6.5.2 Data Cleaning & Preparation***

I began to clean/prepare the data using the process outlined in Banks et al. (2018) and Tonidandel et al. (2021). I removed random text from certain documents (e.g., one participant entered the letter L multiple times in their responses). I converted the text to lowercase. I removed punctuation, symbols, numbers, separators, and stop words. Stop words are common terms within a language that provide little meaning—for example, in English, “the” or “my” (Tonidandel et al., 2021).

**6.5.2.1 Custom Words.** I removed custom words that I believed added little meaning. The list of custom words differed depending on if I was running the analysis for the diversity, equity, or inclusion text corpora. However, I removed some of the same custom words—“organization,” “company,” “initiative,” “initiatives,” etc.—for all three analyses because some participants used wording within the prompts to begin discussing their responses (e.g., “My organizations [*sic*] initiative/efforts toward engaging in to

promote diversity is...”). I also referred to the `topfeatures()` function to see the 25 most commonly used words, to word clouds, and to raw frequency weighting plots to determine possible custom words to remove for each of the three corpora. The process of removing custom words was iterative to see how their removal would affect findings. Before removing any custom word, I referred to the full dataset to read how the word was used in-context to the rest of a participant’s response. In the end, findings did not seem to significantly differ with or without them. Refer to Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7 for the list of custom words removed for the diversity, equity, and inclusion topic modeling analysis, respectively.

### ***6.5.3 Conducting the Analyses***

I used the `stm` package (Roberts et al., 2019) in R (R Core Team, 2021) to conduct the topic modeling analyses. Topic modeling uses Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA; Blei et al., 2003), which is a commonly-used algorithm assuming “that a document is a mixture of topics where each word in the document belongs to a single topic” (Banks et al., 2018, p. 449).

Despite manually coding 25% of the dataset, I did not have an a priori number of topics in mind for the topic modeling analyses; I had gathered many first-level codes during manual coding but had not consolidated them afterwards. My manual coding procedure was not meant to be a comprehensive manual thematic analysis, but rather a means for data immersion. Instead, I used the `searchK()` function in R to run a solution between two to 12 topics (incrementing by one) for each of the three corpora. I then used the output to investigate the cross-validation likelihood and semantic coherence to decide on the number of topics; “the cross-validation likelihood reflects the fit of each solution

in a hold-out sample whereas semantic coherence is a measure of how often words in a topic co-occur” (Tonidandel et al., 2021, p. 5).

A three-to-five topic solution seemed to be optimal for each of the three corpora. In other words, I ran the analyses with a three-topic solution, four-topic solution, and five-topic solution for the diversity, equity, and inclusion text corpora. I examined all the solutions and used the four metrics of the `labelTopics()` function—Highest probability, FREX, Lift, and Score—to investigate each of the topics (see Tonidandel et al., 2021, for an explanation of the metrics). I also examined the seven highest-scoring documents per topic using the `findThoughts()` function. Finally, I compared the findings between the three different solutions for each of the three corpora.

## CHAPTER 7: STUDY 2 RESULTS & DISCUSSION

For each of the three analyses, there were four latent topics that emerged regardless of the number of topics specified (three to five) in the algorithm. For instance, sometimes two topics would cluster together and—upon examination of all the solutions given the aforementioned metrics—it was obvious they were separate topics (for a total of four for each of the three text corpora). I referred to organizational diversity literature to help label the topics (Dobbin & Kalev, 2013; Leslie, 2019; Roberson et al., 2020). Participants perceived their organizations’ diverse hiring, training/education (resources), celebration of events, and employee resource groups as efforts to promote diversity. Additionally, participants perceived their organizations’ equal treatment of employees, standardized organizational processes, employee voice, and pay equity as efforts to promote equity. Finally, participants perceived their organizations’ social events, employee voice, merit-based hiring, and discrimination intolerance as efforts to promote inclusion. The findings are presented in Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10.

### **7.1 Diversity Topics**

#### ***7.1.1 Diverse Hiring***

One of the topics that emerged in discussion of organizational diversity efforts was the perception of Diverse Hiring. For example, some participants indicated:

“We try to hire people from different types of backgrounds...”

“The company hires people from multiple backgrounds. It focuses on having different races as part of the overall company structure...”

“Our company actively seeks candidates from all walks of life. We have a wide

range of people in our company. Our CEO is a woman, our CIO is Arabic, and we have many Asian, African American and people of other ethnic groups working within our company.”

The above examples indicate that participants perceive their organizations’ hiring of racial-ethnic minorities (specifically) as a diversity effort. Hiring of racial-ethnic minorities is perhaps one of the most straightforward strategies used by companies to try to increase diversity in their workforce. One reasoning may be the salience of a racial-ethnic identity. Indeed, unlike sexual orientation, religious-spiritual identity, and certain disabilities (among others), one’s race and ethnicity are less concealable. Companies may, thus, specifically target racial-ethnic minorities for employment as a more salient impression/signal of engagement in diversity efforts. Another factor is for regulatory and litigation purposes. Of the multiple classes protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, two are race and color. Additionally, at least some organizations are required to provide EEO-1 data, which specifically ask for the racial composition of the workforce. Failure to comply with regulations or discriminating based on race and ethnicity can have detrimental (monetary) consequences for the organization (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016).

### ***7.1.2 Training/Education***

A second topic that emerged in relation to organizational diversity efforts was that of Training/Education; participants perceived that their organization provides resources for learning regarding diversity. Some participants noted:

“The organization also requires all employees to complete diversity training as a part of our annual web-based learning training sessions.”

“They [*sic*] company gives on the job training.”

“We often have diversity faires [*sic*] and work shops [*sic*]... We also have diversity training as well...”

As evidenced by at least one participant, many companies will require all employees to partake in diversity training (such as during onboarding); others may leave it to the discretion of the employee. Researchers have studied diversity training as a form to reduce bias, change attitudes, and improve relations among employees (Roberson, 2019; Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 2000). However, their efficacy in organizations seems to be contradictory—for example, meeting their expected outcome of decreasing discrimination but yet also decreasing representation of minorities in the workforce (Bezrukova et al., 2016; Dobbin & Kalev, 2013; Leslie, 2019). Even yet, they have been shown to increase stereotypes (Leslie, 2019). Organizations may use these initiatives from a legal standpoint and require their workforce to partake in them in order to avoid monetary consequences—a form of “negative incentive”—thus using negative messaging during the training, resulting in backlash from some employees (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016). However, diversity training may be most effective when they are framed as significant to the overall goals of the organization, have leadership’s commitment, and have engagement from management during the training process (Roberson et al., 2020). Overall, given current findings in the literature, more comprehensive evaluations of diversity training are needed from both practitioners and academics alike (Roberson, 2019).

### ***7.1.3 Celebration of Events***

A third topic that emerged was Celebration of Events; participants perceived that their organizations' commemoration of events related to employees' identities as a diversity effort. Some of their responses were:

“The agency takes part in a multitude of different cultural events that annually take place in the community such as the pride parade, black and Hispanic history/heritage months, etc.”

“Our organization celebrated cultural programs in each year to celebrate different people's cultural festivals.”

Unlike initiatives such as mentoring programs, diversity task forces, diversity training, etc., company celebration of events related to employee identities are usually not discussed in the literature as a formal, organizational “diversity program” per se. Nevertheless, companies may still use this type of initiative to signal their interest or value in diversity management (Spence, 1973). Furthermore, employee resource groups (discussed below) may choose to first partake in the celebration of such events, receive the support of the organization, which the organization may thus expand the celebration and acknowledgement of the events company-wide. This, again, may be an effort of the organization to signal its interest in diversity (Spence, 1973).

#### ***7.1.4 Employee Resource Groups***

The fourth and final topic that emerged was that of Employee Resource Groups where participants perceived that their organizations' creation of committees for diverse employees and their allies as a diversity effort. Participants indicated:

“My organization has many employee resource groups promoted to diversity. These resource groups are for African-Americans, Asians and LGBTQ.”

“We enforce the building of diverse teams that represent each race in the organization.”

Employee resource groups—also referred to as affinity groups or diversity networking groups—are intended to increase the participants’ support and access to each other (Leslie, 2019). Research indicates that these groups have in an increased representation of White women in managerial ranks, but a decrease for Black men (Dobbin & Kalev, 2013); other researchers have also demonstrated that practices like employee resource groups increase manager racial diversity especially in smaller firms (Richard et al., 2013). Given the mixed findings, the effectiveness of such groups may be a function of organizational characteristics (Roberson et al., 2020).

## **7.2 Equity Topics**

### ***7.2.1 Equal Treatment***

One of the equity topics that emerged was that of Equal Treatment; participants perceived that their organization treats its employees impartially. The following are some examples of this topic:

“in [*sic*] office usage, everyone has the same type of stationery, such as pens, notebooks, and stickers, the basic suite is equally from manager to every engineer.”

“Everyone receives the same evaluation criteria...”

“Everyone is treated the same, no one is selected out as not being enough and needing special accommodations because of their color or ethnicity or belief system outside of work.”



The participants' comments, especially the first example, touch upon the notion of distributive justice or the perception of fairness of the allocation of resources, rewards, etc. (Cook & Hegtvedt, 1983; Eckhoff, 1974; Homans, 1974). Eckhoff (1974) proposed a framework where rules of distribution can be perceived as principles of equality: objective equality, subjective equality, equity, rank order equality, and equal opportunity (Cook & Hegtvedt, 1983). Specifically, Eckhoff (1974)'s objective equality is exemplified by the participants who mention that everyone receives equal amounts of a resource, and his principle of equal opportunity is exemplified by the third participant example.

### ***7.2.2 Standardized Procedures***

Participants perceived Standardized Procedures as another organizational equity effort; namely, the organization engages in standard processes to avoid partiality among its employees. Some participants discussed:

“All managers are extensively trained in the companies process for annual goal setting and performance evaluation. By using standard procedures and checklists in the process, equity is promoted.”

“All hiring actions are conducted using a formal transparent process that undergoes multiple reviews to ensure impartiality.”

“The company also promotes equity by ensuring that all employees participate in the same HR process for performance and appraisal and compensation.”

Standardized procedures usually have an implication of being identity-blind (employee demographic-wise) and objective, thus requiring managers to make decisions based on objective metrics rather than demographics (Roberson et al., 2020). The intent is

that by limiting managerial discretion, given inevitable personal biases, would lead to less discriminatory decisions if variables like employee demographics are not taken into consideration (Roberson et al., 2020). However, researchers of a study using survey and EEO-1 data of more than 800 organizations over three decades still found that limiting managerial discretion led to discrimination; managers' unconscious biases may have continued to play a role (Dobbin et al., 2015; Roberson et al., 2020).

On the other hand, standardized procedures may have a positive effect if there are accountability and transparency involved, especially during hiring and promotion (Roberson et al., 2020). Representation of certain minority groups has been found to increase when organizations post job positions along with job requirements openly to current employees (in the organization) in addition to the public (Dobbin et al., 2015). In addition, researchers of one study of 9,321 employees found that implementing a committee to review reward decisions and sharing information regarding the decisions across different components of the organization resulted in less pay disparities among employee groups (Castilla, 2015). Therefore, standardized procedures in combination with accountability and transparency practices may be beneficial for organizational equity efforts (Roberson et al., 2020).

### ***7.2.3 Voice***

A third, emerged topic was Voice. Participants perceived that their organization soliciting opinions from employees as an organizational equity effort. For instance:

“In our organization, job appraisal is open for open criticism for anyone who feels that they are not fairly treated.”

“After voicing concerns, our board has a democratic system that allows all voices

to make a difference. The same goes for staff, their voices on how the museum should conduct business gets heard.”

“Part of this is regularly seeking out the opinions of the employees to ensure we feel we are being treated fairly.”

In relation to the perception of justice, equity is achieved when the ratio of outcome/input is the same across all those involved in an exchange (Adams, 1965); and justice is viewed as the fairness in situations involving allocation (Cook & Hegtvedt, 1983). The concept of voice has gained prominence in the procedural justice literature, such that voice increases perceptions of the procedural fairness (Folger, 1977; Lind et al., 1990). The comments made by the participants are examples of what Morrison (2014) described as upward voice, “when employees voluntarily communicate suggestions, concerns, information about problems, or work-related opinions to someone in a higher organizational position” (p. 173). They further exemplify forms of formal voice mechanisms within the organization because they involve expressing voice in rather structured contexts or processes than informal ones such as informal discussions, word-of-mouth situations, etc. (Marchington & Suter, 2013; Mowbray et al., 2015).

#### ***7.2.4 Pay Equity***

The fourth topic for equity efforts that emerged was Pay Equity; participants perceived that their organizations compensate their employees with similar roles equally. For example,

“Pay levels are standardized across the company and all employees at the same grade level receive the same base pay.”

“Equity is shown in the company by including the same pay structure for all

employees regardless of culture, race, sex, sexual preference, or any other type of differences among people and variations.”

“Every employee on the same level make the same salary.”

It is most likely the case that participants did not have access to their coworkers’ actual pay information. That being said, their perception of pay equity is worthy of consideration and may be explained by equity theory (Adams, 1965). Participants may have evaluated the inputs (their work) and outcomes (their earnings) in comparison to the perception of their fellow coworkers’ inputs and outcomes (the social exchange in this context being pay; Adams, 1965; Buttner & Lowe, 2017). It is also worthy to note that the second commentator specifically discusses forms of identities in their discussion of pay equity. Notably, regarding gender disparities, the pay gap has been found to continue to exist in many sectors. Even when some women enter traditionally male-dominated fields, they do not necessarily overcome this gap (Bishu & Alkadry, 2017).

### **7.3 Inclusion Topics**

#### ***7.3.1 Social Events***

One topic that emerged in the discussion of organizational inclusion efforts was that of Social Events; the organization hosts social gatherings for employees. Note that this topic is similar to but broader than the diversity topic of Celebration of Events, which reflected employee’s identities more specifically. Social Events as an inclusion topic is inclusive of cultural events but accounts for other types of events and activities as well. For instance, participants mentioned:

“The organization tries to integrate all different types of people by allowing anyone to suggest or host a cultural, national, or religious event...”

“We engage in activities during work time that foster social interactions such as Company lunches, get together, and just general time to interact. My company also occasionally host activities outside of normal work hours.”

“They also organize quarterly social outings such as camping, sledding, and fishing for socializing and team building.”

Nishii and Rich (2014) discussed three factors that facilitate a climate that is inclusive, one of which is the extent the organization fosters interaction among employees or, in other words, has an integration strategy. These types of integration efforts—like the ones discussed by the participants—help with creating an atmosphere for more meaningful conversations, which cross demographic and work function boundaries to thus aid in social inclusion (Nishii & Rich, 2014). They help weaken stereotypes and group boundaries among employees as a result of interaction with each other (Kalev, 2009; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999).

### **7.3.2 Voice**

In a similar vein to the equity topic of Voice, this topic emerged in the inclusion text corpora indicating that participants perceived it as an organizational inclusion effort as well. One of the ways which an organization can be inclusive is by demonstrating that its employees have valuable ideas for contribution (Shore et al., 2011). Therefore, it is not surprising that participants perceived Voice as an inclusion effort if their organizations have mechanisms in place for them to share input. Indeed, organizations can foster these opportunities by “providing multiple channels for upward communication, making a concerted effort to seek informal feedback from employees, being open to alternative ideas about how to go about the organization’s work, and actually incorporating the

information that they receive into decision making whenever appropriate” (Nishii & Rich, 2014, p. 336).

### ***7.3.3 Merit-based Hiring***

A third topic was Merit-based Hiring, where participants perceived their organizations’ employment of candidates based on their credentials as a form of organizational inclusion effort. Some participants explained:

“We do not like favoring certain applications simply because of demographic info, so what we do is just make sure have a pool of varied applicants. These applicants all meet certain criteria credential wise...”

“During their hiring process they advertise the job openings to the general public, therefore giving all people groups the opportunity to apply. The criteria for getting the job is based on knowledge of certain skills and the ability to demonstrate those skills.”

Human resource practices focused on being identity-conscious or targeted (i.e., incorporating objective performance metrics and demographics when making decisions) have been documented to better improve the hiring and development of minorities and women in the workplace than identity-blind ones (Roberson et al., 2020). At the same time, whereas identity-blind and identity-conscious practices differ with regards to their focus on demographic characteristics, they both consider merit in decision-making procedures (Roberson et al., 2020). For that reason, this topic is not believed to contrast with the Diverse Hiring diversity topic as employers may hire diverse candidates given their worthy credentials. It seems that participants view the hiring of their diverse coworkers as a diversity effort; but they view it as an inclusion effort because they were

hired based on (perhaps in addition to) their credentials despite differences in identities. That is, the fact that a prospective applicant can be hired regardless of their identities—assuming they have the credentials for the job—seems to be a form of inclusion from the participants’ perspective.

#### ***7.3.4 Discrimination Intolerance***

The last inclusion topic that emerged was participants’ perception that their organizations are intolerant of discriminatory employee behavior, Discrimination Intolerance. To illustrate:

“Misogynistic, homophobic and transphobic comments are not tolerated. It is boldly written in our contracts hate speeches of any kind will not be tolerated.”

“They do have policies about harassment and discrimination for certain...”

“We have a zero tolerance workplace for any discriminatory behavior...”

Many organizations are prohibited from discriminating employees on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, and genetic information. Some of the comments that the participants have made may be in relation to such governmental regulation specifically. Nevertheless, since regulation does not necessarily mean that discrimination will be abolished, it is the duty of the organization to continuously try to level out the playing field for its employees to create (or maintain) an inclusive space (Nishii & Rich, 2014). After all, there are power imbalances within the society such that certain members of the society are not treated the same as others (Alderfer & Smith, 1982; Alderfer & Thomas, 1988). If organizations perpetuate these imbalances in their spaces, these power imbalances may translate to discrimination and stereotyping of lower-status (i.e., minority) employees therefore creating a climate where those

employees may not engage meaningfully in organizational processes because of not feeling included (Nishii & Rich, 2014).



## CHAPTER 8: GENERAL DISCUSSION

The current study was motivated by the lack of replication studies in the organizational diversity literature and the lack of understanding of U.S. employee perceptions of organizational diversity, equity, and inclusion. To reiterate, the findings of Study 1 provided support for Hypothesis 1 which also replicated that of Triana and García (2009)—perceived racial discrimination was significantly and negatively associated with procedural justice. The findings did not, however, support nor replicate Hypothesis 2; that is, perceptions of organizational diversity efforts did not attenuate the negative association of perceptions of racial discrimination and procedural justice. Instead, perceived organizational efforts to support diversity was significantly and positively associated with procedural justice by itself. Regarding Study 2, the topics of Diverse Hiring, Training/Education, Celebration of Events, and Employee Resource Groups emerged as perceptions of organizational diversity efforts; the topics of Equal Treatment, Standardized Procedures, Voice, and Pay Equity emerged as perceptions of organizational equity efforts; and the topics of Social Events, Voice, Merit-based Hiring, and Discrimination Intolerance emerged as perceptions of organizational inclusion efforts. The novelty of the current study is further empirical evidence of the negative association of perceived racial discrimination and procedural justice in the workplace and a taxonomy of organizational diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts that U.S. employees perceive. In the following subsections, I will discuss theoretical and practical contributions, limitations, and future directions for researchers in more detail.

### **8.1 Theoretical and Practical Contributions**

Given that Study 1 was a replication study, one contribution is by providing further empirical evidence of the negative association of perceived racial discrimination and procedural justice. As mentioned previously, studies investigating the antecedents of procedural justice, and more specifically perceived racial discrimination, have been sparse (Triana & García, 2009). Because of the replication of similar findings, the current study provides further support that there is indeed an association between the two variables.

Another contribution is the investigation of employee perceptions of organizational diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts separately through topic modeling in Study 2. To my knowledge, this was the first study to investigate such perceptions through a topic modeling procedure which has recently started to gain momentum in the organizational science literature. Moreover, participants were presented with the open-ended questions in one page with definitions to help them distinguish between “diversity,” “equity,” and “inclusion” as they may previously have perceived them all under one umbrella. Indeed, one of the limitations of diversity climate as a construct is that its definition (perceptions of fairness and inclusion in the workplace) overlaps with other constructs such as perceived organizational support, organizational justice, inclusion, equity, and fairness (Cachat-Rosset et al., 2019; McKay & Avery, 2015). Also, like the current study, most studies using diversity climate make use of the individual-level perspective whereas others use group or organizational-level perspectives (Cachat-Rosset et al., 2019). Measurement of the construct sometimes differs as well using subjective data such as perceptions (used in this study) or objective data like demographics (Cachat-Rosset et al., 2019). The scope of the current study was not to

investigate convergent or discriminant validity of the aforementioned constructs nor was the original aim to compare and contrast how employees perceive diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. Nevertheless, given that the findings were not the exact same across the three types of efforts, my hope is that future researchers evaluate these constructs for better theory development especially since diversity climate has multiple positive outcomes.

As a reiteration, one implication of Study 2 is a taxonomy of efforts that employees—at least those of this study—perceive as efforts for a supportive diversity climate. Thus, organizations may engage in similar efforts to elicit similar employee perceptions of a supportive diversity climate. That being said, a major caveat is that perceptions of efforts and specific efforts in and of themselves that actually increase diversity, equity, and inclusion in organization are not exactly the same thing (further discussed in detail in the next section). To illustrate, even though diversity training emerged as a topic that participants perceived as a diversity effort, the efficacy of it is somewhat unclear and may depend on how it is delivered to its employees and how intensive and interactive it is (Kalev et al., 2006; Roberson et al., 2020).

## **8.2 Limitations and Future Directions**

Although employees' perceptions of organizational efforts and initiatives for a supportive diversity climate are a valuable addition to the literature, it is worth highlighting that those perceptions and what actually elicit diversity, equity, and inclusion in organizations are slightly distinct things; and in order for the latter to occur, certain factors come into play. As an example, targeted recruitment efforts have been shown to increase (managerial) diversity in the organization (Kalev et al., 2006), but

employees may not necessarily be aware of such efforts because they are not salient to their day-to-day work lives unlike, for instance, the salient racial identities of their coworkers, among others, signaling diverse hiring practices. Furthermore, researchers of one study found that the association between diversity programs and diversity climate was the strongest (positively) when managerial diversity in the organization and managerial relational values (i.e., managerial attitudes of the importance of employees) were high; thus demonstrating the importance of certain contextual factors in the efficacy of such programs (Herdman & McMillan-Capehart, 2010). As another example, the effectiveness of efforts such as mentoring and networking programs and diversity training may depend on their combination with organizational accountability structures (Roberson et al., 2020). Ultimately, the efficacy of formalized HR structures may depend on organizational factors such as leader buy-in and other organizational characteristics (Roberson et al., 2020).

Another limitation of Study 2 is that, in contrast to traditional qualitative approaches, topic modeling does not capture topics with low prevalence (Baumer et al., 2017). In addition, Study 2's sample was not chosen at random since it was upon the discretion of MTurk workers to participate in the study. Therefore, the perceptions of efforts may have differed had random sampling been used. Although simple random sampling may be most ideal, a more feasible option, despite its limitations (such as gaining access, among others), is using a stratified sampling procedure. Future researchers may choose to focus on sampling organizations—in certain regions of the country—meeting a specific criterion of the workforce size. Alternatively, even if a non-random sampling procedure is used, it would still be worthwhile for future researchers to

compare their findings to those of this study. Even though an exhaustive list of topics/efforts may not have been captured, to the author's knowledge, the study is novel in its use of topic modeling in the organizational diversity literature to investigate perceptions of efforts for a supportive diversity climate.

Study 1's findings may not have supported and thus replicated Hypothesis 2 for a few reasons. First, Triana and García's (2009) sample had an average age of 29 years, eight years of average work experience, and with 57% of the sample working full-time. This is all in contrast with the current Study 1's sample which had an average age of 24 years, an average of about two years of work experience, and about 68% of them being part-time status. These differences may provide explanation for the lack of support as the current study's sample may not have been as advanced in their careers or spent nearly enough time working in their current organizations on a weekly basis to be as affected by these efforts as someone who has more experience working for the same organization. Another thing to consider is the study's measure of perceived organizational efforts to support diversity, which specifically measured perceptions of "diversity" efforts. Given the items, it is unclear whether participants perceived diversity efforts or the "diversity management" of their organization (as the items asked about) all under one umbrella of a supportive diversity climate. It may be that these efforts do not signal a focus on justice but rather inclusion instead. Indeed, this alludes to the construct validity of "diversity climate" previously discussed and more research needs to be conducted for better construct validation. Lastly, there may not have been adequate statistical power for Hypothesis 2. Study 1 was sponsored by the Department of Defense to specifically try to replicate Hypothesis 1. For that purpose, power analysis was conducted for Hypothesis 1

but not subsequently for Hypothesis 2 once Hypothesis 2 was also considered for the current study. Therefore, a lower sample size may have resulted in the lack of replication for Hypothesis 2.

Another consideration for Study 1 is that the measures assessed general perceptions of racial discrimination, organizational diversity efforts, and procedural justice and therefore only general conclusions can be made of the associations (or lack thereof) between the variables (Triana & García, 2009). The source of discrimination can be at the individual, group, and/or organizational level (Dovidio & Hebl, 2005; Gelfand et al., 2005; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005; Triana & García, 2009). The authors of the original study argued that the source of discrimination can not only change the direction but also magnitude of the findings and suggested that an instrument measuring such nuances would yield in better conclusions about the associations between the variables of the study (Triana & García, 2009). Indeed, one of the limitations of the perceived organizational efforts to support diversity measure in Study 1 was the (perhaps purposeful) lack of specificity of the items such that they discussed general diversity management in organizations. A strength of Study 2 is that the open-ended items specifically asked the participants to address their organizational diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts separately without generalizing them under one diversity management umbrella.

Finally, even though Study 1's data collection procedure included two time points, causality cannot be established with certainty (Triana & García, 2009). Therefore, reverse causality is a possible concern between perceived racial discrimination and procedural justice. While acknowledging that reverse causality cannot be completely

ruled out, Triana and García (2009) contended that it is unlikely general perceptions of procedural injustice could be associated with perceptions of discrimination regarding one's race-ethnicity specifically; the instrument measures perceptions of racial discrimination and not discrimination in general. Future research is needed to determine whether reverse causality can continue to be a concern.

### **8.3 Conclusion**

With the murder of George Perry Floyd Jr. in 2020, the subsequent Black Lives Matter protests as a result, and the rise in hate crimes during the COVID-19 pandemic against the Asian-American and Pacific Islander communities in the United States, organizations—if they had not already—have begun placing heavy emphasis on their efforts to create a supportive diversity climate in their spaces. As a replication study, the findings of Study 1 confirmed that perceptions of racial discrimination will yield in perceptions of procedural injustice, which has repercussions of its own. In addition, Study 2 provided a taxonomy of what employees perceive as organizational diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts (i.e., what they perceive as constituting a supportive diversity climate). Keeping in mind that perceptions of such efforts and specific efforts that actually result in diverse, equitable, inclusive workplaces may not be the same, my hope is that these findings will nevertheless add novelty to the diversity climate literature given its positive outcomes.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 267–299). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- Alderfer, C. P., & Smith, K. K. (1982). Studying intergroup relations embedded in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27(1), 35–65.
- Alderfer, C. P., & Thomas, D. A. (1988). The significance of race and ethnicity for understanding organizational behavior. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1–41). John Wiley & Sons.
- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 127–136. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.127>
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- American Psychological Association. (n.d.). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. Retrieved December 11, 2019, from <https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/>
- Ashe, S. D., & Nazroo, J. (2016). *Equality, diversity and racism in the workplace: A qualitative analysis of the 2015 Race at Work Survey*.
- Avery, D. R., & McKay, P. F. (2006). Target practice: An organizational impression management approach to attracting minority and female job applicants. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(1), 157–187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00807.x>
- Avery, D. R., Volpone, S. D., & Holmes IV, O. (2018). Racial discrimination in organizations. In A. J. Colella & E. B. King (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of*



*workplace discrimination* (pp. 89–109). Oxford University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199363643.013.8>

Banks, G. C., Woznyj, H. M., Wesslen, R. S., & Ross, R. L. (2018). A review of best practice recommendations for text analysis in R (and a user-friendly app). *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33(4), 445–459. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9528-3>

Bassett-Jones, N. (2005). The paradox of diversity management, creativity and innovation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14(2), 169–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.00337.x>

Baumer, E. P. S., Mimno, D., Guha, S., Quan, E., & Gay, G. K. (2017). Comparing grounded theory and topic modeling: Extreme divergence or unlikely convergence? *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68(6), 1397–1410. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23786>

Bergh, D. D., Ketchen, D. J., Orlandi, I., Heugens, P. P. M. A. R., & Boyd, B. K. (2019). Information asymmetry in management research: Past accomplishments and future opportunities. *Journal of Management*, 45(1), 122–158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318798026>

Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(11), 1227–1274.

Bieling, G. I., & Dorozalla, F. (2014). Making the most of age diversity: How age diversity climate contributes to employee performance. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2014(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2014.19>

- Bishu, S. G., & Alkadry, M. G. (2017). A systematic review of the gender pay gap and factors that predict it. *Administration & Society*, 49(1), 65–104.
- Blake-Beard, S., Murrell, A., & Thomas, D. (2007). Unfinished business: The impact of race on understanding mentoring relationships. In *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 223–248). SAGE Publications.
- Blei, D. M., Ng, A. Y., & Jordan, M. I. (2003). Latent Dirichlet allocation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3, 993–1022.
- Buttner, E. H., & Lowe, K. B. (2017). Addressing internal stakeholders' concerns: The interactive effect of perceived pay equity and diversity climate on turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 143, 621–633.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2795-x>
- Byrne, D. E. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. Academic Press.
- Cachat-Rosset, G., Carillo, K., & Klarsfeld, A. (2019). Reconstructing the concept of diversity climate – a critical review of its definition, dimensions, and operationalization. *European Management Review*, 16(4), 863–885.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12133>
- Castilla, E. J. (2015). Accounting for the gap: A firm study manipulating organizational accountability and transparency in pay decisions. *Organization Science*, 26(2), 311–333.
- Chrobot-Mason, D., & Aramovich, N. P. (2013). The psychological benefits of creating an affirming climate for workplace diversity. *Group & Organization Management*, 38(6), 659–689. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601113509835>
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-

- analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278–321.  
<https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958>
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400.  
<https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/2001-06715-002>
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 3–56). Psychology Press.  
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2005-03594-001>
- Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 39–67.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310388419>
- Cook, K. S., & Hegtvedt, K. A. (1983). Distributive justice, equity, and equality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9(1), 217–241.
- Cox, T. (1994). Cultural diversity in organisations: Research, theory and practice. In *Journal of Intercultural Management*.
- Creary, S. J., & Roberts, L. M. (2017). G.I.V.E.-based mentoring in diverse organizations: Cultivating positive identities in diverse leaders. In A. J. Murrell & S. Blake-Beard (Eds.), *Mentoring Diverse Leaders: Creating Change for People*,

- Processes, and Paradigms* (pp. 3–24). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315747569>
- de Castro, A. B., Fujishiro, K., Sweitzer, E., & Oliva, J. (2006). How immigrant workers experience workplace problems: A qualitative study. *Archives of Environmental & Occupational Health*, 61(6), 249–258.
- diversity. (n.d.). In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved October 19, 2021, from  
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/56064?redirectedFrom=diversity#eid>
- Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2013). The origins and effects of corporate diversity programs. In Q. M. Roberson (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of diversity and work* (pp. 253–281). Oxford University Press.
- Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). *Why diversity programs fail*. Harvard Business Review.  
<https://hbr.org/2016/07/why-diversity-programs-fail>
- 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>
- Dovidio, J. F., & Hebl, M. R. (2005). Discrimination at the level of the individual: Cognitive and affective factors. In R. L. Dipboye & A. Colella (Eds.), *Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases* (pp. 11–35). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eckhoff, T. (1974). *Justice: Its determinants in social interaction*. Rotterdam University Press.
- equity. (n.d.). In *dictionary.com*. Retrieved October 19, 2021, from  
<https://www.dictionary.com/browse/equity#>

- Folger, R. (1977). Distributive and procedural justice: Combined impact of voice and improvement on experienced inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35(2), 108–119.
- Gelfand, M. J., Nishii, L. H., Raver, J. L., & Schneider, B. (2005). Discrimination in organizations: An organizational-level systems perspective. In R. L. Dipboye & A. Colella (Eds.), *Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases* (pp. 89–116). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goldberg, C. B. (2005). Relational demography and similarity-attraction in interview assessments and subsequent offer decisions - Are we missing something? *Group and Organization Management*, 30(6), 597–624.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601104267661>
- Hegarty, W. H., & Dalton, D. R. (1995). Development and psychometric properties of the Organizational Diversity Inventory (ODI). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55(6), 1047–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164495055006014>
- Herdman, A. O., & McMillan-Capehart, A. (2010). Establishing a diversity program is not enough: Exploring the determinants of diversity climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(1), 39–53. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9133-1>
- Homans, G. C. (1974). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- inclusion. (n.d.). In *dictionary.com*. Retrieved October 19, 2021, from <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/inclusion>
- James, K., Lovato, C., & Cropanzano, R. (1994). Correlational and known-group comparison validation of a workplace prejudice/discrimination inventory. *Journal of*

- Applied Social Psychology*, 24(17), 1573–1592. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1994.tb01563.x>
- Kalev, A. (2009). Cracking the glass cages? Restructuring and ascriptive inequality at work. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(6), 1591–1643.  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/597175>
- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, 71(4), 589–617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100404>
- Kehoe, J. F., & Olson, A. (2005). Cut scores and employment discrimination litigation. In F. J. Landy (Ed.), *Employment discrimination litigation: Behavioral, quantitative, and legal perspectives* (pp. 410–449). Pfeiffer.
- Kim, K. Y., Elkins, T., & Werner, S. (2014). Examining sex discrimination experiences: A multi-level signaling theory perspective. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2014(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2014.44>
- King, A. G., & Spruell, S. P. (2001). Coca-Cola takes the high road. *Black Enterprise*, 31(7), 29.
- Köhler, T., & Cortina, J. M. (2019). Play it again, Sam! An analysis of constructive replication in the organizational sciences. *Journal of Management*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319843985>
- Kram, K. E. (1988). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. University Press of America. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392687>
- Leslie, L. M. (2019). Diversity initiative effectiveness: A typological theory of unintended consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(3), 538–563.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2017.0087>

Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 91–131).

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60059-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60059-3)

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social Exchange* (pp. 27–55). Springer.

[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-3087-5\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-3087-5_2)

Light, R., Roscigno, V. J., & Kalev, A. (2011). Racial discrimination, interpretation, and legitimization at work. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 634(1), 39–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716210388475>

Lind, E. A., Kanfer, R., & Earley, P. C. (1990). Voice, control, and procedural justice: Instrumental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 952–959.

Marchington, M., & Suter, J. (2013). Where informality really matters: Patterns of employee involvement and participation (EIP) in a non-union firm. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 52(1), 284–313.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/irel.12004>

McKay, P. F., & Avery, D. R. (2015). Diversity climate in organizations: Current wisdom and domains of uncertainty. In M. R. Buckley, A. R. Wheeler, & J. R. B. Halbesleben (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (33rd ed., pp. 191–233). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/S0742-730120150000033008>

Mor Barak, M. E., Cherin, D. A., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and personal

- dimensions in diversity climate: Ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34(1), 82–104.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886398341006>
- Mor Barak, M. E., Lizano, E. L., Kim, A., Duan, L., Rhee, M. K., Hsiao, H. Y., & Brimhall, K. C. (2016). The promise of diversity management for climate of inclusion: A state-of-the-art review and meta-analysis. *Human Service Organizations Management, Leadership and Governance*, 40(4), 305–333.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2016.1138915>
- Morris, S. B., & Lobsenz, R. E. (2000). Significance tests and confidence intervals for the adverse impact ratio. *Personnel Psychology*, 53(1), 89–111.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb00195.x>
- Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 173–197.
- Mowbray, P. K., Wilkinson, A., & Tse, H. H. M. (2015). An integrative review of employee voice: Identifying a common conceptualization and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17(3), 382–400.
- Ng, E. S. W., & Burke, R. J. (2005). Person-organization fit and the war for talent: Does diversity management make a difference? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(7), 1195–1210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190500144038>
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527–556.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5465/256591>



Nishii, L. H., & Rich, R. E. (2014). Creating inclusive climates in diverse organizations.

In *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion* (pp. 330–363).

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory.

*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751–783.

Pyburn, K. M., Ployhart, R. E., & Kravitz, D. A. (2008). The diversity-validity dilemma:

Overview and legal context. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(1), 143–151.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00108.x>

R Core Team. (2021). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. In *R*

*Foundation for Statistical Computing*. <https://www.r-project.org/>

Richard, O. C., Barnett, T., Dwyer, S., & Chadwick, K. (2004). Cultural diversity in

management, firm performance, and the moderating role of entrepreneurial

orientation dimensions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(2), 255–266.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/20159576>

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.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21528>

Ridgeway, C. L., & Smith-Lovin, L. (1999). The gender system and interaction. *Annual*

*Review of Sociology*, 25, 191–216. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.191>

Roberson, Q. M. (2019). Diversity in the workplace: A review, synthesis, and future

research agenda. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational*

*Behavior*, 6(1), 69–88. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015243>

Roberson, Q. M., King, E., & Hebl, M. (2020). Designing more effective practices for

- reducing workplace inequality. *Behavioral Science & Policy*, 6(1), 39–49.
- Roberts, M. E., Stewart, B. M., & Tingley, D. (2019). stm: An R package for structural topic models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 91(2), 1–40.
- Roscigno, V. J., Williams, L. M., & Byron, R. A. (2012). Workplace racial discrimination and middle class vulnerability. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 56(5), 696–710. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764211433805>
- Roth, P. L., Bobko, P., & Switzer III, F. S. (2006). Modeling the behavior of the 4/5ths rule for determining adverse impact: Reasons for caution. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 507–522. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.507>
- Sackett, P. R., & Lievens, F. (2008). Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59(1), 419–450. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093716>
- Saks, A. M., & McCarthy, J. M. (2006). Effects of discriminatory interview questions and gender on applicant reactions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-006-9024-7>
- Schmiedel, T., Müller, O., & vom Brocke, J. (2019). Topic modeling as a strategy of inquiry in organizational research: A tutorial with an application example on organizational culture. *Organizational Research Methods*, 22(4), 941–968. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428118773858>
- Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1262–1289.
- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355–374. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010>

- Stainback, K. (2018). Organizations, employment discrimination, and inequality. In A. J. Colella & E. B. King (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of workplace discrimination* (pp. 41–58). Oxford University Press.  
<https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199363643.013.4>
- Stewart, R., Volpone, S. D., Avery, D. R., & McKay, P. (2011). You support diversity, but are you ethical? Examining the interactive effects of diversity and ethical climate perceptions on turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(4), 581–593.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0697-5>
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Thomas, K. M., & Chrobot-Mason, D. (2005). Group-level explanations of workplace discrimination. In R. L. Dipboye & A. Colella (Eds.), *Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases* (pp. 63–88). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tonidandel, S., Summerville, K. M., Gentry, W. A., & Young, S. F. (2021). Using structural topic modeling to gain insight into challenges faced by leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101576>
- Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Triana, M. del C., & García, M. F. (2009). Valuing diversity: A group-value approach to understanding the importance of organizational efforts to support diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(7), 941–962. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.598>
- Triana, M. del C., Jayasinghe, M., & Pieper, J. R. (2015). Perceived workplace racial discrimination and its correlates: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational*

- Behavior*, 36(4), 491–513. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1988>
- Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In *Advances in group processes: Theory and research* (pp. 77–122).
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2019, July). *QuickFacts: United States*.  
<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045218>
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2021). *Charge statistics (Charges filed with EEOC) FY 1997 through FY 2020*.  
<https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/charges.cfm>
- Waight, J., & Madera, J. M. (2011). Diversity training: examining minority employees' organizational attitudes. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 3(4), 365–376.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/17554211111162471>
- Wentling, R. M., & Palma-Rivas, N. (2000). Current status of diversity initiatives in selected multinational corporations. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11(1), 35–60. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1532-1096\(200021\)11:1%3C35::AID-HRDQ4%3E3.0.CO;2-#](https://doi.org/10.1002/1532-1096(200021)11:1%3C35::AID-HRDQ4%3E3.0.CO;2-#)
- Williamson, I. O., Slay, H. S., Shapiro, D. L., & Shivers-Blackwell, S. L. (2008). The effect of explanations on prospective applicants' reactions to firm diversity practices. *Human Resource Management*, 47(2), 311–330.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20214>

**Table 1***Study I: Descriptive Statistics of Demographics and Study Measures*

Demographic Variables	Range	$M \pm SD$
Age	18–45	24.16 (5.97)
Work Experience <sup>a</sup>	0–14	2.24 (2.27)
	<i>N</i>	Percentage
Race		
White	51	48.57%
Black or African American	21	20.00%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3	2.86%
Asian	22	20.95%
Multi-racial <sup>b</sup>	7	6.67%
Did not specify	1	0.95%
Ethnicity		
Not Hispanic/Latinx	91	86.67%
Hispanic/Latinx	14	13.33%
Minority Status		
White, not Hispanic/Latinx	43	40.95%
Racial/Ethnic Minority Member	62	59.05%
Gender Identity		
Woman	68	64.76%
Man	36	34.29%
Transgender	1	0.95%
Student Status		
Upper-division, Undergraduate Student	75	71.43%
MBA Student	30	28.57%
Employment Status		
Part-time	71	67.62%
Full-time	34	32.38%
Study Measures	Range	$M \pm SD$
Procedural Justice	1–5	3.26 (0.92)
Perceived Workplace Racial Discrimination	1–5.62	2.07 (0.97)
Perceived Organizational Efforts to Support Diversity	1–6	4.01 (1.23)

*Note.* <sup>a</sup>Seven participants had less than a year's worth of work experience. <sup>b</sup>Three participants selected White and Black or African American, two participants selected White and American Indian or Alaska Native, and two participants selected White and Asian.

**Table 2***Study I: Regression Results Using Procedural Justice as the Criterion*

Step	Variable	$\beta$	$B$ [95% CI]	$SE$	$p$	$R^2$ [95% CI]	$\Delta R^2$ [95% CI]
1	(Intercept)		4.31 [3.42, 5.20]	0.45	< .001	.092 [.00, .15]	
	Woman	-0.12	-0.22 [-0.61, 0.17]	0.20	0.259		
	Transgender Identity	-0.13	-1.24 [-3.12, 0.64]	0.95	0.192		
	Age	-0.22	-0.03 [-0.07, 0.01]	0.02	0.100		
	Minority Member	-0.17	-0.31 [-0.68, 0.05]	0.18	0.094		
	Work Experience	0.17	0.07 [-0.03, 0.17]	0.05	0.169		
	Full-time Status	-0.11	-0.21 [-0.67, 0.25]	0.23	0.362		
	MBA Student	0.03	0.06 [-0.40, 0.51]	0.23	0.798		
2	(Intercept)		3.65 [2.72, 4.58]	0.47	< .001	.349 [.14, .43]**	.258 [.12, .40]**
	Woman	-0.06	-0.12 [-0.46, 0.23]	0.17	0.506		
	Transgender Identity	-0.10	-0.93 [-2.54, 0.68]	0.81	0.254		
	Age	-0.18	-0.03 [-0.06, 0.01]	0.02	0.127		
	Minority Member	-0.07	-0.14 [-0.46, 0.19]	0.16	0.405		
	Work Experience	0.11	0.04 [-0.04, 0.13]	0.04	0.323		
	Full-time Status	-0.07	-0.14 [-0.54, 0.25]	0.20	0.474		
	MBA Student	0.003	0.01 [-0.39, 0.40]	0.20	0.972		
	PWRD	-0.33	-0.31 [-0.49, -0.14]	0.09	0.001**		
	POETSD	0.34	0.25 [0.13, 0.38]	0.06	< 0.001**		
3	(Intercept)		3.45 [3.06, 3.84]	0.20	< .001	.360 [.14, .43]**	.011 [-.02, .04]

Woman	-0.07	-0.13 [-0.47, 0.21]	0.17	0.456
Transgender Identity	-0.10	-0.92 [-2.53, 0.68]	0.81	0.256
Age	-0.19	-0.03 [-0.06, 0.01]	0.02	0.101
Minority Member	-0.07	-0.13 [-0.46, 0.19]	0.16	0.418
Work Experience	0.11	0.05 [-0.04, 0.13]	0.04	0.290
Full-time Status	-0.07	-0.15 [-0.54, 0.25]	0.20	0.462
MBA Student	0.02	0.04 [-0.36, 0.43]	0.20	0.860
PWRD	-0.04	-0.34 [-0.52, -0.16]	0.09	< 0.001**
POETSD	0.56	0.26 [0.13, 0.39]	0.06	< 0.001**
PWRD x POETSD	-0.33	-0.07 [-0.19, 0.04]	0.06	0.207

*Note.*  $N = 105$ . Gender was coded as 0 = man, 1 = woman, 2 = transgender. Minority status was coded as 0 = White, not Hispanic or Latinx, 1 = racial/ethnic minority member. Employment status was coded as 0 = part-time, 1 = full-time. Student status was coded as 0 = upper-division, undergraduate student, 1 = MBA student. PWRD = perceived workplace racial discrimination. POETSD = perceived organizational efforts to support diversity.  $\beta$  = standardized beta coefficient,  $B$  = unstandardized beta coefficient. \*\*  $p < .01$ .

**Table 3***Study 1: Bivariate Correlation Matrix of Study 1 Variables*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Woman	NA								
2. Transgender Identity	-.17	-.05							
3. Age	.02	-.12	.06						
4. Minority Member	-.24*	.12	.58**	-.07					
5. Work Experience	-.23*	-.07	.44**	-.09	.36**				
6. Full-time Status	-.12	-.06	.39**	-.07	.22*	.46**			
7. MBA Student	.23*	-.01	.08	.27**	-.11	-.01	.05		
8. PWRD	.05	-.02	.07	-.02	.04	-.00	.11	-.23*	
9. POETSD	-.10	-.06	-.14	-.17	.04	-.08	-.04	-.46**	.41**
10. PJ									

*Note.*  $N = 105$ . Gender was coded as 0 = man, 1 = woman. Transgender identity ( $n = 1$ ) was coded as 0 = non-transgender identity, 1 = transgender identity. Minority status was coded as 0 = White, not Hispanic or Latinx, 1 = racial/ethnic minority. Employment status was coded as 0 = part-time, 1 = full-time. Student status was coded as 0 = upper-division, undergraduate student, 1 = MBA student. PWRD = perceived workplace racial discrimination. POETSD = perceived organizational efforts to support diversity. PJ = procedural justice. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .



**Table 4***Study II: Descriptive Statistics of Demographics*

Demographic Variables	Range	$M \pm SD$
Age	21–62	36.54 (9.68)
Work Experience <sup>a</sup>	0.17–40	7.19 (5.52)
	$N$	Percentage
Race		
American Indian or Alaska Native	3	1.99%
Asian	21	13.91%
Black or African American	24	15.89%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0.66%
White	98	64.90%
Multi-racial <sup>b</sup>	4	2.65%
Ethnicity		
Not Hispanic/Latinx	142	94.04%
Hispanic/Latinx	9	5.96%
Minority Status		
White, not Hispanic/Latinx	96	63.58%
Racial/Ethnic Minority Member	55	36.42%
Gender Identity		
Woman	58	38.41%
Man	91	60.26%
Transgender	1	0.66%
Do not identify as woman, man, or transgender	1	0.66%
Sexual Orientation		
Bisexual	5	3.31%
Gay/Lesbian	5	3.31%
Heterosexual/Straight	139	92.05%
Other <sup>c</sup>	2	1.32%
Employment Status		
Part-time	15	9.93%
Full-time	136	90.07%
Highest Level of Education Completed		
High school or GED (General Equivalency Diploma)	12	7.95%
Technical Training or Apprenticeship	3	1.99%
Associate Degree	19	12.58%
Bachelor's Degree (e.g., B.A., B.S.)	92	60.93%
Master's Degree (e.g., M.S., M.Ed., M.A., M.B.A.)	19	12.58%
Professional Degree (e.g., J.D., M.Div., M.D., D.V.M.)	1	0.66%
Doctoral Degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)	5	3.31%

Religious Identity		
Buddhism	4	2.65%
Christianity (e.g., Catholicism, Jehovah's Witness, Mormonism, Orthodox, Protestantism)	81	53.64%
Hinduism	7	4.64%
Islam	3	1.99%
Judaism	2	1.32%
Nonreligious/Unaffiliated (e.g., secular, agnostic, atheist)	50	33.11%
Other <sup>d</sup>	4	2.65%
Disability Status		
No	139	92.05%
Yes	12	7.95%
Hierarchical Status		
Temporary/Seasonal Employee	1	0.66%
Part-Time/Full-Time Employee	100	66.23%
Supervisor	36	23.84%
Department Head	10	6.62%
Vice President	2	1.32%
Other <sup>e</sup>	2	1.32%

*Note.* <sup>a</sup>Three participants indicated they had less than a year's worth of work experience (two months, six months, and seven months—these numbers were converted to years).

<sup>b</sup>Two participants selected White and Asian, and two participants selected White and Black or African American. <sup>c</sup>Participants indicated: "Asexual" and "prefer not to disclose." <sup>d</sup>Participants indicated: "prefer not to disclose," "believer," "spiritual," and "Spiritualistic." <sup>e</sup>Participants indicated: "Consultant" and "Teaching Assistant."

**Table 5***Diversity Corpora: Custom Words Omitted From Analysis*

Agency	Etc	Really	Things
Also	Feel	Regardless	Think
Always	High	School	Time
Anything	Hospital	Schools	Times
Around	However	See	Tries
Assignments	Initiative	Seen	Try
Can	Initiatives	Sense	Universities
College	Like	Since	University
Colleges	Make	Specially	Way
Company	Makes	Student	Ways
Could	Making	Students	Well
Diversity	Much	Sure	Within
Effort	Museum	Teacher	
Efforts	Often	Texts	
Especially	Organization	Thing	

**Table 6***Equity Corpora: Custom Words Omitted From Analysis*

Academic	Etc	Regardless
Academics	Hospital	Schools
Agency	However	Student
Also	Initiative	Students
Always	Initiatives	Sure
Can	Irrespective	Teachers
Child	Lessons	Tries
Children	Like	Try
Classroom	Make	Trying
Classrooms	Makes	Tuition
Companies	Making	University
Company	Museum	Well
Could	Organization	Within
District	Really	
Equity	Recently	

**Table 7***Inclusion Corpora: Custom Words Omitted From Analysis*

Agency	Feel	Making	Tries
Also	Hospital	Much	Try
Always	However	Museum	Trying
Assignment	Inclusion	Organization	University
Assignments	Initiative	Really	Well
Can	Initiatives	Recess	Within
Children	Integrating	Regardless	
Classroom	Irrespective	School	
Classrooms	Just	Since	
Company	Lessons	Student	
Could	Like	Students	
E	Lot	Sure	
Effort	Lots	Teachers	
Efforts	Make	Teaches	
Etc	Makes	Things	

**Table 8***Diversity Topics*

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Examples</b>
Diverse Hiring	The organization employs individuals of different identities.	<p>“We try to hire people from different types of backgrounds...”</p> <p>“The company hires people from multiple backgrounds. It focuses on having different races as part of the overall company structure...”</p> <p>“Our company actively seeks candidates from all walks of life. We have a wide range of people in our company. Our CEO is a woman, our CIO is Arabic, and we have many Asian, African American and people of other ethnic groups working within our company.”</p>
Training/Education	The organization provides resources for learning.	<p>“The organization also requires all employees to complete diversity training as a part of our annual web-based learning training sessions.”</p> <p>“They [<i>sic</i>] company gives on the job training.”</p> <p>“We often have diversity faires [<i>sic</i>] and work shops [<i>sic</i>]... We also have diversity training as well...”</p>
Celebration of Events	The organization commemorates occasions related to employees’ identities.	<p>“The agency takes part in a multitude of different cultural events that annually take place in the community such as the pride parade, black and Hispanic history/heritage months, etc.”</p> <p>“Our organization celebrated cultural programs in each year to celebrate different people's cultural festivals.”</p>
Employee Resource Groups	The organization has created committees for diverse employees and their allies.	<p>“My organization has many employee resource groups promoted to diversity. These resource groups are for African-Americans, Asians and LGBTQ.”</p>

		“We enforce the building of diverse teams that represent each race in the organization.”
--	--	--

**Table 9***Equity Topics*

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Examples</b>
Equal Treatment	The organization treats its employees impartially.	<p>“in [<i>sic</i>] office usage, everyone has the same type of stationery, such as pens, notebooks, and stickers, the basic suite is equally from manager to every engineer.”</p> <p>“Everyone receives the same evaluation criteria...”</p> <p>“Everyone is treated the same, no one is selected out as not being enough and needing special accommodations because of their color or ethnicity or belief system outside of work.”</p>
Standardized Procedures	The organization engages in standard processes to avoid partiality among its employees.	<p>“All managers are extensively trained in the companies process for annual goal setting and performance evaluation. By using standard procedures and checklists in the process, equity is promoted.”</p> <p>“All hiring actions are conducted using a formal transparent process that undergoes multiple reviews to ensure impartiality.”</p> <p>“The company also promotes equity by ensuring that all employees participate in the same HR process for performance and appraisal and compensation.”</p>
Voice	The organization solicits opinions from employees.	<p>“In our organization, job appraisal is open for open criticism for anyone who feels that they are not fairly treated.”</p> <p>“After voicing concerns, our board has a democratic system that allows all voices to make a difference. The same goes for staff, their voices on how the museum should conduct business gets heard.”</p> <p>“Part of this is regularly seeking out the opinions of the employees to ensure we feel we are being treated fairly.”</p>



Pay Equity	The organization compensates its employees with similar roles equally.	<p>“Pay levels are standardized across the company and all employees at the same grade level receive the same base pay.”</p> <p>“Equity is shown in the company by including the same pay structure for all employees regardless of culture, race, sex, sexual preference, or any other type of differences among people and variations.”</p> <p>“Every employee on the same level make the same salary.”</p>
------------	--	---

**Table 10***Inclusion Topics*

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Examples</b>
Social Events	The organization hosts social gatherings for employees.	<p>“The organization tries to integrate all different types of people by allowing anyone to suggest or host a cultural, national, or religious event...”</p> <p>“We engage in activities during work time that foster social interactions such as company lunches, get together, and just general time to interact. My company also occasionally host activities outside of normal work hours.”</p> <p>“They also organize quarterly social outings such as camping, sledding, and fishing for socializing and team building.”</p>
Voice	The organization solicits opinions from employees.	<p>“The company tries to put every persons [sic] ideas into consideration despite their gender, sexual orientation, age, race and even education [sic] background.”</p> <p>“Company engages in inclusion based on inviting many people to a meeting to hash out and generate ideas...In these meetings, everyone is allowed to join and voice any opinions, ideas, and comments on the specified topic at hand.”</p> <p>“...involving all members of the agency in policy and practice decision making rather than just leadership.”</p>
Merit-based Hiring	The organization employs candidates based on their credentials.	<p>“We do not like favoring certain applications simply because of demographic info, so what we do is just make sure have a pool of varied applicants. These applicants all meet certain criteria credential wise...”</p> <p>“During their hiring process they advertise the job openings to the general public, therefore giving all people groups the opportunity to apply. The criteria for getting the job is based on knowledge of certain</p>

		skills and the ability to demonstrate those skills.”
Discrimination Intolerance	The organization is intolerant of discriminatory employee behavior.	<p>“Misogynistic, homophobic and transphobic comments are not tolerated. It is boldly written in our contracts hate speeches of any kind will not be tolerated.”</p> <p>“They do have policies about harassment and discrimination for certain...”</p> <p>“We have a zero tolerance workplace for any discriminatory behavior...”</p>

## APPENDIX A: Study I Email Recruitment

### Email Recruitment

[Subject: Eligible UNCC Volunteers Needed – Earn an Amazon Gift Card!]

Our research team wants to learn about diversity and inclusion in the workplace. We invite employed, UNC Charlotte upper-division undergraduate students and MBA students, aged 18 years or older to participate in our study. You will be pre-screened for eligibility. If you are deemed eligible, you will complete both phases of the survey study online (about five-minute commitment for each phase). As an eligible participant, you will receive a \$5 Amazon electronic gift in total upon completion of the two-phase study.

**Here is the link to the first phase of the study:** link

If you have questions concerning the study, please contact Adoril Oshana at [aoshanaa@uncc.edu](mailto:aoshanaa@uncc.edu), Dr. George Banks at [gbanks3@uncc.edu](mailto:gbanks3@uncc.edu), or the UNCC Office of Research Compliance. This study was approved by UNC Charlotte's IRB (#19-0406).

## APPENDIX B: Study I Phase I Survey



### Pre-screener

**Are you a current MBA student, or a current undergraduate student (who has completed at least two years of college)?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**What is your student status?**

- ☐ Upper-division, undergraduate student
- ☐ MBA student

**What is your employment status?**

- ☐ Unemployed
- ☐ Part time (1-39 hours per week)
- ☐ Full time (40+ hours per week)

# **Consent Form**

**Department of Management**

**9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001**



## **Consent to Participate in a Research Study**

**Title of the Project: Diversity & Inclusion in the Workplace**

**Principal Investigator: Adoril Oshana, UNC Charlotte**

**Co-investigators: Dr. George Banks, UNC Charlotte**

**\*Sponsored by the Department of Defense through an award to the Center for Open Science.**

**You are invited to participate in a two-phase research study. Participation in this research study is voluntary. The information provided is to give you key information to help you decide whether or not to participate.**

- The purpose of this study overall is to investigate how you perceive issues with regards to diversity and inclusion while at work. You will answer some questions about your organization and about your experiences at work. The questions may be sensitive and personal (because they are about your experiences at work, including how you are treated). That being said, you are welcome to discontinue your participation at any time.**

- You must be age 18 or older, currently an upper-division undergraduate or MBA student at UNC-Charlotte, and currently employed in order to take part in this study.
- It will take you about 10 minutes to complete the entire study online.
- During the first phase, you will be asked to provide your email address. We need your email address in order to send you a follow-up survey for the second phase of the study for you to complete. You will be asked to provide your email address during the second phase as well for us to verify that you have completed both phases of the study in order to send the electronic gift card (upon the end of the entire study).
- We do not believe that you will experience any risk from participating in this study.
- You will not benefit personally by participating in this study. What we learn about diversity and inclusion and your experiences at work may be beneficial to others.
- You will receive a \$5 Amazon electronic gift card at the end of the study, following the second phase.
- Your privacy will be protected, and confidentiality will be maintained to the extent possible.

We are also asking for your names. We are required to give the University's Financial Services division a log/tracking sheet with the names of all individuals who received a gift card. This sheet is for tax purposes only and is separate from the research data, which means the names will not be linked to survey responses.

Given the collection of your survey responses, email address, and full name, your responses will be initially linked to your identity. However, we will separate the survey responses from your identifying information and will store them separately with access to this information controlled and limited only to people who have approval to have access. After we send you the e-gift card, your identifying information will be deleted.

**We might use the survey data for future research studies, and we might share the non-identifiable survey data with other researchers for future research studies without additional consent from you. The data we share will NOT include information that could identify you.**

**Participation is voluntary. You may choose not to take part in the study. You may start participating and change your mind and stop participation at any time.**

**If you have questions concerning the study, contact the principal investigator, Adoril Oshana by email at [aoshanaa@uncc.edu](mailto:aoshanaa@uncc.edu), and/or the co-investigator, Dr. George Banks by email at [gbanks3@uncc.edu](mailto:gbanks3@uncc.edu).**

**If you have further questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this study, contact the Office of Research Compliance at (704) 687-1871 or [uncc-irb@uncc.edu](mailto:uncc-irb@uncc.edu).**

**If you are 18 years of age or older, are currently employed, are currently an UNC-Charlotte student, have read and understand the information provided, and freely consent to participate in the study, please sign below.**

×

SIGN HERE

clear

## **Perceived Workplace Racial Discrimination**

**Please indicate your response to each item below; there are no right or wrong answers.**



**At work I am treated poorly because of my racial/ethnic group.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**At work I feel socially isolated because of my racial/ethnic group.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I have sometimes been unfairly singled out because of my racial/ethnic group.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**At my present place of employment, people of other racial/ethnic groups do not tell me some job-related information that they share with members of their own group.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I have experienced discrimination at work.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**At my present job, some people get better treatment because of their racial/ethnic group.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**Where I work all people are treated the same, regardless of their racial/ethnic group.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**Where I work promotions and rewards are not influenced by racial or ethnic group membership.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

## **Perceived Organizational Efforts to Support Diversity**

**Please indicate your response to each item below; there are no right or wrong answers.**

**Managing diversity helped my organization to be more effective.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree

- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**My organization has sponsored classes, workshops, and/or seminars on diversity.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**My organization puts a lot of effort into diversity management.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**My organization spends enough money and time on diversity awareness and related training.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**My organization values diversity.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

## **Control Variables/Demographics**

**Please indicate your response to each item below; there are no right or wrong answers.**

**How do you describe yourself?**

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Transgender
- ☐ Do not identify as female, male, or transgender

**With which race do you identify? (Select all that apply.)**

- ☐ **White** – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa
- ☐ **Black or African American** – A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa
- ☐ **American Indian or Alaska Native** – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America) and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment
- ☐ **Asian** – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam
- ☐ **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander** – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands

With which ethnicity do you identify?

- ☐ **Hispanic/Latinx** - A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race.
- ☐ **Not Hispanic/Latinx**

How many years have you worked at your current organization?

What is your age?

## **Names & Email Addresses**

**Please provide a copy of your email address so that we can send you the second survey after 15 days.**

**We are required to give the University's Financial Services division a log/tracking sheet with the names of all individuals who received a gift card. This sheet is for tax purposes only and is separate from the research data, which means the names will not be linked to survey responses. Please provide us with your first and last name.**

**First Name:**

**Last Name:**

## APPENDIX C: Study I Phase II Survey



### Procedural Justice

The following items refer to your organization's procedures and treatment of you. To what extent:

Have you been able to express your views and feelings to your organization?

- ☐ To a Small Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Small Extent
- ☐ To a Moderate Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Large Extent
- ☐ To a Large Extent

Have you had influence over your organization's treatment of you?

- ☐ To a Small Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Small Extent
- ☐ To a Moderate Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Large Extent
- ☐ To a Large Extent



**Has your organization's treatment of you been applied consistently?**

- ☐ To a Small Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Small Extent
- ☐ To a Moderate Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Large Extent
- ☐ To a Large Extent

**Has your organization's treatment of you been free of bias?**

- ☐ To a Small Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Small Extent
- ☐ To a Moderate Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Large Extent
- ☐ To a Large Extent

**Has your organization's treatment of you been based on accurate information?**

- ☐ To a Small Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Small Extent
- ☐ To a Moderate Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Large Extent
- ☐ To a Large Extent

**Have you been able to appeal your organization's treatment of you?**

- ☐ To a Small Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Small Extent

- ☐ To a Moderate Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Large Extent
- ☐ To a Large Extent

**Has your organization's treatment of you upheld ethical and moral standards?**

- ☐ To a Small Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Small Extent
- ☐ To a Moderate Extent
- ☐ To a Somewhat Large Extent
- ☐ To a Large Extent

## **Affective Commitment**

**Please indicate your response to each item below; there are no right or wrong answers.**

**I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree

- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

## **OCBO**

**Please indicate your response to each item below; there are no right or wrong answers.**

**I attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I keep up with developments in the organization.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I defend the organization when other employees criticize it.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I show pride when representing the organization in public.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I express loyalty toward the organization.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I take action to protect the organization from potential problems.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**I demonstrate concern about the image of the organization.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ Somewhat Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**Email Address**

**Please re-enter the same email address you provided us during the first part of the research study so that we can send you the electronic gift card.**



## APPENDIX D: Study II MTurk Recruitment

### MTurk Recruitment

**Title:** Diversity Climate in Organizations (~5-10 mins.)

**Description:** Our research team wants to learn about diversity, equity, and inclusion in the workplace. We invite those who are 18 years of age or older, currently employed, and currently residing in the U.S. to participate in our study. You will be pre-screened for eligibility. If you are deemed eligible and subsequently complete the study, you will be compensated \$1.

Select the link below to complete the survey. At the end of the survey, you will receive a code to paste into the box below to receive credit for taking our survey.

**Make sure to leave this window open as you complete the survey.** When you are finished, you will return to this page to paste the code into the box.

If you have questions concerning the study, please contact Adoril Oshana at [aoshanaa@uncc.edu](mailto:aoshanaa@uncc.edu), Dr. George Banks at [gbanks3@uncc.edu](mailto:gbanks3@uncc.edu), or the UNCC Office of Research Compliance. This study was approved by UNC Charlotte's IRB (#21-0085).

Link

**Provide the survey code here:**

APPENDIX E: Study II Survey



**Pre-Screener**

**What is your employment status?**

- ☐ Unemployed
- ☐ Part-Time (1-39 hours per week)
- ☐ Full-Time (40+ hours per week)

**Do you currently reside in the United States?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**What is your age? (years)**

**Consent Form**

Department of Management

9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001



### **Consent to Participate in a Research Study**

Title of the Project: Diversity Climate in Organizations

Principal Investigator: Adoril Oshana, UNC Charlotte

Co-Investigator: Dr. George Banks, UNC Charlotte

You are invited to participate in a research study. Participation in this research study is voluntary. You may start participating, change your mind, and stop participating at any time.

- The purpose of this study is to investigate how you perceive diversity, equity, and inclusion while at work. You will answer some questions about your organization and about your experiences at work. The questions may be sensitive and personal. That being said, you are welcome to discontinue your participation at any time.
- You must be age 18 years or older, currently residing in the United States, and currently employed in order to take part in this study.
- It will take you about 5-10 minutes to complete the entire study online.
- We do not believe that you will experience any risk from participating in this study.
- You will not benefit personally by participating in this study. What we learn about diversity, equity, and inclusion and your experiences at work may be beneficial to others.
- You will be compensated \$1 at the end of the study. Your privacy will be protected, and confidentiality will be maintained to the extent possible.

Your responses will be initially linked to your worker ID. However, we will separate the survey responses from your worker ID and will store them separately with access to this information controlled and limited only to people who have approval to have access. After we compensate you, your identifying information will be deleted.

We might use the survey data for future research studies, and we might share the non-identifiable survey data with other researchers for future research studies without additional consent from you. The data we share will NOT include information that could identify you.

If you have questions concerning the study, contact the principal investigator, Adoril Oshana by email at [aoshanaa@uncc.edu](mailto:aoshanaa@uncc.edu), and/or the co-investigator, Dr. George Banks by email at [gbanks3@uncc.edu](mailto:gbanks3@uncc.edu). If you have further questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this study, contact the Office of Research

Protections and Integrity at (704) 687-1871 or [uncc-irb@uncc.edu](mailto:uncc-irb@uncc.edu).

By continuing, you freely consent to participate in the study. If you are not consenting, please close the survey tab in your browser. We will delete any responses you have inputted thus far.

### Open-Ended Questions

**Diversity** is defined as, "the condition or quality of being different, or varied." What initiatives/efforts does your organization engage in to promote **diversity**? (300 characters minimum.)

**Inclusion** is defined as, "the practice of integrating all people and groups." What initiatives/efforts does your organization engage in to promote **inclusion**? (300 characters minimum.)

**Equity** is defined as, "the quality of being fair or impartial." What initiatives/efforts does your organization engage in to promote **equity**? (300 characters minimum.)

### Demographics

With which race do you identify? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ **White** – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa
- ☐ **Black or African American** – A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa
- ☐ **American Indian or Alaska Native** – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America) and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment
- ☐ **Asian** – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam
- ☐ **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander** – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands

With which ethnicity do you identify?

- ☐ **Hispanic/Latinx** - A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race
- ☐ **Not Hispanic/Latinx**

How do you describe yourself? (Check one.)

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Transgender
- ☐ Do not identify as female, male, or transgender

With which sexual orientation do you identify?

- ☐ Gay/Lesbian
- ☐ Bisexual
- ☐ Heterosexual/Straight

☐  Other (please specify)

**What is the highest level of formal education that you have *completed*?**

- ☐ Elementary/Middle School (grades 1-8)
- ☐ High school or GED (General Equivalency Diploma)
- ☐ Technical Training or Apprenticeship
- ☐ Associate's Degree
- ☐ Bachelor's Degree (e.g., B.A., B.S.)
- ☐ Master's Degree (e.g., M.S., M.Ed., M.A., M.B.A)
- ☐ Professional Degree (e.g., J.D., M.Div., M.D., D.V.M)
- ☐ Doctoral Degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)

**With which religion do you identify?**

- ☐ Buddhism
- ☐ Christianity (e.g., Catholicism, Jehovah's Witness, Mormonism, Orthodox, Protestantism)
- ☐ Hinduism
- ☐ Islam
- ☐ Judaism
- ☐ Nonreligious/Unaffiliated (e.g., secular, agnostic, atheist)
- ☐  Other (please specify)

**Do you have a mental and/or physical disability?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

How many years have you worked at your current organization? (If less than a year, write "# weeks/months.")

In what industry do you work?

What is your hierarchical status in your organization? (Select the best status that applies to you.)

- ☐ Intern
- ☐ Temporary/Seasonal Employee
- ☐ Part-Time/Full-Time Employee
- ☐ Supervisor
- ☐ Department Head
- ☐ Vice President
- ☐ President
- ☐  Other (please specify)

**Random ID**

Here is your survey code for MTurk: \${e://Field/Random%20ID}

When you have copied the code, please click the next button to submit your survey.