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Abstract

The presence of multicultural values, emphasizing the appreciation of distinct cultural identities in companies’ promotional materials, versus colorblind values, which minimize cultural distinctions, may affect Black/Hispanic/Latinx (BHL) vs White individuals’ cognitive ability employment selection test scores and likelihood of applying to an organization differently depending on the company’s demonstrated leader racial diversity (LRD). Participants (N = 419), recruited via Amazon MTurk, read a hypothetical job application call and mission statement with a specific diversity ideology emphasized (multiculturalism, colorblind, control, Black Lives Matter (BLM)) and viewed headshots of the company C-suite either with low LRD (mostly White) or high LRD before filling out survey measures. Results revealed that BHL participants in the high LRD condition were significantly more likely to apply to the organization than those in the low LRD condition, emphasizing the importance of minority representation, while White participants in the BLM condition were significantly less likely to apply to the organization than in the multicultural condition. Additionally, identity threat, psychological safety, and organizational trust mediated the LRD-Likelihood of applying relationship. BHL participants experienced significantly higher identity threat and lower psychological safety than White participants in the low LRD condition. Analyses also revealed a significant moderation such that White participants low in social dominance orientation (SDO) were more likely to apply in the high than the low LRD condition, unlike their high SDO counterparts. Implications regarding how organization leadership may promote equitable workplace outcomes are discussed.

Keywords: diversity, multiculturalism, colorblindness, BLM, race, representation, leadership, organizations
Introduction

As the demographic composition of the U.S., and subsequently, the U.S. workforce, rapidly shifts, with minority groups becoming the majority regarding factors such as gender, race, culture, religion, and sexual preferences, among others (Buckley & Bachman, 2017), organizations must learn to manage diversity properly to harness potential benefits (Saxena et al., 2014; Stevens et al., 2008) and protect the wellbeing of all employees. This is especially important in the face of persisting racial disparities, rooted in systemic racism, in the United States that pervade in a multitude of domains: wealth, employment, criminal justice, education, housing, and healthcare (Plaut, 2010; Williams & Collins, 2001). These inequities inevitably translate to workplace contexts, greatly affecting especially Black and Hispanic/Latinx employees, amongst others, who are already earning less than their White and Asian counterparts (Median Usual Weekly, 2021; Thompson, 2013), are more likely than White people to have to work in-person even during COVID-19 due to their frontline roles (Gould & Sheirholz, 2020), and are almost twice as likely as Whites to be laid off amid the pandemic (Jan & Clement, 2020).

Research shows a diverse workforce can lead to positive interpersonal and organizational outcomes, from decreased prejudice (Konrad et al., 2005. p. 60) to increased levels of creativity, innovation, productivity, and economic competitiveness (Konrad et al., 2005; Lambert, 2016; Roberts, 2020; Saxena et al., 2014). However, to garner the benefits of diversity, organizational leadership must be aligned on diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives, ensuring authentic investment to counter negative outcomes of diversity such as racism, discrimination, conflict, and compartmentalization (Jehn et al., 1999; Roscoe, 2019; Smith et al., 2012). A diverse workforce can lead to benefits for employees, customers, and the company, but to reach the stage in which diversity can help a company thrive, organizational leadership must promote and
practice policies that aim to help individuals work across differences before the value of these differences may be seen. While important, increasing demographic diversity in itself is not effective. In fact, increasing demographic diversity without initiating progressive initiatives to accompany this increase may backfire, causing minority employees to feel undervalued and disrespected while failing to help employees work across differences to achieve positive outcomes (Ely & Thomas, 2020). Instead, organizations must think about the greater company culture, values, and policies that surround the people they hire and whether their power structures reflect the messages they are promoting. They must embrace a mindset of learning and growth as they transform workforce diversity from a hindrance to a superpower, supporting employees as they learn to embrace their differences rather than deny or marginalize them.

Konrad et al. (2005) extend the argument for the fostering of diversity in the workplace past the business case, which justifies a diverse workforce through linking increased diversity to positive organizational outcomes, primarily in terms of profit. They propose a transformation of the “Discourse of Diversity” that redefines organizational purpose around enhancement of human wellbeing, individual fulfillment and happiness, and meaning rather than financial success and return on investment (pp. 87 - 88). Shaping organizations around human growth, connection, and cooperation across social boundaries may not only accompany monetary gain, but it may propel companies forward regarding a multitude of measures of success, as human and community happiness are valued as ends rather than means to organizational prosperity. In a nation built on ideals entrenched in racism and White supremacy, with many systems that were created to be inequitable with barriers to marginalized groups (Tulshyan, 2020), it is important to consider how people in positions of power, from teachers to doctors to employers, may intentionally and thoughtfully provide tools to support and empower marginalized groups. It is
critical that organizations approach diversity initiatives from a human rights and human dignity lens, even if added financial benefits provide additional incentive.

Many leaders may be aware of how to avoid overt racism within company policies and procedures. However, they may not realize that the way their company is represented, through projected ideological values and diversity representation, can negatively affect racial minority job applicants and employees, along with other interpersonal and organizational outcomes. Therefore, in the current study, we investigate the effects of various diversity ideologies and racial representation, respectively, in addition to the interaction between the two factors, on various workplace outcomes in White versus Black/Hispanic/Latinx (BHL) participants. More specifically, we examine how a company’s projected diversity values (PDV) and leader racial diversity (LRD) may affect BHL versus White individuals’ decision-making and performance during the job application process while also exploring possible mediators and moderators of this relationship. By looking at these relationships, we can better understand how companies may be disadvantaging minority applicants, before they even enter the workplace, through covertly racist practices and how leaders may limit systemically racist practices to promote equitable outcomes and increase access to workplace opportunities through proper diversity management.

Projected Diversity Values (PDV)

Much debate exists around the role that diversity ideologies, or “individuals’ beliefs regarding the importance of demographic differences and how to navigate them” play in improving “intergroup relations in organizations and the broader society” (Leslie et al. 2020). These ideologies are often categorized into two groups: identity-blind ideologies, which posit that demographic differences such as race are insignificant and should be ignored or minimized, and identity-conscious, which promote the appreciation and recognition of group differences
The effects of a variety of specific ideologies within these categories have been investigated. For example, researchers have investigated the effects of meritocracy, which promotes equitable treatment of demographic groups solely based on merit and skill, and assimilation, in which nondominant groups conform to the practices and values of the dominant group (Leslie et al., 2020; Verkuyten, 2010). However, the present study will focus on two of the most prominent ideologies, multiculturalism and colorblindness, and more specifically, their effects in workplace contexts.

Multiculturalism (MC) is an ideology that recognizes, promotes, and emphasizes the maintenance and inclusion of distinct and unique cultural identities and values (Plaut, 2010; Wilton et al., 2015; Levin et al., 2012). This ideology arose from a dissatisfaction with progress made of the racial equality and immigrant- rights movements of the 1960s and 70s (Plaut, 2010) and implies that no one group culture is superior to another. However, while multiculturalism is based in a desire to embrace group differences, some social psychologists have posited that emphasizing the appreciation of group differences may lead to the essentialization of group differences, leading to increased stereotyping and pigeonholing of marginalized individuals (Plaut, 2010). Gutierrez & Unazueta (2010) found that when presented with a multicultural prime, rather than colorblind or control, participants were more likely to show higher levels of liking for an African American portrayed in a stereotypic manner than counterstereotypic. Examples like this show how multiculturalism may backfire and cause the perpetuation of racial divides and the creation of expectations of stricter cultural boundaries. Furthermore, by focusing on more surface-level elements of a different group’s culture, such as food and celebrations, rather than the lived experiences of these groups and challenges they have faced, people in
positions of power may use multiculturalism to reinforce and essentialize group boundaries rather than address structural inequalities (Plaut, 2010).

Colorblindness (CB), on the other hand, is a diversity ideology promoting the idea that cultural characteristics of groups should be ignored so that people are all treated equally as individuals rather than as members of particular groups, minimizing the significance of racial group membership (Levin et al., 2018; Plaut et al., 2018). The public became more aware of the colorblind model with Supreme Court Justice John Harlan’s dissent to *Plessy v. Ferguson’s* “separate but equal” doctrine, although it has roots in the pre-Civil War era, and promoters of colorblindness will often claim that they do not see color and that race should not matter (Plaut, 2010). In an alternative society in which since the beginning of time, race never affected any outcomes, colorblindness may be ideal. However, as an ideology that represents a vision for a society in which race does not affect outcomes in a nation build on racist principles, many argue that colorblindness minimizes the lived experiences of Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC), failing to acknowledge that racism has pervaded in the United States throughout history and persists today. Additionally, while historically, colorblind ideals have been used to champion the deconstruction of unequal, segregated, and racist systems, they have also been used to argue against initiatives aimed at creating equitable opportunities for marginalized groups on the basis that these disadvantage White people and that if people are supposed to practice colorblindness, then racial classifications should not be used for any purpose (Plaut et al., 2018).

While both diversity ideologies have advantages and disadvantages when it comes to promoting equity of all racial groups, research has shown that racial minorities tend to favor multiculturalism more than majority groups while White people prefer colorblindness (Plaut et
al., 2018). Additionally, multiculturalist beliefs are associated with more positive outcomes for minority groups, both in general and in the workplace. While there is conflicting data, a multitude of studies have found multiculturalism in majority-group members, whether experimentally manipulated or measured as an individual difference, to be negatively associated with prejudice, negative stereotyping, and discrimination (Hachfeld et al., 2015; Leslie et al., 2020; Levin et al., 2012) and to be endorsed by minority groups (Ryan et al., 2007; Wolsko et al., 2006). In practice, researchers have found multiculturalism to have positive implications for interracial interaction, minority engagement and performance, and detection of discrimination in the workplace (Plaut et al., 2018). For example, in a field study, Plaut et al. (2009) found that White employees’ multiculturalist beliefs positively predicted their minority coworkers’ psychological engagement, or how much employees valued their role and success within the organization (and vice versa for colorblind beliefs), while Wilton et al. (2015) found that women of color performed better on a math test when primed with a multicultural rather than a colorblind message. Unfortunately, White individuals may feel threatened by multiculturalist values, provoking increased feelings of prejudice toward minority groups (Plaut et al., 2018; Yogeeswaran & Dasgupta, 2014). This threat may arise from feelings of exclusion or from the false belief that multiculturalism is an attempt to rob White people of their own identities. However, a diversity philosophy termed all-inclusive multiculturalism, which emphasizes that diversity includes both majority and minority groups, may serve as a successful alternative to traditional multiculturalism, reducing feelings of threat in majority members and making majority and minority members feel included (Stevens et al., 2008).

Meanwhile, colorblind values, which remain dominant in workplaces throughout the United States (Walton et al., 2015), have been endorsed over multiculturalism by White people
and have been associated with stronger stereotypes among Whites (Ryan et al., 2007). Minorities, specifically Black and Latinx individuals, however, may perceive colorblind messages as exclusionary attempts to hide important group differences and erase lived experiences and cultural identities (Bonilla-Silva 2006; Markus et al. 2000; Ryan et al. 2007; Walton et al., 2015). In practice, majority-group members who promote colorblindness may be less sensitive and attuned to racism and minority groups’ lived experiences (Plaut et al., 2018). For example, Hachfeld et al. (2015) found that teachers with a colorblind orientation rather than multicultural were less likely to adapt teaching to minority students’ needs while Apfelbaum et al. (2010) found that children primed in a colorblind condition were less likely to detect racial discrimination. Whites may adopt a colorblind approach and avoid speaking about race when they are concerned about coming off as prejudiced, even when race is clearly relevant to a situation, and this tendency easily translates to the workplace, where people often avoid talking about racial issues (Apfelbaum, 2008; Smith et al., 2017). However, minorities may interpret this avoidance as prejudice (Apfelbaum et al., 2008), doubting the genuineness of their White counterparts. While the goal of colorblindness may be to unite all people regardless of race, in reality, this ideology’s presence in society in general, and more specifically workplaces, may negatively impact minority groups, overlooking a history of national systemic oppression and causing minorities to feel that the injustices they face continue to go unacknowledged, which may either directly or indirectly influence their performance.

**BLM Exploratory Variable**

In addition to multiculturalism and colorblindness, as a timely social issue, this study will include an exploratory Black Lives Matter variable to examine whether company statements in support of the BLM movement attract or deter White vs BIPOC applicants. Throughout
the 2020 uprising of the Black Lives Matter movement, companies released statements committing to “action,” “justice,” and “conversation” around issues of “racism” (Pacheco & Stamm, 2020). Companies have released these promises for a variety of reasons relating to both profit (Roberts, 2020) and social justice, with the general assumption that these statements are meant to appeal to Black customers, applicants, employees, etc. (Birchall, 2020).

However, research has shown a tendency for feelings of racial battle fatigue, or strain on racially marginalized groups resulting from exerting extra energy to deal with microaggressions and racism, to expedite activist burnout specifically for BIPOC in predominantly White settings, like many US workplaces (Gorski, 2019; Smith et al., 2016). Increased levels of racial battle fatigue may increase feelings of frustration, shock, anger, anxiety, hopelessness, and fear (Smith et al., 2016). These findings suggest that participants of color may feel racial battle fatigue and burnout when reminded of the BLM movement if this messaging is accompanied by pictures of company leadership being predominantly White since the BLM messaging coupled with low racial diversity subconsciously (or consciously) may trigger fatigue and burnout, feeling inauthentic. Meanwhile, White participants may experience a range of responses in response to BLM-focused messaging, from feelings of empathy to ignorance to feeling threatened (Luttrell, 2019).

While Hispanic/Latinx individuals likely differ from Black individuals in the specific ways that they respond to BLM-focused messaging, many members of this population have backed BLM protests in the past year while also demanding change for themselves (Medina, 2020), although Black and Latinx voters were also pitted against each other in some respects for the 2020 election (Mazzei & Medina, 2020). Latinx individuals have generally been found to support BLM once they are made aware of its goals (Corral, 2020). While there is potential for
Hispanic/Latinx participants to weaken the effects seen regarding the BLM condition within the BHL category, it is expected that as another group that faces extreme workplace disparities that can relate to Black individuals, Hispanic/Latinx individuals will react similarly to Black participants in their support of BLM-centered messaging.

**Leader Racial Diversity (LRD)**

Within organizations in real life, values are juxtaposed against realities, emphasizing the importance of looking at how demographic composition of company leadership in practice, in addition to projected company values, can affect minority applicants and employees’ decision-making and performance. Company actions may contradict company words and promises, and an applicant’s impressions of a company may depend more on actual portrayal of diversity than how they describe their diversity values.

In a test of the similarity attraction hypothesis, Young et al. (1997) found that participants had more positive reactions toward an open teacher role at a school if shown a videotape of a racially similar school administrator giving the recruitment message. While Lin et al. (1992) found similar same-race effects in alignment with the similarity attraction hypothesis in a job interviewer-interviewee scenario for Black and Hispanic applicants, this bias was not found for White applicants. Perkins et al. (2000) had similar findings; data indicated that portraying diversity in job advertisements may assist in recruiting Black applicants while having no effect on Whites. These results suggest that when minority applicants are involved, they may feel more comfortable within the recruitment context of an organization when interviewed by an employee who looks like them because this sends the message that this employee is valued. It is unclear whether this trend may be generalizable to White applicants as well. Thomas & Wise (1999) also found that women and racial minority job applicants placed more importance on
diversity factors than men and non-racial minority applicants and that minority applicants saw recruiter characteristics as more important than non-minorities when examining the attractiveness of jobs and organizations. These results suggest that when underrepresented job applicants see minority employees representing a company, this physical cue may signal the value the organization places on diversity. This relationship may be especially salient within organizations that are embedded in more homogeneous and White communities, with few racial minorities, as physical demographic diversity may be seen as a more genuine signal that the organization wants to foster diversity and eliminate discrimination communities (Pugh et al., 2008).

In addition to negatively impacting perceptions of organizations, Roberson et al. (2002) found that a lack of racial representation at work may negatively impact Black employees’ performance, possibly leading to long-term negative impacts on job and career trajectories. It is vital that organizations acknowledge that underrepresentation of minority groups at work may lead to negative impacts on the performance of these groups (Block et al., 2011) and that they work to counter this phenomenon through increased minority representation to create an equitable playing field. Findings showing that diverse representation in job advertisements and the workplace may attract and benefit the performance of minority applicants while having no effect on White applicants suggest that White applicants do not attend as much to racial cues in application and recruitment materials. While there is some conflicting data showing that Whites may be deterred from organizations as the number of minorities within recruitment materials increases, specifically when Whites are in the minority (Walker, 2009), when they are the majority, as in most workplaces in the United States, they should be less likely to be influenced by ad diversity (Avery, 2003; Perkins et al., 2000). White job seekers likely pay less attention to
racial cues due to their majority status in which they have the psychological privilege of rarely needing to consider what it would be like to experience the workplace as a racial minority in the United States. Data suggests that increasing minority representation may help to attract and retain minority employees as well as support them in performing to the best of their ability.

The present study specifically examines the impacts of racial numerical representation in company leadership due to research emphasizing the importance of commitment to diversity and inclusion initiatives and representation in leadership positions. Jin et al. (2017) found that inclusive leadership predicts performance of employees of color more strongly than diversity policy alone, emphasizing the need for top management to model inclusive leadership behaviors and ensure that diversity management is addressing overall workplace processes. Additionally, Pittinsky (2010) found that when followers belong to a different subgroup than their leader, their trust and support in their leader and identification with the organization decline, emphasizing a need for diverse representation in leadership along with a need for adequate diversity management to counter the negative effects of underrepresentation. The leader-follower relationship is complex, and even more so when the follower belongs to a different subgroup than their leader. With a stark lack of racial diversity in leadership positions in major U.S. companies (Larcker & Tayan, 2020), it is important to examine the negative effects that a lack of representation in leadership may have on minority employees and job applicants.

The Authenticity of Projected Diversity Values

While research has shown that both numerical representation of minorities in the workplace and the promotion of specific diversity ideologies have the potential to influence how minority job applicants perceive the organization and perform, the research exploring the interaction between the two factors is scarce. However, existing findings suggest that sincerity
matters when it comes to projecting a diversity-related image; people, and especially BIPOC, are more likely to find diversity-related messaging and promotions authentic if this projected diversity image is matched by diversity in demographic representation (Walton, 2015; Avery et al. 2003; Purdie-Vaughns et al. 2008; Smith et al., 2012). Individuals interpret cues from both numerical representation and mission and diversity statements when either consciously or unconsciously interpreting their own value within the context of an organization. For example, Smith et al. (2012) found that perceptions of an organization’s commitment to diversity were highest when both numerical diversity and diversity image authenticity were high. Authenticity was operationalized through a hypothetical news article discussing how the organization was either “truly committed to” diversity in the authentic condition and how they superficially marketed themselves as diverse in the insincere condition (pp. 54-55). Purdie-Vaughns et al. (2008) found that low minority representation cues coupled with a colorblind diversity policy presented in relation to a workplace setting led Black participants to feel that their identity was threatened and to distrust the organizational setting, both being factors that may inevitably affect performance.

Since research suggests that both numeric underrepresentation of minority group members and colorblind diversity philosophies may negatively impact performance and feelings of belonging in the workplace for minority employees and job applicants (Walton et al., 2015), it is important to consider how the two constructs interact and influence each other in the eyes of potential job applicants. In today’s political and social context, many companies engage in “woke-washing,” in which they say or do something to signal advocacy for a specific social-justice related cause or value while continuing to cause harm to vulnerable communities, potentially misleading customers (Vredenburg et al., 2020). The research around the above
interaction highlights that if companies are unable to match their projected diversity values and assurances through authentic company policies and practices, job applicants may see through these empty promises.

**Mediators and Moderators**

It is important to explore possible mediators and moderators of the relationships between LRD and PDVs and applicant decision-making and performance so that companies may consider the underlying mechanisms behind the relationships to better understand what constructs they must target to best serve the needs of their employees. The present study examines identity threat, psychological safety, and organizational trust as potential mediating mechanisms of the IV-DV relationships in addition to social dominance orientation (SDO) as a possible moderator.

**Identity Threat**

Identity threat, or the expectation one will be judged (and conform) based on group membership rather than performance and potential due to devaluation of this group (Branscombe et al., 1999; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Walton et al., 2015), ties in closely to the idea of stereotype threat, or the worry that one will confirm a negative stereotype about their group (Steele, 1997). According to social identity and stereotype threat theory, when one experiences these types of threats, they may perform poorly compared to what they are capable of when under evaluation even if they do not believe that the stereotype about their group is true (Kirnan et al., 2009; Walton et al., 2015). In the context of the workplace, underperforming may affect individuals in a variety of contexts, including pre-employment selection tests, performance evaluations, and daily workplace exchanges, ultimately negatively impacting these employees and applicants through being overlooked for hiring decisions, promotions, and other workplace decisions due to underperformance.
While a variety of factors may affect exactly when and to what magnitude identity threat occurs, most stereotype threat research has focused on women and racial minorities, especially Black and Hispanic individuals, although in theory, anyone can experience stereotype threat if they feel that a particular identity of theirs is negatively stereotyped in a certain context (Walton et al., 2015, p. 525). Within the research exploring possible antecedents of identity threat in the workplace, numeric underrepresentation and colorblind statements and policies have been identified as possible identity-threatening cues (Walton et al., 2015, p. 528). Numeric underrepresentation may cause threat if employees and applicants wonder whether nobody looks like them at this organization because of a specific stereotype and if they feel pressure to represent their group well to disprove any negative stereotypes. Colorblindness may cause potential employees to wonder whether the organization will respect their distinct background and differences.

Researchers have used a variety of methods to trigger stereotype threat and investigate its effects on performance; Steele and Aronson (1995) found that Black individuals’ standardized test performance was impaired by stereotype threat priming that involved either suggesting that participants’ performance was diagnostic of intellectual ability (vs nondiagnostic) or by having participants list their race before taking the test. Kirnan et al. (2009) found score increases were greater for some minorities when demographic questions were placed after a cognitive ability test and that positioning of demographic items after (rather than before) the Wonderlic Personnel test, a commonly used job selection test, was also associated with an increase in test scores. These findings, in addition to those more specific to the negative impacts of colorblind messaging and beliefs (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008; Wilton et al., 2015; Holoien & Shelton, 2012) and numerical underrepresentation (Blascovich et al., 2001; Murphy et al., 2007; Purdie-
Vaughns et al., 2008; Roberson et al., 2003) on performance and this relationship’s inherent connection to identity threat, highlight the need to further explore identity threat. This construct may be an underlying mechanism for poorer performance in minority job applicants and employees and a mediator of the relationship between PDV and LRD and decision-making and performance. Studies showing that minority group members tend to prefer multicultural messaging and feel less threatened when they see employees that look like themselves suggest that minority job applicants would be more likely to choose to work at an organization that reflects these values, but little research has attempted to explore decision-making processes in job applicants in relation to diversity messaging and numerical representation. The present study aims to expand on the few workplace-related findings, examining how colorblindness and demographic underrepresentation may lead to identity threat which may negatively affect minority employees in the short-term and the long-term.

**Psychological Safety**

Psychological safety is defined as the shared belief held by members of a team that the team is safe for interpersonal risk taking and that team members can express their authentic selves and beliefs without fear (Edmondson, 1999; Kahn, 1990), closely related to a feeling of certainty that group relationship dynamics are characterized by trust and respect (Edmonson & Lei, 2014; Kahn, 1990). Studies have shown that employees who experience a more positive and supportive diversity climate will feel more psychological safety and feel better able to safely express their true identities, opinions, and ideas within their workplace (Adjei, 2020; Singh et al., 2013). Diversity climate refers to employee perceptions regarding the extent to which an organization values, supports, and integrates diversity and equity-related initiatives into organizational practices and has often been examined in relation to women and other minority
groups within the workplace (Kaplan et al., 2011; Mor Barak et al., 1998; Singh et al., 2013). Since numerical underrepresentation of marginalized groups and colorblind diversity philosophies may send the message to minority groups that they are not valued in a certain place, these factors are inherently related to the idea of a diversity climate, which takes into account employees’ perceptions of organizational values regarding diversity.

In addition to finding a positive association between diversity climate and psychological safety in employees, Singh et al. (2013) found that psychological safety mediated the relationship between diversity climate and performance, implying that when an employee feels supported by an organization’s diversity climate, he or she may feel increased psychological safety and perform better in their role. Singh et al. (2013) also found that these relationships were stronger for racial minorities than for Whites, suggesting that organizations must be especially sensitive to the needs of minority employees. If organizations fail to foster a positive diversity climate, they may be negatively impacting the way employees, and especially minority groups, feel and perform. The discovered and explored relationships between diversity-related factors, psychological safety, and their impact on individual and team outcomes in the workplace (Adjei, 2020; Delizonna, 2017; Edmondson & Lei, 2014; McCluney et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2013) suggest that psychological safety may be an important underlying mechanism, mediating the relationship between diversity climate and various employee outcomes.

**Organizational Trust**

Various studies have illustrated the impact that diversity-related cues can have on organizational trust, or the confidence that one will be treated fairly within their organization and that management will work to be honest and keep them safe and comfortable, in minority employees. For example, Purdie-Vaughns et al. (2008) found that low minority representation
cues coupled with colorblind messaging led African American professionals to distrust the organizational setting while Pittinsky (2010) explored how when followers belong to a different subgroup than leader’s, whether based on race or another characteristic, their support and trust in their leader may decrease. These findings highlight the significance of companies’ diversity-related values in the formation of trust, which is closely related to psychological safety, which requires employees to feel that they can trust their coworkers and leaders to accept their authentic selves in the workplace. Research has highlighted that trust (in coworkers and organizational leadership) is vital in optimizing team and organizational outcomes and performance (Delizonna, 2017; Kramer & Tyler, 1995), emphasizing the need to examine how organizations can maximize trust, especially in minority employees who may struggle to trust organizational settings due to diversity-related factors.

**Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)**

Companies must also consider the effects of their diversity policies on majority-group members because not all White individuals will respond the same way to specific diversity initiatives. If Whites are viewed as a heterogeneous group, companies must consider that diversity-friendly policies may be attractive to many White individuals while deterring others. Studies have linked increased levels of social dominance orientation (SDO), or the “extent to which one desires that their ingroup dominate and be superior to outgroups” (Pratto et al., 1994), in White people to increased prejudice against outgroups (Kteily et al., 2011; Levin et al., 2012; Michinov et al., 2005; Whitley, 1999). Stereotypes and hierarchical maintenance play a central role in the justification of these attitudes in individuals with high SDO (Levin et al., 2012; Michinov et al., 2005; Whitley, 1999) as high SDO majority-group members are likely to adhere to negative stereotypes about minority-group members to maintain their superiority to outgroups.
within an inherently hierarchical world. Stewart & Tran (2018) found that SDO is an important factor in understanding White Americans’ collective action willingness to reduce racial inequality which relates closely to their willingness to support hierarchy-attenuating social policy and advocacy. These findings suggest that levels of SDO in White people may affect how they make decisions that have to do with race like whether to work at a company that supports racial diversity in leadership. For example, White individuals low in SDO, compared to high SDO Whites, may be more likely to support a company high in racial diversity that supports pro-diversity initiatives because they value group equality, reacting similarly to BIPOC individuals. Meanwhile, Whites high in SDO may feel threatened if they believe a company values minority racial groups over White people through increased diversity representation.

Research around the relationships between diversity ideologies such as colorblindness and multiculturalism (both in terms of primed and pre-existing beliefs) and SDO has been scarce, producing mixed findings (Levin et al., 2012; Morrison et al., 2010). For example, Levin et al., (2012) found that personal support for multiculturalism was negatively associated with SDO while Morrison et al. (2010) found a multicultural prime to be associated with higher SDO and increased prejudice. Due to the links between increased prejudice toward outgroups in White people and high levels of SDO, it is important to expand exploration around SDO as a possible moderator of the relationship between diversity philosophies and demographic representation and decision-making in White people. It seems likely that White people that desire their ingroup to be superior to outgroups and feel increased prejudice toward outgroups may feel threatened by a company boasting racial diversity in leadership and multicultural or BLM-related philosophies supporting the maintenance and appreciation of distinct cultural groups, which may ultimately cause them to not want to work at this company even if they are qualified. So, White people high
in SDO may be less likely to apply to an organization promoting multiculturalism, BLM, or high racial diversity compared to colorblindness or low racial diversity. Meanwhile, Whites low in SDO may be more likely to apply to a company promoting multiculturalism, BLM, and high racial diversity compared to colorblindness and low racial diversity because of their willingness to support hierarchy-attenuating initiatives, similar to BIPOC. However, it is possible that low SDO Whites may still be hesitant to support the same ideologies and representation as BIPOC but may not oppose these initiatives as much as high SDO whites.

Much of the research related to diversity-related initiatives within companies and their effects on workplace outcomes centers around minority groups. However, it is important to explore underlying mechanisms of these relationships in majority-group members since companies want to optimize outcomes for all job applicants, including majority-member individuals. Additionally, the actions and decisions of these individuals will ultimately impact the experiences of the people around them and organizational culture if hired into a company, and companies must consider how hiring high-SDO individuals could impact their organization. They must consider how to train these employees to recognize that diversity initiatives are meant to promote an equitable playing field rather than to disadvantage majority groups.

**The Present Study**

Prior research has examined the effects of various ideologies and demographic representation, respectively, on specific workplace outcomes, in addition to beginning to uncover the effects of the interaction between the two constructs. However, with some conflicting findings and theories that lack empirical support, it is important to confirm the validity and reliability of these findings using similar methods and explore how these factors may impact specific groups in today’s social context and the underlying mechanisms behind these effects.
Results may provide company leadership with practical and applicable knowledge around how their policies and practices may be impacting potential and current employees. Previous research has explored siloed relationships between diversity ideologies and specific outcomes, often failing to connect diversity-related findings to how minority applicants may be actively disadvantaged in the job application process before they are even hired into a company. This scholarship aims to fill research gaps by exploring how diversity-related factors may actively disadvantage minority applicants, intermediary and moderating variables, and connections to current events, providing a comprehensive picture around how companies may be harming minority applicants through covertly racist practices.

The present study explores how leader racial diversity (LRD), projected diversity values (PDV), and the interaction between the two may negatively affect BHL versus White applicants’ decision-making and performance, and possible mediators and moderators of this relationship. Specifically, it explores how a company’s PDVs and LRD affect 1) likelihood of applying and 2) cognitive ability selection test scores in Black/Hispanic/Latinx (BHL) versus White applicants using a 2 (Race: BHL, White) x 2 (LRD: Low, High) x 4 (PDV: MC, CB, Control, Black Lives Matter (BLM)) Factorial Design. The chosen dependent variables will illustrate whether the way companies represent themselves to potential applicants may deter BIPOC applicants, causing them to miss out on potentially beneficial and career-advancing opportunities or actively disadvantaging them in selection tests and other interview evaluative processes due to factors such as identity threat. Based on the review of the literature, several hypotheses are offered:

**Hypothesis 1a.** For BHL participants, their likelihood of applying and scores will be higher in the multicultural and BLM conditions than the colorblind condition. Research has demonstrated that minority groups tend to endorse multiculturalism over colorblindness (Ryan et al., 2007;
Wolsko et al., 2006) and that under multicultural rather than colorblind conditions, they perform better (Plaut et al., 2018). Additionally, there is a general consensus that BLM-focused messaging is meant to appeal to Black applicants and customers and those who support the BLM movement.

**Hypothesis 1b.** For BHL participants, higher LRD will increase likelihood of applying and scores. Links have been found between a lack of racial representation and negative reactions and worse performance in minority job applicants (Young et al., 1997; Roberson et al., 2002).

**Hypothesis 1c.** For BHL participants, there will be a two-way interaction between LRD and PDV such that the effect of PDV will be greater under high LRD than low LRD. Research findings have highlighted the importance that minority applicants place on racial representation cues. Under high LRD, BHL applicants should have a higher baseline level of attraction and comfort regarding the company compared to low LRD, and this baseline level of comfort will allow them the freedom to have higher standards when it comes to factors such as PDV. Meanwhile, in the low LRD condition, BHL participants likely will not care as much about the specifics of PDVs because they have already seen that even if the PDV is appealing, the LRD does not match, showing that the actions of the company do not match their promises.

**Hypothesis 2a.** For White participants, likelihood of applying will be lower in the multicultural and BLM condition than in the colorblind condition. This is hypothesized because Whites may feel threatened by multiculturalist values and BLM messaging due to feeling excluded from the ideologies (Plaut et al., 2018; Yogeeswaran & Dasgupta, 2014). No hypotheses regarding scores are made for White participants due to the lack of research around White people and identity threat affecting test scores.
**Hypothesis 3.** There will be a three-way interaction such that the two-way interaction between PDV and LRD should depend on race: for BHL participants, the effect of PDV should depend on LRD while for Whites, the effect of PDV should not depend on LRD for likelihood of applying. This three-way interaction is expected because a two-way interaction between PDV and LRD is expected for BHL applicants as they are more attuned to diversity cues, but this same two-way interaction is not expected for White participants.

**Hypothesis 4.** Identity threat, psychological safety, and organizational trust will mediate the relationships between my IVs and my DVs, and the IVS will have stronger effects on the mediators for BHL participants than for White participants. Increased feelings of identity threat may decrease likelihood of applying and selection test scores due to negative effects of identity threat on feelings of belonging, acceptance, and performance (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Branscombe et al., 1999; Walton et al., 2015; Kirnan et al., 2009; Walton et al., 2015). Threat may be increased by colorblind messaging and low representation (Walton et al., 2015, p. 528). Meanwhile, increased feelings of psychological safety and organizational trust may increase likelihood of applying and test scores due to the links found between increased levels of these factors and increased feelings of organizational support and enhanced performance in relation to improved diversity climates (Singh et al., 2013; Delizonna, 2017; Kramer & Tyler, 1995; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). However, because the IVs are race- and diversity-related, these IVs are expected to have stronger effects on the mediating variables for BHL participants compared to White participants.

**Hypothesis 5.** For White participants, SDO will moderate the relationships between the IVs and likelihood of applying: White participants with higher SDO will be less likely to apply under multiculturalism, BLM, and high LRD conditions compared to colorblindness and low LRD,
mirroring hypotheses for White participants in general. Meanwhile, White participants with lower SDO will either be more likely to apply under multiculturalism, BLM, and high LRD conditions compared to colorblindness and low LRD, mirroring BHL participants, or they will follow a similar pattern to Whites with high SDO, but with weaker relationships. Moderating effects of SDO are hypothesized due to the links found between SDO and increased prejudice against outgroups in Whites (Kteily et al., 2011), demonstrating White people with higher SDO may be less likely to apply to an organization with multicultural or BLM values and high racial diversity in leadership due to support of hierarchical maintenance.

Methods

Participants

Research participants were recruited via Amazon MTurk, a crowdsourcing marketplace, using the CloudResearch MTurk Toolkit, in which they took a 12-minute Qualtrics survey for the opportunity to receive 50 cents (halfway through data collection, payment was raised to $1.50 in order to recruit more BHL participants). Data collection occurred between February 24th and March 3rd, 2021. Participants with an education level lower than a high school degree or equivalent, who were not Black, Hispanic/Latinx, or White, and who were not U.S. citizens were filtered out using the Cloud Research qualification system. Although 430 people attempted the survey, 11 individuals were removed, either due to incomplete data (N = 7), because they somehow accessed the survey without meeting race restrictions (N = 3), or because they failed the one-item attention check (N=1), leaving 419 participants in the final sample, 226 White and 193 BHL. More specifically, in the BHL condition, 102 participants identified as Black while 91 identified as Non-Black Hispanic/Latinx. Any participant who identified as both Black and Latinx or as mixed-race Black was categorized as Black. Any participant who identified as
White/Asian/ Pacific Islander/American Indian and Hispanic/Latinx was categorized as Hispanic/Latinx within the BHL category. The mean age of participants was 40.26 years (SD = 13.821), and there were 236 women and 177 men, with 6 people who preferred to self-describe their gender. Additionally, 25 participants identified as very conservative, 79 as conservative, 113 as independent, 149 as liberal, and 51 as very liberal, with 2 failing to respond. Highest level of education was a high school degree or equivalent for 50 participants, some college or a 2-year college degree for 124 participants, a 4-year college degree or some graduate school for 166 participants, and a master’s degree or doctorate degree for 79 participants. The mean level of education was between a 2- and 4-year college degree.

**Design and Procedure**

Once recruited, each participant was informed that the study would involve an exploration of the behaviors of U.S. job applicants and that they would be presented with a series of information about a company with various open roles and then asked to fill out a variety of survey measures about their attitudes toward the job application, including a shortened version of a mock cognitive ability selection test. A 2 x 2 x 4 between-subjects quasi-experimental factorial design was used with independent variables of race (Black/Hispanic/Latinx (BHL) or White), leader racial diversity (LRD) (low or high), and projected diversity value (PDV) (colorblindness, multiculturalism, and control, with an additional exploratory Black Lives Matter (BLM) level).

After signing the informed consent form (See Appendix A), all participants read a general call for applicants for a fake Hotel chain. The hospitality industry was chosen because jobs within this sector are typically held by a more diverse population and less likely to be racialized than many other sectors (*Global Diversity Report*, 2011). The call was open to candidates interested in a variety of positions to prevent participants from choosing whether to apply based
on the specific role offered with very general skill requirements (ex. Ability to work in teams). Participants were presented with a hypothetical scenario in which they were asked to imagine that they really wanted to find a job because they were recently laid off and the new roles had a competitive salary. The mock job call was created by synthesizing and re-vamping existing application calls found on the internet. See Appendix B for full scenario, job ad, and contextualization instructions. The application call also contained information about the general company mission and values. Then, participants were presented with a mock diversity statement, framed as a general company mission statement “to learn more about the company,” with a manipulated projected diversity value for the company and a picture of the corporate suite of the company, showing either high or low leader racial diversity, depending on experimental condition in order to “see their future colleagues!” Next, all participants received the following instructions: “You will now complete a variety of survey measures exploring how you picture this company to be in real life along with how you envision your life at the company would be based on the materials you have read.” Participants then completed a variety of survey measures, including an identity threat measure, psychological safety measure, organizational trust measure, likelihood of applying measure, and exploratory qualitative measure examining the factors that they were thinking about when filling out the preceding measures. Finally, participants took a mock cognitive ability selection test measure after receiving the following instructions: “You will now take a mock cognitive ability selection measure meant to determine if your general cognitive ability level is a strong match for the skills necessary at this company. There will be 13 questions, and you have three minutes to complete as many questions as you can. You may answer questions in whatever order you wish and may skip questions. You are not expected to complete all items.” These surveys were followed by manipulation checks for the PDV and LRD
conditions, a social dominance orientation (SDO) measure, and demographic questionnaire including measures of gender, race, age, education level, socioeconomic status, US citizenship, and political affiliation (see Appendix C for demographic questionnaire). An attention check was also included before the cognitive ability test, and MTurk workers who failed were excluded from analyses and were not paid. The attention check asked participants which of the following is not something that you can drink: wine, detergent, ginger ale, or apple juice.

Projected Diversity Value (PDV) Manipulation

The projected diversity value manipulation was enacted through the manipulation of company diversity statements. BHL and White participants, respectively, were randomly assigned to either a multicultural, colorblind, control, or BLM condition. Under the multicultural and colorblind conditions, key language and themes highlighted in the research literature defining these ideologies were highlighted within a general company diversity mission statement. For example, the multicultural statement emphasized “embracing” different cultures and identities as well as “distinct” perspectives while the colorblind statement emphasized looking at people as “unique individuals” rather than through a lens of race or gender. In the control condition, participants were presented with a neutral diversity mission statement focused on growth and benefits rather than colorblind or multicultural ideals. Under the BLM condition, participants were presented with a mock Black Lives Matter Statement issued by the company in response to the killing of George Floyd. It was created by synthesizing and compiling common themes and phrases found through an analysis of 2020 company BLM statements found on company websites, ranging from small businesses to Fortune 100 companies. This statement emphasized the company’s commitment to reducing systemic racism. All statements were approximately equal regarding word count. See Appendix D for PDV manipulation materials.
Manipulation check. Following the survey measures for mediating and dependent variables, a manipulation check question asked participants to identify which sentence represented the values of the company they read about, with four possible answers, one aligning with each PDV condition (See Appendix E for manipulation check). PDV manipulations and checks were altered from the pilot study.  

Leader Racial Diversity (LRD) Manipulation

The leader racial diversity manipulation was enacted through the manipulation of photos of C-Suite members. Participants were assigned to either a low or high leader racial diversity condition. Participants in the low leader racial diversity condition were presented with images of 10 people in the hotel chain’s C-Suite (eight White-presenting, two of which were women, one Asian-presenting man and one Black-presenting woman). Participants in the high leader racial diversity condition were also presented with images of 10 people in the hotel chain’s C-Suite (three White-presenting- one woman and two men, three Black-presenting- two men and one

---

1 A pilot study was conducted prior to the main study in order to assess whether the LRD and PDV manipulations were successful. In the pilot study, in the low LRD condition, 59.62% of participants answered the manipulation check correctly while 93.75% of participants in the high LRD condition answered the manipulation check correctly. The relation between the PDV condition and the manipulation check answers was significant, meaning that the LRD condition participants believed that they were in was associated with what condition they were actually in: $\chi^2 (1, 100) = 31.68, p < .001$. For the PDV manipulation, 39.13% of participants in the multicultural condition answered the manipulation check correctly, 92% of participants in the colorblind condition answered the manipulation check correctly, 75% of participants in the BLM condition answered the manipulation check correctly, and 25% of participants in the control condition answered the manipulation check correctly. A chi-square test of independence was performed to confirm the association between the projected diversity value manipulation condition and which condition participants thought they were in. The relation between these variables was also significant, again showing an association between participant’s PDV manipulation condition and the manipulation condition they believed they were in, $\chi^2 (9, 100) = 93.52, p < .001$. However, since more than 50% of participants in both the multicultural and control conditions answered the manipulation check incorrectly, strength of PDV manipulations was increased for the main study and manipulation check questions were altered to optimize clarity. See Appendix F for pilot study PDV conditions and manipulation check.
woman, two Asian-presenting- one woman and one man, and two Latinx presenting- one man and one woman). See Appendix G for LRD conditions.

**Manipulation check.** Along with the PDV manipulation check, a manipulation check question asked participants to identify which level of diversity best described the level of racial diversity in the headshots of the people at the company they read about. See Appendix H for LRD manipulation check.

**Measures**

**Identity Threat**

The *Social Identity Threat Measure* (Belmi et al., 2015) consists of 5 items meant to assess college students’ worry about being seen negatively in school due to their ethnicity. Each item is rated using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). In this study, the word “school” was changed to “company” and one item was excluded. The remaining four items were averaged, with the mean score representing a final identity threat score, with higher numbers implying greater identity threat. An example item in this measure is “At this company, I worry that people will draw conclusions about my competence based on my racial group.” This measure had high reliability (α = .97). See Appendix I for full measure.

**Psychological Safety**

The *Team Psychological Safety Measure* (Edmonson, 1999), which has been extensively utilized and validated (Adjei, 2020), consists of seven items rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*), with items one, three, and five being reverse-scored. In this study, the word “team” was changed to “company” and the word “members” was changed to “employees.” Sentences were grammatically altered to represent that participants should be answering based on how they think they would feel at the company in real
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life. All items were averaged, with the mean score representing a final psychological safety score, with higher scores representing higher psychological safety. An example item in this measure is “Employees at this company are able to bring up problems and tough issues.” This measure had moderate reliability ($\alpha = .60$). See Appendix J for full measure.

**Organizational Trust**

The Organizational Trust Measure was adapted from Purdie Vaughns’ et al. (2008) *Trust and Comfort* measure, which consists of 11 items adapted from questionnaires measuring trust and satisfaction in the workplace (Tyler & Blader, 2000). Seven items were removed due to lack of relevance and one was added. The five remaining items were rated on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). All items were averaged, with higher scores representing higher organizational trust. An example item in this measure is “I think I would be treated fairly by my supervisor.” This measure had high reliability ($\alpha = .95$). See Appendix K for full measure.

**Likelihood of Applying**

Likelihood of applying was measured by three items in a self-created measure. An example item in this measure is: “How likely do you think you would be to apply to this organization in real life?” Answers were rated on a five-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (*not likely at all*) to 5 (*very likely*) and all items were averaged to calculate likelihood, with higher scores indicating higher likelihood of applying. This measure had high reliability ($\alpha = .94$). See Appendix L for full measure.

**Qualitative Response**

To see what participants were thinking about while deciding whether they would apply to this company in real life and filling out the measures, they were asked “*What factors were you
thinking about when answering the questions in the previous three surveys?” This question was created to see if there were any trends recognized in reasoning patterns. For example, did participants mention consciously thinking about diversity values or demographic diversity when filling out the surveys, or did they mention alternative reasoning? The implications of these responses are valuable when analyzing the data through a qualitative, identity-conscious lens to identify the reasoning behind certain responses. See Appendix M for measure.

**Cognitive Ability Selection Score**

Cognitive ability scores on a mock selection test were measured through the provision of a sample Wonderlic Test, which is a real-world job personnel selection test (*Wonderlic*). Participants were given a sample short-version of the test using 13 sample items from testprep-online.com, which offers a selection of Wonderlic-style cognitive ability questions as part of a test prep pack. See Appendix N for full measure. To create a cognitive ability test score (0-13), the following calculation was completed: (sum of # correct answers). Since the Wonderlic test is timed, participants were given 3 minutes to complete all of the questions, proportional to the standard version in which participants have 12 minutes to complete 50 questions. This test was chosen due to its ability to measure general cognitive ability, similar to the WAIS-R (Matthews & Lassiter, 2007), its popular usage for entry-level, college, and training programs (*What is the Wonderlic?*), its supposed lack of cultural bias (Jensen, 1977), and due to the presence of a highly-educated population on MTurk (in which participants were expected to be able to answer some of the items correctly) (Ross et al., 2009).

**Social Dominance Orientation**

The *Social Dominance Orientation Measure* (Ho et al., 2015) consists of 16 items meant to assess an individual’s support for group-based hierarchies. Each item is rated using a seven-
point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly oppose) to 7 (strongly favor). The items were averaged, with 5-8 and 13-16 being reverse-scored, with the mean score representing a final SDO score and higher numbers implying more support for group-based hierarchies. An example item in this measure is “Groups at the bottom should not have to stay in their place.” This measure had high reliability (α = .912). See Appendix O for full measure. See Appendix P for full Qualtrics survey.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

The goal of this study was to assess how leader racial diversity, company projected diversity values, and race affect individuals’ likelihood of applying to an organization and performance on a cognitive ability selection test. The primary independent variables of interest were projected diversity values (Multicultural, Colorblind, BLM, Control), leader racial diversity (High, Low), and race (White and Black/Hispanic/Latinx). The primary dependent variables of interest were likelihood of applying (Likelihood measure) and cognitive ability score (Wonderlic measure). Additionally, three mediators (psychological safety, identity threat, and organizational trust) and one moderator were measured (social dominance orientation; SDO). Race breakdown and experimental condition for the final sample are presented in Table 1.

Skewness and kurtosis values for each dependent variable, moderator and mediator were in normal range (between -1 and 1). While no variables were normal according to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality (p < .05) and many variables had skewed histograms, analyses were continued as planned since ANOVA as a statistical analysis is generally robust against deviations from normality. Overall, the scales had adequate reliability. Descriptive statistics for each dependent variable, moderator, and mediator are presented below in Table 2.
See Table 3 for means and standard deviations for each experimental condition for Likelihood of Applying and Cognitive Ability Scores. See Table 4 for correlations among study variables.

**Table 1**

*Number of Participants by Race for Each Condition in Final Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Projected Value Diversity Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multicultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td><strong>HL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHL</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. HL = High LRD, LL = Low LRD*

**Table 2**

*Descriptive Statistics for Dependent Variables, Mediating and Moderating Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Reliability (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Ability</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Safety</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Trust</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Threat</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

*Descriptives Summary Table for Likelihood of Applying and Cognitive Ability Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>PDV Condition</th>
<th>LRD Condition</th>
<th>Likelihood Mean</th>
<th>Likelihood SD</th>
<th>CogAbility Score Mean</th>
<th>CogAbility Score SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorblind</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHL</td>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorblind</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorblind</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Correlations among Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Likelihood</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-CogAbility</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Psych Safety</td>
<td>0.52***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Org Trust</td>
<td>0.71***</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.74***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Identity Threat</td>
<td>-0.31***</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.62***</td>
<td>-0.51***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-SDO</td>
<td>-0.20***</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.13**</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-LRD</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>-0.26***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. p < .05*, p < .01**, p < .001***, LRD included as dichotomous variable, 0 = low LRD, 1 = high LRD

Manipulation Checks

To assess whether the leader racial diversity and projected diversity value manipulations were successful, participants completed two manipulation check questions (See Appendices E and H). In the low LRD condition, 69.38% of participants answered the manipulation check correctly while 99% of participants in the high LRD condition answered the manipulation check correctly. A chi-square test of independence was performed to confirm the association between the LRD manipulation condition and which condition participants thought they were in. The relation between these variables was significant, meaning that the LRD condition participants believed that they were in was associated with what condition they were actually in: χ²(1, 419) = 215.34, p < .001. For the PDV manipulation, 69.81% of participants in the multicultural condition answered the manipulation check correctly, 85.05% of participants in the colorblind condition answered the manipulation check correctly, 64.08% of participants in the BLM condition answered the manipulation check correctly, and 63.11% of participants in the control condition answered the manipulation check correctly. The number of participants that answered the BLM manipulation check correctly was surprisingly low considering this was the only answer choice related to Black lives. A chi-square test of independence was performed to
confirm the association between the projected diversity value manipulation condition and which condition participants thought they were in. The relation between these variables was also significant, again showing an association between participant’s PDV manipulation condition and the manipulation condition they believed they were in, $\chi^2 (9, 419) = 512.59, p < .001$.

**Primary Analyses**

To examine the effects of leader racial diversity (LRD), projected diversity value (PDV), and race, in addition to their interactions, on likelihood of applying (Likelihood) and cognitive ability selection test scores (Wonderlic), ANOVAs were performed. Before running the ANOVAs, correlations between income level and education level and the dependent variables were examined to determine whether ANCOVAs should be performed instead of ANOVAs. Income and cognitive ability (Wonderlic) scores were found to be weakly positively correlated, $r(419) = .16, p = .001$, while education level and Wonderlic scores were found to be moderately positively correlated, $r(419) = .30, p < .001$. These results highlighted the need for an ANCOVA for the Wonderlic scores. Correlations between income ($r(419) = -.04, p = .47$) and education level ($r(419) = -.05, p = .34$) and likelihood of applying were not significant. Levene’s Test of homogeneity of variance passed for likelihood of applying ($F(15,403) = 1.39, p = .15$) and cognitive ability scores ($F(15,403) = .89, p = .58$), confirming homogeneity of variances.

**Likelihood of Applying**

Following preliminary analyses, a three-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effects of leader racial diversity, projected diversity value, and race, in addition to their interactions, on likelihood of applying. While the main effect of leader racial diversity and interaction effect between race and projected diversity value condition on likelihood of applying were significant, other effects were not significant (see Table 5 for ANOVA summary statistics
for likelihood of applying). Contrary to predictions, the effect of PDV on likelihood of applying did not depend on LRD for any participants, and the three-way interaction with participant race was not significant either, failing to support hypotheses 1c and 3. For likelihood of applying for all participants, observed post hoc power was estimated at 40.90% for detecting significant differences regarding the PDV manipulation and 81.20% regarding the LRD condition. The interaction between race and PDV had an observed power of 66.50% while all other interaction effects had observed power between 16%–40%.

The main effect of leader racial diversity indicated that participants in the high leader racial diversity condition \( (M = 3.79, SD = 1.13) \) were significantly more likely to apply to the organization than participants in the low leader racial diversity condition \( (M = 3.46, SD = 1.1) \). This finding is consistent with predictions for BHL participants, but not for White participants (for whom no difference was expected).

Regarding the effect of PDV across BHL and White participants, hypotheses predicted that for BHL participants, likelihood of applying would be higher in the BLM and multicultural conditions than the colorblind condition, but for White participants, likelihood of applying would be lower in the BLM and multicultural conditions than in the colorblind condition. Furthermore, for BHL participants, hypotheses predicted a two-way interaction between LRD and PDV such that the effect of PDV would be greater under high LRD than low LRD. In order to test these specific hypotheses for each racial condition, two-way ANOVAs for the effects of PDV and LRD were run separately for White and BHL participants.

**White participants.**

A main effect of projected diversity value was found \( F(3, 218) = 4.13, p = .007 \). Post hoc analyses (Scheffé) indicated that White participants in the BLM condition were significantly less
likely to apply ($M = 3.25, SD = 1.3$) to the organization than in the multicultural condition ($M = 3.93, SD = .88$), $p = .013$. See Table 6 for ANOVA summary statistics. These findings fail to support Hypothesis 2, which was that for White participants, scores and likelihood of applying in BLM and multicultural conditions would be lower than in the colorblind condition. Instead, they simply show that White participants were significantly less likely to apply in the BLM condition than the multicultural condition, which had the lowest and highest means for likelihood of applying for White participants, respectively. However, no significant main effect regarding LRD or interaction effect between LRD and PDV for White participants was found, aligning with the lack of hypotheses regarding LRD main effects or PDV-LRD interactions for White participants, as no significant differences based on these factors were hypothesized. Regarding the effects, however, it is important to note that there was little power to detect significant differences. Observed power was estimated at 27% for detecting significant differences regarding the LRD manipulation and 24.3% regarding the LRD x PDV two-way interaction for White participants and the likelihood variable. Estimated power for PDV was 84.6%.

**BHL participants.**

Interestingly, BHL participants had the highest likelihood of applying in the BLM condition ($M = 3.87, SD = 1.1$) while White participants had the lowest likelihood in the BLM condition ($M = 3.25, SD = 1.3$), and this difference was the only statistically significant racial difference across the projected diversity value conditions ($p = .008$).

A main effect of leader racial diversity was the only significant effect found for BHL participants, such that participants in the high leader racial diversity condition ($M = 3.89, SD = 1.03$) were significantly more likely to apply to the organization than those in the low diversity condition ($M = 3.46, SD = 1.10$). See Table 7 for ANOVA summary statistics and Figure 3 for a
visual representation. These findings support Hypothesis 1b, that for BHL participants, LRD would increase likelihood of applying. However, these findings fail to provide support for the predicted two-way interaction between leader racial diversity and projected diversity value, likely because there was no main effect of projected diversity value for BHL participants, failing to support Hypotheses 1a and 1c. Regarding the simple effects, however, it’s important to note that there was little power to detect significant differences. Observed power was estimated at 17.6% for detecting significant differences regarding the PDV manipulation and 27.1% regarding the LRD x PDV two-way interaction for BHL participants and the likelihood variable. Estimated power for LRD, however, was 76%. See figures 1 and 2 for visual representations of results for White and BHL participants, respectively.

**Figure 1.**
*Interaction between projected diversity value condition and LRD on likelihood of applying for White Participants, Significant Main Effect of PDV Found*
Figure 2.
*Interaction between projected diversity value condition and LRD on likelihood of applying for BHL Participants. Significant Main Effect of LRD found*

Figure 3.
*Main effect of leader racial diversity on likelihood of applying for BHL participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ANOVA Summary Table for Likelihood of Applying, all participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>8.14*</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race*PDV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.75*</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race*LRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDV*LRD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race<em>PDV</em>LRD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. MS = Mean squares, effect size = partial $\eta^2$*
Table 6
ANOVA Summary Table for Likelihood of Applying: Only for White participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.13*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDV*LRD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. MS = Mean squares, effect size = partial $\eta^2$.

Table 7
ANOVA Summary Table for Likelihood of Applying: Only for BHL participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>7.18*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDV*LRD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. MS = Mean squares, effect size = partial $\eta^2$.

Cognitive Ability

Next, a three-way ANCOVA, controlling for income and education level, was conducted to examine the effects of leader racial diversity, projected diversity value, and race, in addition to their interactions, on cognitive ability scores. The only significant effect found was a main effect of race such that White participants ($M = 6.13, SD = 2.85$) scored significantly higher than BHL participants ($M = 5.18, SD = 2.62$). See Table 8 for ANCOVA summary statistics. No further analyses were run due to the lack of relevant effects found. These findings fail to provide support for hypotheses for BHL participants regarding the cognitive ability measure. Power analyses revealed that there may not be enough power to detect significant differences, especially considering that three-way interactions were comparing 1/16 of the sample to another 1/16 due to the high number of cells in the analysis. The power to detect a three-way interaction for likelihood of applying was .163 (16.3%) and .069 (6.9%) for cognitive ability scores. Regarding the main effects, there was also low observed power to detect significant differences. Power was
estimated at 65.1% for detecting significant differences regarding the PDV manipulation and 52.3% regarding the LRD condition. All possible two and three-way interactions had observed powers between 8% and 45%.

Table 8
ANCOVA Summary Table for Wonderlic Scores, Controlling for Income and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.05</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race*PDV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race*LRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDV*LRD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race<em>PDV</em>LRD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. MS = Mean squares, effect size = partial $\eta^2$

Mediation Analyses

Likelihood of Applying

Following the main ANOVA analyses for the IV-DV relationships, mediation analyses were performed to examine the indirect effects of race, leader racial diversity, and projected diversity value on likelihood of applying through the mediation of three potential mediating variables: psychological safety, identity threat, and organizational trust. Initial analyses used the Baron and Kenny method due to the use of multiple independent variables. See Table 4 above for correlational analyses, demonstrating the significant positive correlations between LRD and psychological safety and organizational trust, and the negative correlation between LRD and identity threat.

First, multiple regression analysis was used to test if the three independent variables significantly predicted likelihood of applying. The results indicated the three predictors explained 3.9% of the variance in likelihood of applying ($R^2 = .039$, $F(5, 413) = 3.33$, $p = .006$).
For this regression, projected diversity value manipulation conditions (multicultural, colorblind, and BLM) were dummy-coded so that each participant in that condition was assigned a value of “1” while participants in each other condition were assigned a value of “0.” Consistent with the analysis performed as an ANOVA, only leader racial diversity significantly added to the prediction. See Table 9 for summary statistics from the multiple regression.

### Table 9

**Multiple Regression Summary Table for Likelihood of Applying**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRD</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Dummy</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind Dummy</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM Dummy</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.96</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the IV-DV regression, a multiple regression was performed to examine the relationship between the mediators and likelihood of applying. The results indicated the three predictors explained 50.3% of the variance in likelihood of applying ($R^2 = .503$, $F(3, 415) = 140.05, p < .001$). Organizational trust significantly added to the prediction ($\beta = .71, p < .001$) while the significance of the prediction of identity threat on likelihood was marginal ($\beta = .082, p = .065$). Meanwhile, psychological safety did not account for any unique variance: $\beta = .046, p = .415$.

Finally, regression analyses were performed to examine the relations between the independent variables and each mediator. All three multiple regressions were significant: psychological safety ($R^2 = .08, F(5,413) = 7.91, p = . p < .001$), organizational trust ($R^2 = .065, F(5,413) = 5.76, p < .001$), and identity threat ($R^2 = .12, F(5,413) = 11.45, p < .001$). However,
leader racial diversity was the only predictor that significantly contributed to each mediator \((p < .05)\).

Next, since only the LRD independent variable significantly added to the prediction between independent variables and likelihood of applying, further mediation analysis with LRD as the only predictor variable was performed using PROCESS Model 7 (Hayes, 2013) bootstrapping procedures. Three separate analyses were performed (one for each mediator) in order to prevent suppression effects and make results easier to interpret, especially because of the conflicting directional effects of the different mediators. Mediation analyses revealed that there was a significant indirect effect of LRD on likelihood of applying through psychological safety, \((ab = .34, 95\% \text{ CI} [.22, .47], \text{PM} = 1.06)\), through organizational trust \((ab = .40, 95\% \text{ CI} [.25, .56], \text{PM} = 1.26)\), and through identity threat \((ab = .17, 95\% \text{ CI} [.09, .27], \text{PM} = .53)\). These findings partially support Hypothesis 4, at least with regard to identity threat, psychological safety, and organizational trust mediating the relationship between LRD and likelihood of applying. Participants were more likely to apply to an organization when the leadership team was more diverse because greater leader racial diversity was associated with greater feelings of psychological safety and organizational trust, and lower identity threat. See Tables 10, 11, and 12 and Figures 4, 5, and 6 for mediation results. It is important to note that these models each included only a singular mediator, not accounting for the variance predicted by the other two. As written above, organizational trust was the only unique mediator that predicted likelihood of applying within the multiple regression. This means there is likely a relationship between identity threat and psychological safety with organizational trust such that the first two are correlated with and do not contribute beyond organizational trust.
### Table 10

*Model Coefficients for Psychological Safety Mediation Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>M(Psych Safety)</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Y(Likelihood)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X(LRD)</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M(Psych Safety)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .08$

$F(1, 417) = 37.37, p < .001$

### Table 11

*Model Coefficients for Organizational Trust Mediation Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>M(Trust)</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Y(Likelihood)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X(LRD)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M(Trust)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .06$

$F(1, 417) = 28.07, p < .001$

$F(2, 416) = 208.11, p < .001$

### Figure 4

*Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Relationship Between Leader Racial Diversity and Likelihood of Applying as Mediated by Psychological Safety*

 Leader Racial Diversity \[ \rightarrow \] Psychological Safety \[ \rightarrow \] -01 (.32***)

 Likelihood of Applying

*** $p < .001$
Figure 5
Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Relationship Between Leader Racial Diversity and Likelihood of Applying as Mediated by Organizational Trust

*** $p < .001$

Table 12
Model Coefficients for Identity Threat Mediation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X(LRD)</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M(Threat)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(1, 417)$</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>$F(2, 416)$</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6
Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Relationship Between Leader Racial Diversity and Likelihood of Applying as Mediated by Identity Threat

* $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$
Exploratory ANOVAs Examining Effect of Race on Mediators

Following the mediation analyses on likelihood of applying, exploratory two-way ANOVAs were run to explore the relations between LRD, race, and their interaction on each mediator since Hypothesis 4 specified strongest mediation effects for BHL participants.

First, a two-way ANOVA was run exploring the effects of leader racial diversity and race on psychological safety. In addition to the main effect of leader racial diversity reported in the regression above, an interaction between LRD and race was found, $F(1,415) = 4.47, p = .035$. While both BHL ($p < .001$) and White participants ($p = .002$) experienced significantly higher psychological safety in the high leader diversity condition (White $M = 3.75$, $SD = .64$; BHL $M = 3.8$, $SD = .63$) than the low leader diversity condition (White $M = 3.49$, $SD = .63$; BHL $M = 3.27$, $SD = .67$), the difference for BHL participants was twice the size as for White participants. Furthermore, LSD pairwise comparisons indicated that BHL participants ($M = 3.27$, $SD = .67$) had significantly lower psychological safety than White participants ($M = 3.49$, $SD = .63$) in the low leader racial diversity condition ($p = .015$). See Table 13 for ANOVA summary statistics.

Next, a two-way ANOVA was run exploring the effects of leader racial diversity and race on organizational trust. Results revealed only the main effect of leader racial diversity reported in the regression above. No interaction effect was found. See Table 14 for ANOVA summary statistics.

Next, a two-way ANOVA was run exploring the effects of leader racial diversity and race on identity threat. In addition to the main effect of leader racial diversity reported above, a main effect of race was found, with BHL participants having significantly higher identity threat ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 1.75$) than White participants ($M = 2.34$, $SD = 1.41$). An interaction effect was also found, $F(1,415) = 7.13, p = .008$. While comparisons revealed that both BHL ($p < .001$) and
White participants (p = .02) experienced significantly higher identity threat in the low leader racial diversity condition (White $M = 2.57$, $SD = 1.5$; BHL $M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.83$) than the high leader racial diversity condition (White $M = 2.11$, $SD = 1.28$; BHL $M = 2.4$, $SD = 1.42$), the difference for BHL participants was nearly three times the size as for White participants. LSD pairwise comparisons indicated that BHL participants had significantly higher identity threat ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.83$) than White participants ($M = 2.57$, $SD = 1.5$) in the low leader racial diversity condition ($p < .001$). See Table 15 for ANOVA summary statistics.

Findings from these exploratory ANOVAs reveal that the effects of LRD on identity threat and psychological safety depended on participant race, while the same dependence was not found for organizational trust. While both BHL and White participants experienced significantly lower identity threat and higher psychological safety in the high LRD condition compared to the low, BHL participants experienced significantly higher identity threat and lower psychological safety than White participants in the low LRD condition. While the mediations were run for all participants, the ANOVA results also support the second part of Hypothesis 4, that the IVS would have stronger effects on the mediators for BHL participants compared to White participants.

**Table 13**  
ANOVA Summary Table for Psychological Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>39.3*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRD*Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>4.47*</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*—MS = Mean squares, effect size = partial $\eta^2$, *denotes significance at .05 level
Mediation analyses were not performed for cognitive ability scores because the ANOVAs did not find any effects of the IVs on cognitive ability scores to be mediated when income and education level were controlled.

**Moderation Effects of SDO**

To test Hypothesis 5, whether SDO moderates the relationship between the independent variables and likelihood of applying for White participants, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted. The SDO variable was centered by subtracting the mean from each SDO term. In the first step, dummy-coded variables for leader racial diversity (with low racial diversity as the reference group), and for projected diversity value (with the control condition as the reference group), were included: These variables accounted for a significant amount of variance in likelihood of applying: $R^2 = .06$, $F(4, 221) = 3.66$, $p = .007$. Next, SDO was added to
the regression as the potential moderator, which accounted for a significant proportion of variance in likelihood of applying: $R^2_{\text{Model 2}} = .12$, $F(5, 220) = 5.8$, $p < .001$ ($R^2_{\text{Change}} = .05$, $p < .001$). An increase in 1 unit of SDO predicted a -.2 decrease in likelihood of applying.

Next, the interaction term between the LRD-dummy variable and SDO was added to regression model, which also accounted for a significant proportion of variance in likelihood of applying: $R^2_{\text{Model 3}} = .15$, $F(6, 219) = 6.46$, $p < .001$ ($R^2_{\text{Change}} = .03$, $p = .003$). This demonstrates a moderating effect of SDO on the relationship between leader racial diversity and likelihood of applying for White participants. Examination of the interaction plot showed that likelihood of applying increased with greater LRD for low SDO White participants, but not for their high SDO counterparts. See Figure 7 for the visual representation. These results provide partial support for Hypothesis 5, which predicted that SDO would moderate IV-DV relationships for White participants for likelihood of applying. ANOVA analyses using a median-split on SDO demonstrated that likelihood of applying significantly increased in the high LRD ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 1.09$) compared to the low LRD condition ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 1.04$) for White participants with low SDO ($F(1, 101) = 4.64$, $p = .034$), while there was no significant difference between LRD conditions for White participants with high SDO ($F(1, 121) = .12$, $p = .73$). The difference between likelihood of applying for White participants in the high LRD condition compared to low LRD based on SDO was marginally significant, with high SDO Whites being marginally less likely to apply ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 1.24$) under high leader racial diversity compared to low SDO Whites ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 1.09$) ($F(1, 113) = 3.44$, $p = .066$).

Finally, the interaction terms between projected diversity value dummy variables and SDO were added to the model but did not account for a significant change in the proportion of variance in likelihood of applying: $R^2_{\text{Model 4}} = .18$, $F(9, 216) = 5.2$, $p < .001$ ($R^2_{\text{Change}} = .03$, $p < .001$).
p = .06). See Table 16 for summary of hierarchical regression. It is important to note, however, that the interaction effect between BLM and SDO was marginally significant (p = .059), and therefore, with higher power, a real effect may exist. Examination of the interaction plot showed that likelihood of applying decreased in the BLM condition relative to control for high SDO White participants more so than for low SDO counterparts. See Figure 8 for the visual representation. ANOVA analyses using a median split on SDO demonstrated that likelihood of applying significantly decreased in the BLM condition (M = 2.87, SD = 1.25) compared to the control condition (M = 3.65, SD = 1.14) for White participants with high SDO (F(1, 121) = 9.16, p = .003), while there was no significant difference between BLM and control conditions for White participants with low SDO (F(1, 101) = 1.20, p = .28).

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Likelihood of Applying including SDO Moderator (for just White participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLMDummy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MulticulturalDummy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ColorblindDummy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDR x SDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLMDummy x SDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MultDummy x SDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-blindDummy x SDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Figure 7
*Moderating Effect of SDO on Relationship between LRD and Likelihood of Applying for White Participants*

![Graph showing the moderating effect of SDO on the relationship between LRD and likelihood of applying for white participants.]

Figure 8
*Moderating Effect of SDO on Relationship between PDV and Likelihood of Applying for White Participants*

![Graph showing the moderating effect of SDO on the relationship between PDV and likelihood of applying for white participants.]

Exploratory Analyses: W vs B vs H/L

Due to the significant findings regarding likelihood of applying, an additional exploratory three-way ANOVA was run to explore the relationship between leader racial diversity, projected diversity values, and race, and their interactions, on likelihood of applying to an organization, but this time dividing the race category into three levels, White, Black, and Hispanic/Latinx. See Table 17 for summary statistics. In addition to the main effect of LRD found in the primary ANOVA analyses above, the interaction between race and projected diversity value was significant. LSD pairwise comparisons indicated that Black participants were significantly more likely to apply to the organization in the BLM condition \((M = 4.09, SD = 1.06)\) than in the control condition \((M = 3.32, SD = 1.38; p = .02)\), but no pairwise comparisons were significant for Latinx participants. These findings indicate the potential for additional and stronger effects with a larger sample of only Black participants, as well as possible differences in the effects of projected diversity values on Black and Hispanic/Latinx participants.

Table 17
ANOVA Summary Table for Likelihood of Applying w/ White vs Black vs Latinx (WvBvL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WvBvN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>8.36*</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WvBvL*PDV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.46*</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WvBvL*LRD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDV*LRD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WvBvL<em>PDV</em>LRD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—MS = Mean squares, effect size = partial \(\eta^2\), *denotes significance at .05 level

Exploratory Qualitative Response

In addition to the surveys for the mediating, moderating, and dependent variables, participants were asked to answer an open-ended qualitative question in 1-3 sentences: “What factors were
you thinking about when answering the questions in the previous three surveys?” While these answers were not coded or categorized in any particular way, a sample of qualitative answers is provided in Table 18 below.

**Table 18**

Sample of Qualitative Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Manipulation Conditions</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Colorblind, Low LRD</td>
<td>The prejudicial stereotypes and the lack of looking at me as a black woman for my competency, and not as a token to fulfill quota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>Colorblind, Low LRD</td>
<td>It was an all white company. Only 2 people of color, 1 woman, 1 man. There were 4 white women probably for quota only. No hispanics at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>Control, Low LRD</td>
<td>I noticed that the company was devised of 4 women and 6 men and this was appealing to me because it shows the diversity within this organization. I also noticed that the company was comprised of multiple different people from various racial backgrounds and this was a great thing in relation to the diversity and fairness of the company. It appears to be a fair company with good values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>BLM, High LRD</td>
<td>Their beliefs on BLM and the diversity of their staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Multicultural, Low LRD</td>
<td>I was definitely considering the diversity and staff makeup first and foremost. I want to fit in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Multicultural, High LRD</td>
<td>I was think about the fair practices of the job. I was thinking about if it would be diverse. I was thinking about how much money I would possibly make.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Multicultural, Low LRD</td>
<td>The company is well established so I figure there is job security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Control, High LRD</td>
<td>i'm not looking to change jobs and i don't work in that industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Colorblind, Low LRD</td>
<td>The ease of working here and the good culture. Wondered about the money though.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

This study investigated how companies’ leader racial diversity, projected diversity values, and the interaction between the two may negatively affect Black/Hispanic/Latinx versus White applicants’ decision-making and performance, and possible mediators and moderators of this relationship. By assessing how diversity-related factors may disadvantage BIPOC applicants and a variety of constructs relating to this matter, this study provides a nuanced view around how companies may better protect and understand the impacts of their actions on BIPOC applicants.

Associations have been found between multicultural diversity messaging, higher demonstrated racial diversity, and positive outcomes for BIPOC employees, compared to negative outcomes that have been associated with colorblind messaging and low demographic diversity. Additionally, in the past year, a high number of prominent companies have made statements in support of the Black Lives Matter movement. While companies may have authentic intentions to increase equity and fight for social justice issues, these messages are also likely published to appease customers, attract applicants of color, and improve public image (Birchall, 2020; Pacheco & Stamm, 2020; Roberts, 2020). Due to a lack of existing research explicitly exploring applicant responses to BLM messaging, while BLM was expected to appeal to BHL applicants, it was unclear whether this outcome would stay consistent across LRD conditions or even whether the BLM condition could lead to opposite effects, making BHL participants less likely to apply due to factors such as racial battle fatigue (Gorski, 2019). As a result, BHL participants were expected to be more likely to apply to the organization and have higher cognitive ability selection test scores in the multicultural and BLM conditions compared to the colorblind (H1) and in the high LRD condition compared to the low (H1b). Additionally, since there has been increased pressure recently for companies to show that they are actively working
to improve DEI initiatives through increased minority representation (Kerber & Jessop, 2020; Kishan, 2020) and due to the demonstrated importance of racial representation for BIPOC job applicants, a two-way interaction between LRD and PDV was expected for BHL participants such that the effect of PDV would be greater under high LRD than low LRD (H1c). These results were hypothesized due to expectations that BHL participants would depend more on LRD cues than PDV cues, leading them to ignore PDV cues in the low LRD condition because the low LRD would negatively impact their views of the company so much that they would not pay attention to PDV. Meanwhile, in the high LRD condition, BHL applicants would pay more attention to PDV cues because they would not be as concerned about LRD given the high levels of diversity seen in the C-suite photo.

Meanwhile, due to research demonstrating that White people may feel threatened by multicultural and BLM messaging, White participants were expected to be less likely to apply to the company in the BLM and multicultural conditions compared to the colorblind (H2). No hypotheses were made regarding White participants’ cognitive ability test scores or the LRD conditions due to the lack of research around identity threat impacting test scores for White people and due to the literature proposing that White people are less attuned to racial diversity cues than BIPOC. A three-way interaction between race, LRD, and PDV was expected such that for BHL participants, the effect of PDV would depend on LRD while for White people, this dependence would not exist (H3). This interaction was expected because of the hypothesized two-way interaction between PDV and LRD for BHL participants that was absent for White participants due to the literature showing White people are less attuned to physical diversity cues.
Regarding explanatory mechanisms for the relationships hypothesized above, identity threat, psychological safety, and organizational trust were expected to mediate the relationships between my IVs and my DVs (H4) due to the research demonstrating links between diversity-related cues, these mediators, and organizational and individual feelings of safety, wellbeing, and performance. These hypotheses align with the notion that when an individual feels safer, more comfortable, and less threatened in an organization, they will be more likely to want to be there and to perform better. Additionally, aligning with research highlighting the importance of psychological safety, low identity threat, and organizational trust for marginalized groups, specifically, the IVs were expected to have stronger effects on the mediators for BHL participants than for White participants since they were diversity-related (H4). Finally, due to research demonstrating that SDO is an important factor in determining White people’s attitudes toward various diversity initiatives, with higher SDO possibly linking to increased prejudice and feelings of threat amidst high racial diversity, SDO was expected to moderate the relationships between the independent variables and likelihood of applying. High SDO White participants were expected to be less likely to apply in multicultural and BLM conditions compared to colorblind and in high LRD compared to low, mirroring hypotheses made for White participants in general. For low SDO White participants, similar effects were expected, but with less strength and significance, such that their likelihood may actually align more closely with that of BHL participants, who were expected to be less likely to apply in colorblind compared to BLM and multicultural conditions and less likely to apply in low LRD compared to high.

**BHL Participant Findings**

For BHL participants alone, the only significant effect found was a main effect of LRD such that BHL participants in the high LRD condition were more likely to apply to the
organization than in the low LRD condition, consistent with Hypothesis 1b regarding the likelihood of applying DV, but failing to provide support for Hypotheses 1a and 1c. These findings suggest that BHL participants were more aware of the LRD conditions than the PDV conditions, implying that BIPOC job applicants may be more likely to notice actual representation than values companies say they hold. While the expected effects of PDV on likelihood of applying were not supported, these results highlight the extreme importance of racial representation to job applicants of color. The idea that “representation matters,” regarding the representation of underrepresented groups, has been discussed in a variety of fields (Bühlmann & Schädel, 2012; Tukachinsky, 2015), and these findings corroborate that for BHL participants, actions may speak louder than words, especially at a time when many companies have made promises committing to fight for racial justice and equity but have failed to execute these commitments in practice.

The lack of effects for BHL participants regarding PDV condition may indicate that BHL participants were simply not attuned to these factors in the presence of LRD cues. However, it may indicate that some BHL participants may support, even if indirectly, some of the ideas present in colorblind messaging, aligning with qualitative research showing that some BIPOC may hold views around racial discrimination that have been shaped by colorblind ideals (Bonilla-Silva & Embrick, 2001). Although research has shown that colorblind messaging may negatively impact BIPOC, there is a lack of consensus around the best approach regarding ideology when it comes to promoting race relations, with almost half of racial and ethnic minority groups saying it is better to focus on what different groups have in common than to focus on each group’s unique experiences, aligning with a colorblind approach (Horowitz et al., 2019). Another reason for the lack of effect may simply be that PDV conditions were not strong enough to detect significant
effects, leading ecological validity. In a real-life job application scenario, an applicant would likely receive a multitude of diversity-related cues from different aspects of their organization: messaging on the website, posters on the walls in the office, implications from informal conversations with current employees, etc., and one paragraph highlighting a specific ideology may not have seemed significant.

Findings failed to provide support for any hypotheses relating to cognitive ability scores (H1a,b,c) for BHL participants, and there are a variety of reasons why this may have happened. First, cognitive ability scores are affected by many different factors that have influenced participants throughout their lives, making it a very stable variable which is challenging to alter through short-term manipulations. Additionally, due to the virtual setting of the experiment, participants may have felt little pressure to put effort into the cognitive ability measure, causing scores to be skewed, due to a lack of pressure from being observed, in what is known as the Hawthorne Effect (BK et al., 2019), although research around this effect is conflicting. This reasoning is especially plausible given that the mean score on the Wonderlic was less than 6/13 questions correct even though many of the questions were meant to be quite easy and the average participant had a college degree. Another reason for these results may be the low power for this variable. Because hypotheses regarding cognitive ability scores were only made for BHL participants, it may have been beneficial to have a larger sample size of just BHL participants in order to detect effects regarding cognitive ability scores. If the predicted effect size for this type of variable is smaller, a larger sample may be necessary to detect the effect.

**White Participant Findings**

For White participants, the only significant effect found was a main effect of PDV such that White participants were significantly less likely to apply in the BLM than the multicultural
condition, and these were the lowest and highest likelihoods, respectively, for the PDV conditions. These findings partially contradict Hypothesis 2, in which White participants were expected to be less likely to apply in the multicultural and BLM conditions than the colorblind condition. These findings indicate that this specific multicultural statement may have hinted at ideals present in the all-inclusive multiculturalism model, which emphasizes that diversity includes all employees, both minorities and non-minorities, which White people may feel less threatened by (Stevens et al., 2008). There is also a possibility that White people are recognizing the benefits of multiculturalism and pitfalls of colorblindness, including how colorblindness may lead to the “refusal to take public note of race” and allow people to ignore racism and discrimination rather than try to mitigate it, as they have become more well-known, with increased coverage from mainstream media outlets (Fuchs, 2020; Stafford, 2015; Wingfield, 2015).

The findings regarding BLM illustrate that White people may in some way feel left out of, or threatened by, BLM messaging, which relates to the development of the phrase “All Lives Matter” in response to the BLM movement. Even while in reality, the majority of DEI or race-related company initiatives to help BIPOC are meant to counteract disproportionate suffering in times of crisis and long-standing inequities and discrimination against BIPOC (Tulshyan, 2020), companies must work to emphasize that these are the goals, rather than to somehow put White employees at a disadvantage. They must work to alter the perceptions of White employees, framing BLM as a cause that they are supporting so that everyone feels supported and is on a fair playing field. This responsibility should not fall onto employees of color; it is the responsibility of company leadership to commit to authentic and long-term investment to DEI practices (Smith et al., 2012), helping all employees to understand why certain practices are in place and to feel
comfortable and safe at work. Additionally, specific hypotheses were not made about White participants in relation to cognitive ability scores due to the lack of literature around identity threat for White people.

Three-way Interaction

In addition to the hypothesized main effects and two-way interactions for BHL and White participants, respectively, a three-way interaction such that the effect of PDV would depend on LRD for BHL participants but not for White participants was expected. Because the expected PDV-LRD two-way interaction did not occur for BHL participants, in addition to a lack of two-way interaction for White participants, there was no three-way interaction detected. The lack of three-way interaction may indicate that the interaction between PDV and LRD simply does not depend on race, but it may have been hidden due to unexpected outcomes regarding the PDV condition described above or a lack of experimental power. For example, there was no main effect of PDV for BHL participants and those for White participants were somewhat unanticipated, so a three-way interaction may have been suppressed or concealed due to alternative factors.

Explanatory Mediating Mechanisms

Consistent with Hypothesis 4, identity threat, psychological safety, and organizational trust all significantly mediated the relationship between LRD and likelihood of applying in the hypothesized directions. These mediators start to shed light on the why behind the effects of diversity on outcomes in BHL versus White applicants as explanatory mechanisms. These mediators help to move the present study past one of the typical questions asked in diversity research, which is whether diversity has positive or negative ramifications for teams, individuals, and organizations. Instead, through focusing on the why and how behind how different levels of
LRD and PDVs may negatively affect diverse applicants, this study indicates that these negative effects may be mitigated thorough promoting psychological safety and organizational trust while lessening identity threat. The exploratory ANOVAs between LRD and race on likelihood of applying demonstrated stronger IV-mediator relationships for BHL than White individuals, specifically showing that low LRD led to lower psychological safety and higher identity threat for BHL than for White participants, demonstrating that the impact of these variables is more significant for minority applicants. These findings support that marginalized groups should be the focus of DEI initiatives meant to foster psychological safety and lessen identity threat. However, mediations were significant for all participants, BHL and White, albeit less significant for White, in that in general, all had lower identity threat and higher psychological safety and trust in the high LRD condition, showing that helping BHL applicants could in turn benefit White applicants as well; high racial diversity should not necessarily deter White applicants.

While no significant effects were found for the cognitive ability DV, results showing that BHL participants had higher identity threat than White participants in the low LRD condition demonstrate that there could be inequities when it comes to the selection test process if the literature showing that higher identity threat leads to underperformance on certain achievement tests is accurate. For various reasons, whether conscious or unconscious, applicants of color may not receive certain opportunities because they feel threatened or unsafe because of promoted organizational ideals, leading to poorer performance. While the present study’s findings failed to find support showing that the three mediators under question affected cognitive ability scores, this may have been due to issues with the cognitive ability construct in this study rather than a lack of accuracy of hypotheses. For example, even while cognitive ability is a relatively stable construct, other researchers have been able to manipulate related variables (ie. Standardized
testing or Wonderlic scores) through short-term manipulations that influence identity threat (Kirnan et al., 2009; Steele & Aronson, 1995). The current study’s lack of findings may be a result of other factors, such as those mentioned above related to the Hawthorne Effect and a lack of experimental power.

**SDO Moderator**

Finally, consistent with Hypothesis 5, findings demonstrated that for White participants, likelihood of applying significantly increased with greater LRD for low SDO White participants, but not for their high SDO counterparts and that likelihood of applying decreased more significantly in the BLM condition relative to control for high SDO White participants compared to their low SDO counterparts. Findings showing that White participants low in SDO were more likely to apply in the high LRD than low LRD condition may demonstrate why there was a main effect of LRD for the sample as a whole (in which all participants (White and BHL) were more likely to apply in the high LRD than low LRD). Many White people responded in the same directional pattern as BHL participants regarding the LRD conditions, but it was simply those with high SDO who were less likely to apply in high LRD and BLM conditions, which may indicate why the main effect of LRD was mitigated in the two-way ANOVA for only White participants (all SDO).

These findings indicate that rather than thinking about White individuals as a homogeneous group, like in some of the present study’s hypotheses, it may be beneficial to think about White people in relation to SDO. Many White people may respond similarly to issues of diversity as BIPOC, supporting issues related to equity initiatives. Since low-SDO White participants were more likely to apply in the high LRD condition compared to low LRD, this indicated that in trying to optimize outcomes for BHL applicants, companies are not hurting or
deterring White applicants. If only White people with high SDO tend to respond differently to diversity-related cues, researchers should focus on the implications of this divide. Given that it seems that White individuals low in SDO are more likely to apply to an organization with high LRD compared to low, similar to BHL participants, it is important to examine what matters to White individuals high in SDO. When do they feel safe, trusting, and non-threatened and why is high LRD a deterrent for these individuals?

**Implications of Explanatory Mechanisms**

As mentioned above, the purpose of including mediators and moderators in this study was to explore beyond the question of whether diversity has positive or negative ramifications in organizations to the *why* and *how* behind these relationships. Even if every study showed negative effects of diversity, the importance of ethics and a social justice orientation in the field of I/O psychology affirms that diversity is here to stay and must be valued as organizations and leaders do their best to foster equitable opportunities and outcomes. While the findings regarding psychological safety, identity threat, and organizational trust make it clear that these factors are important for all job applicants and employees, although possibly to a greater degree for applicants of color, the findings around SDO are not as clear-cut.

The likelihood of applying for White people with low SDO in relation to the IVs paralleled that of BHL participants, while White participants with high SDO were deterred by high LRD and BLM conditions. These findings reveal that it is important to explore what matters to White, high-SDO participants and how to protect these individuals. However, if their high levels of SDO are linked to higher levels of prejudice, as the research has shown (Kteily et al., 2011; Michinov et al., 2005; Whitley, 1999), it is also important to consider whether companies should hire these individuals in the first place if their prejudice views and actions could harm the
wellbeing of the marginalized groups around them, perpetuating a system of discrimination and oppression (Cyrus, 2017) as hired applicants’ views ultimately translate to the workplace culture. If high-SDO Whites are hired, companies must ensure that they are not contributing to a threatening and unsafe environment for underrepresented employees, and they should keep in mind that even if these people come with talent and skills, their negative contributions to the company culture may negatively impact the organization in the long-run. High-SDO White individuals may require increased training from organizations that are supporting their employees in learning to communicate and coordinate across differences, and organizations must emphasize that diversity initiatives are meant to create a fair playing field rather than disadvantage majority groups. Representation matters when considering how to optimize outcomes for underrepresented job applicants, and maybe companies with high LRD should not be bothered by the fact that White people high in SDO could be deterred from their company since high diversity representation and positive diversity ideologies did not deter Whites with low SDO in the present study. However, future researchers should investigate these relationships and their interaction with SDO more thoroughly, examining how to mitigate negative ramifications for all.

**Limitations**

Several limitations to the study should be noted. First, a higher number of participants than expected got the PDV manipulation check question wrong. Especially in the BLM condition, which participants should have been able to identify since it was the only option that mentioned Black Lives Matter, it was surprising that 37% of participants could not identify the correct condition. Due to COVID-19, there was no opportunity to consider an in-person study, but one reason for the high number of incorrect responses may be that participants were not
paying close attention, even though they passed the attention check, and felt little pressure to stay attentive due to the emphasized anonymity and absence of observation in a virtual study. The manipulation may have had low ecological validity in other ways as well. Due to the hypothetical nature of the study, it may have failed to elicit thought patterns in participants comparable to those that job applicants would experience in the real world since participants knew they were not actually applying to a company and therefore may have not been as attentive to specific cues. Although specific phrases in the PDV mission statements were bolded to emphasize experimental conditions, in the real world, projected diversity values may be present in a variety of other materials as well. For example, an offer letter that emphasizes holidays for people of all religions and cultures may signal support for multiculturalism. In addition to increasing ecological validity, future researchers may want to explore the effects of PDV using a control LRD condition with an absence of any explicit cues about leader racial diversity to see if certain PDV effects are revealed with a lack of representation cues. However, this addition may lack real-world relevance considering that generally, there is always some kind of representation of diversity in real world situations in which people are involved.

The LRD manipulation may have also lacked ecological validity. The low LRD condition likely looked similar to many C-Suites in U.S. corporate companies, with 84% of Fortune 500 board seats and Fortune 100 C-Suite positions being filled by White employees (DeHaas, 2019; Larcker & Tayan, 2020). However, the high LRD condition showed an image that likely does not match the levels of racial diversity seen even in many companies that consider themselves diverse, with 70% of the people in the C-Suite photo presenting as BIPOC, representing a hopeful vision for the future in which C-suites are more representative of national demographics. Future researchers may aim to increase the resemblance of manipulations to real-
world scenarios, calibrating ratios to better reflect real world settings. Additionally, they may offer different levels of diversity to capture when the effects found in this study kick in. For example, researchers may explore how effects differ when half of the board is composed of BIPOC versus an entire board of BIPOC versus a number in between. How much racial representation is necessary for applicants to believe that a company values diversity?

Additionally, participants who failed the manipulation check for LRD and PDVs were still included in analysis, both to preserve experimental power and because it was possible that manipulations could have still affected participants without them correctly identifying their manipulation condition. The inclusion of these participants, however, could have weakened the effects found if manipulations did not affect them to the degree that was expected. Another possibility is that the experimental manipulations were simply not as strong as expected or that participants were not attuned to some of the constructs they were expected to pay attention to.

A third limitation involves the lack of effects regarding the cognitive ability dependent variable. As mentioned above, cognitive ability is affected by many factors over time, making it a hard variable to manipulate through a short-term experimental manipulation condition. Additionally, due to the hypothetical nature of the study, participants may have felt a lack of motivation to pay attention and put in effort on the test questions due to the challenging and tiring nature of some of the test questions as well as the lack of incentive, considering they knew that they were not actually applying to a real job. Future studies should aim to make the cognitive ability test conditions seem more realistic to participants, hopefully increasing attentiveness and feelings of stress that would match a real-world situation to see if effects on this variable exist, mirroring existing literature. They should also aim to increase experimental power as mentioned above.
A fourth limitation relates to the effects from the exploratory analyses examining White, Black, and Hispanic/Latinx participants separately. Results demonstrated that Black participants were significantly more likely to apply to the organization in the BLM condition than the control, but this same effect did not exist for Hispanic/Latinx participants. These findings indicate that Black and Hispanic/Latinx participants may have viewed the manipulation materials differently, with Black participants possibly being more susceptible to certain effects. In this study, due to a lack of certain resources and struggles recruiting Black participants on MTurk, the final sample only included 102 Black participants; the choice to include 91 Hispanic/Latinx participants was made after data collection had begun. Future researchers should attempt to recruit larger Black samples, both in order to examine effects within this population and to compare to White and Hispanic/Latinx samples. A larger sample size of Black participants should help to increase experimental power and detect effects, especially those hypothesized to be stronger for Black participants rather than BIPOC in general.

**Future Research**

While this study begins to examine the effects of leader racial representation, race, and different diversity values on outcomes for job applicants, future research should continue to explore these effects and more. First, while the results showed that racial representation matters in promoting equitable outcomes for job applicants, this is not enough. To counter negative outcomes of diversity within an organization, leadership must commit to authentic and long-term investment in diversity management and initiatives (Smith et al., 2012; Roscoe, 2019; Jehn et al., 1999). In fact, until adequate diversity infrastructure and policies are in place, it may be harmful to bring underrepresented applicants into a space in which they may feel undervalued and pigeonholed. Even if an applicant is attracted to a company due to diverse representation, they
may feel threatened or unsafe if once they begin working, the internal company values do not match their own. The present study demonstrated that identity threat, psychological safety, and organizational trust explained the relationship between leader racial diversity and likelihood of applying, illustrating that these are important constructs for organizations to target in promoting a healthy organizational diversity culture beyond simply increasing representation. Future research should examine how companies may maintain adequate racial representation through policies that promote psychological safety of all employees and the lasting positive effects of diversity cues such as LRD and PDVs on employees’ wellbeing through the employee lifecycle.

An interesting finding in this study was that in the LRD condition, 99% of participants in the high LRD condition answered the manipulation check correctly while 70% answered correctly in the low LRD condition. This finding shows that 30% of participants thought that the company had high racial diversity when the image of the C-suite showed eight White people, one Asian man, and one Black woman while almost every single participant said that the company had high racial diversity in the condition with 7/10 BIPOC employees. This finding indicates that people vary in what they consider to be diverse, especially when it comes to representations of mostly White people with one or two BIPOC, and that even putting two people of color in a photo of a bunch of White people can shift participants’ attention enough to either be tricked into thinking that the photo is diverse or truly believe that having two people of color in a group of ten shows high racial diversity. Future research should focus on examining how and why people perceive diversity certain ways and whether the effects of perceived diversity versus real diversity on certain outcomes differ. For the purposes of the present study, the actual manipulation conditions were used in analysis, rather than the conditions that participants
believed they were in, but it could be interesting to explore whether results differ using the manipulation checks rather than the actual manipulations as IVs.

Future researchers should also attempt to test the ecological validity of these findings through an examination of these relationships in real-world settings. For example, it could be interesting to compare job applicants at various companies in different industries with alternative messaging by race. When a job applicant applies to a company in real life, they likely encounter many more diversity cues, even if they are subtle, than in this study. These cues may range from pictures on the walls to words used in offer materials to statements by employees made in informal conversation to who is present in the building and what they look like. While the present study had relatively high internal validity, through random assignment and experimental control, it lacks external validity in that its results may not be generalizable to real-world settings. Additionally, while the cognitive ability variable did not elicit effects in the current study, more realistic scenarios may contradict this finding if the literature around identity threat is accurate, and future researchers should explore the cognitive ability dependent variable further while considering that it may be hard to manipulate and is affected by a range of longitudinal factors.

Future research should also expand the scope of the current study by expanding research into different racial populations, countries, and diversity ideologies. The present study only examined outcomes for Black, White, and Hispanic/Latinx U.S. citizens and colorblind vs multicultural PDVs for purposes of parsimony. However, future research may expand to other races, such as Asian, Native American, and Pacific Islander populations, examining how different forms of racism and discrimination along with alternative stereotypes like the model minority myth may impact responses to the manipulation materials and how other ideologies like assimilation may affect outcomes. This study was also limited to individuals with at least a high
school education or equivalent, and it is important to note that this excludes uneducated Black individuals, who many may consider to be the most marginalized in contemporary society and who may differ in the way that they respond to the present study’s manipulations. Additionally, since people in different countries experience and encounter issues of race differently, it would be interesting to explore how job applicants in different countries respond to the messaging present in the current study, in addition to expanding the projected diversity value conditions to those that may be present in different cultures and places. It would also be interesting to investigate impacts of racial representation in other fields, such as politics and media. In examining the effects of various diversity ideologies on applicant perceptions, it is also important to consider how these ideologies translate to policies and procedures in real-world work settings.

What does multiculturalism look like in practice? How can companies make employees feel safe throughout the entire employee lifecycle?

Finally, there is a lack of qualitative research around these topics, and future researchers should look deeper into the “why” behind the present study’s findings through qualitative questions that allow participants to discuss specific factors that they are thinking about while applying to jobs, in addition to exploring additional mediators and moderators of these relationships, such as support for diversity and/or BLM, socioeconomic status, political views, and home state. The present study included one qualitative question asking the participants to elaborate on what they thought about while filling out the self-report measures, and while participants had a range of responses, thoughts, and opinions, many thought about racial diversity representation and company diversity values. Another interesting factor to consider is gender diversity, as some participants mentioned thinking about gender when filling out the
surveys. Future research should delve further into participant thought patterns and categorize these along racial lines to delve deeper into explanatory mechanisms for these relationships.

The current study provides an important step toward filling prior research gaps related to the exploration of diversity management and outcomes through a thorough investigation of the interactions between different diversity-related variables as well as the explanatory mechanisms that surround them. A crucial finding of the present research is that representation matters. Leader racial diversity proved to be the most significant variable in predicting the measured outcomes for BHL participants, and this finding sends a strong message to organizations; their actions may speak louder than their words. However, this important information comes with the caveat that increasing demographic diversity is not enough. This research specifically examines job applicant perceptions, when in reality, a big part of diversity-related work must be focused on internal culture and values, ensuring that hired applicants feel valued once they work at an organization. The current research suggests that identity threat, psychological safety, and organizational trust are significant factors that companies should consider when attempting to help underrepresented individuals feel safe and valued. Future research should build on these important findings, examining the mechanisms and context surrounding the examined relationships throughout the employee lifecycle in different organizations.
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Appendix A. Informed Consent Form

You have been invited to take part in a research study being conducted by a student Claremont McKenna College. IF YOU ARE TAKING THIS SURVEY A SECOND TIME, YOU WILL NOT BE COMPENSATED.

This study complies with the standards set by the Claremont McKenna College (CMC) Institutional Review Board and has been approved by this board. This project will be conducted by a senior at Claremont McKenna.

Details of the study: In this study you will be asked to read a description and information about a Hotel Chain Job Posting and imagine that you are reading this in real life. Then, you will fill out a few surveys and scale measures around your attitudes regarding this role and company, including a mock cognitive ability selection test, in addition to attention checks to ensure you have read the materials presented. This study will add to our knowledge of the attitudes and behaviors of U.S. job applicants. This study will take approximately **8-13 minutes**. You may stop taking the survey at any time, but **you will not receive a payment unless it is complete AND you have passed the attention checks**. By complete, we mean that you must get to the very end of the survey, but you are permitted to skip a question if you are given written permission for that specific question.

Please do your best to stay in a quiet area with limited distractions in which you can play close attention to what you are reading and clicking. **You may be required to view some screens for a certain amount of time (ex. 30 seconds) and will not be permitted to move on until the amount of time has passed. You may be required to answer some questions in order to complete the survey.** This survey may work best on a Chrome browser in full-screen mode.

Benefits/Risks: Results from this study will add to our knowledge of psychological science. Additionally, participating will provide you with exposure to research. Your participation in the study is completely voluntary, and you are able to withdraw from the study at any time by exiting out. There are no known risks associated with your participation in this research. However, you will be asked to answer questions about your own attitudes and opinions as well as take a mock short-version cognitive ability test.

You will receive a payment of **$1.20** through MTurk once you have completed this survey.

**PLEASE REMEMBER THAT YOU WILL NOT GET PAID IF YOU DO NOT PASS THE ATTENTION CHECK OR IF YOU DO NOT COMPLETE THE SURVEY - You MUST press the final SUBMIT arrow on the debrief screen.**

Confidentiality: We respect your privacy. There will be total confidentiality: No personal identifying information will be collected.

If you have any questions or concerns about this project, you may contact the PI's supervisor, Shana Levin, at 909-607-5089.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

**Agreement and permission to participate:**
By checking the box below, I am indicating that I have read the above information and am aware of the potential risks and complications. If you do not want to continue, please x-out of this survey. My electronic signature indicates that I have read and understood all of the above and agree to participate in the study.
Appendix B. Contextualization and Job Ad

IMAGINE: You have recently been laid off from your job and are urgently seeking employment. However, you still want a role that will make you feel fulfilled and have a salary that is the same as or greater than your last job. Your old salary was $75,000/year. You run across the following job posting:

WHO WE ARE
We’re Wyngate Suites – we believe in building brighter futures by redefining the world of travel, providing a warm and inviting atmosphere for travelers to stay in short or long-term—all around the U.S. We are a national hotel chain that is rapidly growing in terms of finances and people, and we were recently named one of the top 15 hotel chains in the U.S. by the New York Times.

Open Roles
As we are experiencing a time of unprecedented growth, we have a variety of open corporate roles. Each role has a minimum starting salary of $75,000 and salaries range from $75,000-85,000/year. We are looking to hire immediately. Current open business functions include:

Brand Management
Sales and Marketing
Global Operations
Public Relations and Communications
Global Design
Information Technology and Data Analytics

WHAT WE VALUE

- Strong analytical skills, both quantitative and qualitative, and working knowledge of Microsoft Office—Word, Excel, and PowerPoint
- Excellent interpersonal, verbal, and written communication skills
- Intellectual curiosity; seeking opportunities to develop new skills
- Ability to work in teams and be flexible to work under tight deadlines and changing client needs
- Superior organizational skills and strong attention to detail

PREFERRED QUALIFICATIONS

1. A high school diploma or GED
2. Legal work authorization to work in the U.S. on a permanent and ongoing basis

WHAT’S IN IT FOR ME?
• Be challenged to deliver impactful solutions and strategies for a major growing hotel chain serving millions of customers each week
• Fine tune your natural skills and learn new ones
• Opportunity to work with some of the smartest people in the industry
• Excellent growth, mobility and advancement opportunities
• Top benefits
Appendix C. Demographic Questionnaire

1. What is your gender:
   a. Man
   b. Woman
   c. Non-Binary or Gender Non-Conforming
   d. I Prefer to self-describe: ________

2. What is your age:
   __________

3. What is your race?
   a. White/Caucasian
   b. African American or Black
   c. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   d. Asian
   e. American Indian or Alaska Native
   f. Other—Please self-describe: ______

4. What is your ethnicity?
   a. Hispanic or Latinx
   b. Not Hispanic or Latinx

5. What is your political ideology?
   a. very conservative
   b. conservative
c. independent

d. liberal

e. very liberal

f. other—please self-describe:

6. What is your highest level of education?

a. Some High School

b. High school diploma or equivalency

c. some college

d. 2-year college degree

e. 4-year college degree

f. some graduate school

g. Master’s degree

h. Doctorate (Including a Juris Doctorate/ Law degree)

7. Are you a U.S. Citizen?

a. Yes

b. No

8. What was the total income of all members of your family living in your household during the past 12 months before taxes?

a. Less than $25,000

b. $25,000 - $49,999

c. $50,000 - $74,999

d. $75,000 - $99,999

e. $100,000 - $124,999

f. $125,000 - $149,999

g. $150,000 - $174,999

h. $175,000 - $199,999
i. $200,000 or more
Appendix D. PDV Manipulation Materials

Multicultural Statement:

At Wyngate Suites, we appreciate the importance of creating a healthy work environment. We recognize that each employee’s distinct cultural experiences, perspectives, and viewpoints are critical to creating products that engage and inspire customers from all over the world. Therefore, we will do our best to foster workplace practices that are conducive to the promotion and appreciation of the experiences and contributions to our company from distinct cultural groups as well as the maintenance and inclusion of distinctive identities. Our goal is to foster an environment that is an incubator for great ideas, is attractive to the best talent, and that creates a profound sense of pride across our Company. Our company-wide efforts will therefore focus on:

- Leading and managing inclusively – We value and embrace different cultures, ethnicities, genders, sexual orientations, perspectives, experiences etc. (e.g. We respect your holidays!)
- Creating a work environment that fosters growth and advancement
- Engaging with our customers in a way that reflects, embraces, and respects their diverse perspectives and experiences

Our company objectives, and progress towards achieving them, will be assessed annually to ensure they align with our business and talent objectives.

Colorblind Statement:

At Wyngate, we appreciate the importance of creating a healthy work environment. We recognize that each employee is critical to creating products that engage and inspire customers from all over the world. Therefore, we will do our best to treat each employee as a person, rather than simply a member of a group. Instead of looking at our employees through the lens of race or gender, we see each employee as a unique individual! Our goal is to foster an environment that is an incubator for great ideas, is attractive to the best talent, and that creates a profound sense of pride across our Company. Our company-wide efforts will therefore focus on:

- Ensuring that every employee is treated as an individual, without regard to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc. (e.g. We respect your individual and unique contributions.)
- Creating a work environment that fosters growth and advancement
- Treating all of our customers as unique individuals, regardless of factors such as race, gender, cultural beliefs, etc.
Our company objectives, and progress towards achieving them, will be assessed annually to ensure they align with our business and talent objectives.

BLM Statement:

In response to the killing of George Floyd by a Minneapolis police officer and persistent patterns of anti-Black racism in our nation, I write to express both my strongest personal support and the institution’s fullest commitment to standing in solidarity with the #BlackLivesMatter movement. We have a duty to our Black members, employees, creators and talent to speak up. We must acknowledge the racism and disproportionate risk that Black people face in our law enforcement and justice system as well as their daily lives.

In the words of Martin Luther King Jr., “Every society has its fraternities of the indifferent who are notorious for sleeping through revolutions. Today, our very survival depends on our ability to stay awake, to adjust to new ideas, to remain vigilant and to face the challenge of change.”

After days of conversation and reflection, our board has created several actionable items that we will take on in years to come in order to combat systemic racism and white supremacy. These will be outlined in an email to come later today.

To create change, we have to reexamine our own views and actions. To the Black community — we see you. You matter and your lives matter.

--Wyngate Suites CEO, Jordan Johnson

Control:

At Wyngate Suites, we believe that the key to the long-term success of any service providing company is to offer a quality of service that cannot be matched, and this success starts with our employees. Therefore, we will do our best to foster workplace practices that are conducive to the promotion, appreciation, and growth of our employees, beginning with rigorous and meaningful core skills trainings throughout onboarding. Our goal is to foster an environment that is an incubator for great ideas, is attractive to the best talent, and that creates a profound sense of pride across our Company. We pride ourselves on being one of the best up and coming hotel chains in the nation: luxurious rooms, attractive locations, unmatchable customer service, and unbeatable deals, and we are looking to maintain and grow our reputation. Our company-wide efforts will therefore focus on:

- Ensuring top benefits for all of our employees
- Creating a work environment that fosters growth and advancement
- Holding ourselves to the highest standard for the way in which we interact and serve our customers
Our company objectives, and progress towards achieving them, will be assessed annually to ensure they align with our business and talent objectives.
Appendix E. PDV Manipulation Check

Which of the following best represents the company’s values in the statement you read about the company?

a. The company supports and embraces the value of distinct cultural groups and identities
b. The company supports and embraces the value of distinct individuals regardless of race, gender, or other group identities
c. The company values Black lives and combatting systemic racism and white supremacy
d. None of the Above

*a=Multiculturalism, b=Colorblind, c=Black Lives Matter, d=Control
Appendix F. Pilot Study PDV Manipulation Materials

Multicultural:

At Wyngate Suites, we appreciate the importance of creating an environment in which all of our employees feel valued, included and empowered to bring great ideas to the table. We recognize that each employee’s distinct cultural experiences, perspectives, and viewpoints are critical to creating products that engage and inspire customers from all over the world. Therefore, we will do our best to foster workplace practices that are conducive to the promotion and appreciation of the experiences and contributions to our company from distinct cultural groups as well as the maintenance and inclusion of distinctive identities. Our goal is to foster an environment that is an incubator for great ideas, is attractive to the best talent, and that creates a profound sense of pride across our Company. Our company efforts will therefore focus on:

· Leading and managing equitably across different cultures, ethnicities, genders and sexual orientations
· Creating a work environment that fosters growth and advancement
· Engaging with our customers in a way that reflects, embraces, and respects their cultural perspectives and experiences

Our company objectives, and progress towards achieving them, will be assessed annually to ensure they align with our business and talent objectives.

Colorblind:

At Wyngate, we appreciate the importance of creating an environment in which all of our employees feel valued, included and empowered to bring great ideas to the table. We recognize that each employee is critical to creating products that engage and inspire customers from all over the world. Therefore, we will do our best to treat each employee as a person, rather than simply a member of a group. Instead of looking at our employees through the lens of race or gender, we see each employee as a unique individual! Our goal is to foster an environment that is an incubator for great ideas, is attractive to the best talent, and that creates a profound sense of pride across our Company. Our diversity and inclusion efforts will therefore focus on:

· Ensuring that every employee is treated equally, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation.

· Creating a work environment that fosters growth and advancement

· Treating all of our customers equally, regardless of their cultural perspectives and experiences
Our company objectives, and progress towards achieving them, will be assessed annually to ensure they align with our business and talent objectives.

**Black Lives Matter:**

In response to the killing of George Floyd by a Minneapolis police officer and persistent patterns of anti-Black racism in our nation, I write to express both my strongest personal support and the institution’s fullest commitment to standing in solidarity with the #BlackLivesMatter movement. We have a duty to our Black members, employees, creators, and talent to speak up. We must acknowledge the racism and disproportionate risk that Black people face in our law enforcement and justice system as well as their daily lives.

In the words of Martin Luther King Jr., “Every society has its fraternities of the indifferent who are notorious for sleeping through revolutions. Today, our very survival depends on our ability to stay awake, to adjust to new ideas, to remain vigilant and to face the challenge of change.”

After days of conversation and reflection, our board has created several actionable items that we will take on in years to come in order to combat systemic racism and white supremacy. These will be outlined in an email to come later today.

To create change, we have to reexamine our own views and actions. To the Black community — we see you. You matter and your lives matter.

--Wyngate Suites CEO, Jordan Johnson

**Control:**

At Wyngate Suites, we appreciate the importance of creating an environment in which all of our employees feel valued, included and empowered to bring great ideas to the table. **We believe that the key to the long-term success of any service-providing company is to offer a quality of service that cannot be matched, and this success starts with our employees.** Therefore, we will do our best to foster workplace practices that are conducive to the promotion, appreciation, and growth of our employees, beginning with **rigorous and meaningful core skills trainings throughout onboarding.** Our goal is to foster an environment that is an incubator for great ideas, is attractive to the best talent, and that creates a profound sense of pride across our Company. Our company efforts will therefore focus on:

- **Ensuring fair working conditions for all of our employees**
- Creating a work environment that fosters growth and advancement
- **Holding ourselves to the highest standard** for the way in which we interact and serve our customers

Our company objectives, and progress towards achieving them, will be assessed annually to ensure they align with our business and talent objectives.
Manipulation Check:

Which of the following represent the values of the company you read about the company in question?

a. The company supports and embraces the value of distinct cultural groups and identities
b. The company supports and embraces the value of distinct individuals regardless of race, gender, or other group identities
c. The company values Black lives and combatting systemic racism and white supremacy
d. None of the above
Appendix G. LDR Manipulation Materials

Low LRD:

High LRD:
Appendix H. LRD Manipulation Check

Which of the following best describes the level of demographic diversity in the corporate C-Suite of this company?

1. low racial diversity (not many people of different races)
2. high racial diversity (many people of different races)
Appendix I. Identity Threat Measure

Indicate the degree to which you agree with these statements. (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).

1. I predict that people’s evaluations of my performance at company will be affected by my race.
2. At this company, I worry that people will draw conclusions about my competence based on my racial group.
3. At this company, I worry that people will draw conclusions about me, based on what they think about my racial group.
4. At this company, I worry that other people will draw conclusions about me based on stereotypes about my race.
Appendix J. Psychological Safety Measure

Indicate the degree to which you agree with these statements. (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

1. If I made a mistake at this company, it would be held against me. R
2. Members of this company will be able to bring up problems and tough issues.
3. People at this company will sometimes reject others for being different. R
4. It is safe to take risks at this company.
5. It will be difficult to ask other employees at this company for help. R
6. No one at this company would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts.
7. Working with employees at this company, my unique skills and talents will be valued and utilized.

**R = reverse-scored**
Appendix K. Organizational Trust Measure

Indicate the degree to which you agree with these statements. (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).

1. I think I would like to work in a company that has similar hiring practices as those of this company.
2. I think this company would have fair hiring practices.
3. I think I would like to work under the supervision of people with similar values as the staff at this company.
4. I think I would be treated fairly by my supervisor.
5. I think I would trust the management to treat me fairly.
Appendix L. Likelihood Measure

*On a scale of 1-5, rank the following: (1=not likely at all, 2=not likely, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat likely, 5=very likely)* (under the assumption that there is a role that you are interested in and are qualified for)

1. How likely do you think you would be to apply to this organization in real life?
2. How likely do you think it is that you would want to work at this company in real life?

*On a scale of 1-5, rank the following: (1=not at all, 2=not much, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat, 5=a lot) (under the assumption that there is a role that you are interested in and are qualified for)*

3. How much does this company appeal to you as a potential place of employment?
Appendix M. Qualitative Measure

Qualitative question

*Please respond to the following in 1-5 sentences or bullet points:*

What factors were you thinking about when answering the questions in the previous three surveys?
Appendix N. Cognitive Ability Measure

1. In the following set of words, which word does not belong?
   A. Sanction
   B. Designation
   C. Approval
   D. Authorization
   E. Permission

Answer: B - Designation is the act of indicating or specifying, while the other words mean allowance.
Word comparison

2. Arrange the following words so that they form a complete sentence. Is the rearranged sentence true or false?
   not Winter seasons summer are and
   A. True
   B. False

Answer: B – The sentence is: Winter and summer are not seasons, which is false.

3. If 5 cookies cost $0.30, how much will 30 cookies cost?
   A. $1.50
   B. $1.80
   C. $2.80
   D. $5.30
   E. $30.00
   F. None of the above

Answer: B – Because 30 is 6 times more than 5, we also multiply the cost by 6, 0.3*6=1.80.

4. Together, Sam and Edna have 56 marbles. Edna has 6 times the amount of marbles that Sam has. How many marbles does Sam have?
   A. 8
   B. 12
   C. 32
   D. 46
   E. 49
   F. None of these

Answer: A – If Edna has 6 times the amount of marbles that Sam has, we can define
Sam as X and Edna as 6X, and build the following equation: X+6X=56, which becomes 7X=56, divide by 7 on both sides, and therefore X=8.

5. How many of the five pairs listed below are exact duplicates?
Truman. H.W. Trumen, H.W.
Salif, O.L. Salif, O.J.
Grinberg, A.L. Grinberg, A.L.
Havanos, B.G. Havanos, B.G.
Lichtenstein, D.W. Lichtunstein, D.W.
A. 1
B. 2
C. 3
D. 4 E. 5

Answer: B - Grinberg, A.L. and Havanos, B.G. are the two pairs which are exactly the same.

6. A train travels 100 feet every 2 seconds. How far will it travel in 36 seconds?
A. 1,670 ft
B. 1,836 ft
C. 200 ft
D. 286 ft
E. 1,480 ft
F. None of these

Answer: F – Since 36 seconds is 18 times more than 2 seconds, we multiply the distance traveled by 18, 100*18=1800, which does not appear in the answer choices.

7. 17 out of 20 lung diseases are curable; what is the percentage of lung diseases that are curable?
A.17%
B.72%
C.85%
D.87%
E.90%
F.None of these

Answer: C – In order to determine the percentage of 17 out of 20, we need a denominator of 100 (a percent is simply a fraction with a denominator of 100). In order to do this we multiply the fraction 17/20 by 5 and reach 85/100 which is 85%.

8. Which of the following is the earliest date?
A. May 3, 1986
B. March 31, 1988
C. March 3, 1986  
D. May 30, 1988  
E. March 13, 1986

Answer: C. March 3, 1986

9. The words BENEVOLENT and MAGNANIMOUS have __?__ meanings?
   
a. similar  
b. contradictory  
c. unrelated

Answer: A. Similar

10. The eleventh month of the year is:  
A. January  
B. November  
C. October  
D. May

Answer: B. November

11. There are three times elephants compared to giraffes in the safari. If there is a total of 88 elephants and giraffes, how many elephants are there in the safari?  
A. 22  
B. 31  
C. 43  
D. 59  
E. 66  
F. None of these

Answer: E. 66

12. If the first two statements are true, is the final statement true?  
   James bought Thomas a drink.  
   Thomas bought Suzette a drink.  
   James bought Suzette a drink.

A. Yes  
B. No  
C. Uncertain

Answer: C. Uncertain
13. A shop owner bought some shovels for $5,500. The shovels were sold for $7,300, with a profit of $50 per a shovel. How many shovels were involved?

A. 18  
B. 36  
C. 55  
D. 73  
E. 90  
F. None of These

Answer: B. 36
Appendix O. SDO Measure

Show how much you favor or oppose each idea below by selecting a number from 1 to 7 on the scale below. You can work quickly; your first feeling is generally best.

1: Strongly Oppose, 2: Somewhat Oppose, 3: Slightly Oppose, 4: Neutral, 5: Slightly Favor, 6: Somewhat Favor, 7: Strongly Favor

1. Some groups of people must be kept in their place.
2. It’s probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.
3. An ideal society requires some groups to be on top and others to be on the bottom.
4. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
5. Groups at the bottom are just as deserving as groups at the top. R
6. No one group should dominate in society. R
7. Groups at the bottom should not have to stay in their place. R
8. Group dominance is a poor principle. R
9. We should not push for group equality.
10. We shouldn’t try to guarantee that every group has the same quality of life.
11. It is unjust to try to make groups equal.
12. Group equality should not be our primary goal.
13. We should work to give all groups an equal chance to succeed. R
14. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups. R
15. No matter how much effort it takes, we ought to strive to ensure that all groups have the same chance in life. R
16. Group equality should be our ideal. R

**R = reverse-scored**
Appendix P. Full Qualtrics Survey

4/22/2021 Qualtrics Survey Software

Intro, Posting

What is your MTurk Worker ID? Workers can generally find this on their Dashboard or in the upper left corner of the Worker website.

You have been invited to take part in a research study being conducted by a student from Claremont McKenna College. IF YOU ARE TAKING THIS SURVEY A SECOND TIME, YOU WILL NOT BE COMPENSATED.

This study complies with the standards set by the Claremont McKenna College (CMC) Institutional Review Board and has been approved by this board. This project will be conducted by a senior at Claremont McKenna.

Details of the study: In this study you will be asked to read a description and information about a Hotel Chain Job Posting and imagine that you are reading this in real life. Then, you will fill out a few surveys and scale measures around your attitudes regarding this role and company, including a mock cognitive ability selection test, in addition to attention checks to ensure you have read the materials presented. This study will add to our knowledge of the attitudes and behaviors of U.S. job applicants. This study will take approximately 8-13 minutes. You may stop taking the survey at any time, but you will not receive a payment unless it is complete AND you have passed the attention checks. By complete, we mean that you must get to the very end of the survey, but you are permitted to skip a question if you are given written permission for that specific question.

Please do your best to stay in a quiet area with limited distractions in which you can play close attention to what you are reading and clicking. You may be required to view some screens for a certain amount of time (ex. 30 seconds) and will not be permitted to move on until the amount of time has passed. You may be required to answer some questions in order to complete the survey. This study may work best on a Chrome browser in full-screen mode.

Benefits/Risks: Results from this study will add to our knowledge of psychological science. Additionally, participating will provide you with exposure to research. Your participation in the study is completely voluntary, and you are able to withdraw from the study at any time by exiting out. There are no known risks associated with your participation in this research. However, you will be asked to answer questions about your own attitudes and opinions as well as take a mock short-version cognitive ability test.

You will receive a payment of $1.20 through MTurk once you have completed this survey.

PLEASE REMEMBER THAT YOU WILL NOT GET PAID IF YOU DO NOT PASS THE ATTENTION CHECK OR IF YOU DO NOT COMPLETE THE SURVEY- **You MUST press the final SUBMIT arrow on the debrief screen.**

Confidentiality: We respect your privacy. There will be total confidentiality: No personal identifying information will be collected.

If you have any questions or concerns about this project, you may contact the PI's supervisor, Shana Levin, at 909-607-5089.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Agreement and permission to participate:
By checking the box below, I am indicating that I have read the above information and am aware of the potential risks and complications. If you do not want to continue, please x-out of this survey. My electronic signature indicates that I have read and understood all of the above and agree to participate in the study.

https://claremontmckenna.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SDefaultJS=DIV_REDIRECTOR=0&REDIRECTOR=0&Orientation=0&SurveyId=SE_83bBEbA6U74p7jmq5D75OLL0Q&ContextLibraryID=191919
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IMAGINE: You have recently been laid off from your job and are urgently seeking employment. However, you still want a role that will make you feel fulfilled and have a salary that is the same as or greater than your last job. Your old salary was $75,000/year. You run across the following job posting:

(click the arrow in the bottom right hand corner to continue, you will be required to spend at least 45 seconds viewing the posting)

WHO WE ARE
We're Wyndham Suites—we believe in building brighter futures by redefining the world of travel, providing a warm and inviting atmosphere for traveler's to stay in short or long-term—all around the U.S. We are a national hotel chain that is rapidly growing in terms of finances and people, and we were recently named one of the top 15 hotel chains in the U.S. by the New York Times.

Open Roles
As we are experiencing a time of unprecedented growth, we have a variety of open corporate roles. Each role has a competitive and negotiable starting salary with opportunities for performance bonuses and promotions. We are looking to hire immediately. Current open business functions include:

- Brand Management
- Sales and Marketing
- Global Operations
- Public Relations and Communications
- Global Design
- Information Technology and Data Analytics

WHAT WE VALUE
- Strong analytical skills, both quantitative and qualitative, and working knowledge of Microsoft Office—Word, Excel, and PowerPoint
- Excellent interpersonal, verbal, and written communication skills
- Intellectual curiosity; seeking opportunities to develop new skills
- Ability to work in teams and be flexible to work under tight deadlines and changing client needs
- Superior organizational skills and strong attention to detail

PREFERRED QUALIFICATIONS
1. A high school diploma or GED
2. Legal work authorization to work in the U.S. on a permanent and ongoing basis

WHAT'S IN IT FOR ME?
- Be challenged to deliver impactful solutions and strategies for a major growing hotel chain serving millions of customers each week
- Fine tune your natural skills and learn new ones
- Opportunity to work with some of the smartest people in the industry
- Excellent growth, mobility and advancement opportunities
- Top benefits
Multicultural Manipulation

Click the next button to view the Wygate Suites Mission Statement so that you can learn more about the company:

(click the arrow in the bottom right hand corner to continue, you will be required to spend at least 30 seconds viewing the statement)

WYGATE SUITES: MISSION STATEMENT

At Wygate Suites, we appreciate the importance of creating a healthy work environment. We recognize that each employee’s distinct cultural experiences, perspectives, and viewpoints are critical to creating products that engage and inspire customers from all over the world. Therefore, we will do our best to foster workplace practices that are conducive to the promotion and appreciation of the experiences and contributions to our company from distinct cultural groups as well as the maintenance and inclusion of distinctive identities. Our goal is to foster an environment that is an incubator for great ideas, is attractive to the best talent, and that creates a profound sense of pride across our Company. Our company-wide efforts will therefore focus on:

- Leading and managing inclusively – We value and embrace different cultures, races, ethnicities, genders, sexual orientations, perspectives, experiences etc. (e.g. We respect your holidays!)
- Creating a work environment that fosters growth and advancement
- Engaging with our customers in a way that reflects, embraces, and respects their diverse perspectives and experiences

Our company objectives, and progress towards achieving them, will be assessed annually to ensure they align with our business and talent objectives.

Colorblind Manipulation

Click the next button to view the Wygate Suites Mission Statement so that you can learn more about the company:

(click the arrow in the bottom right hand corner to continue, you will be required to spend at least 30 seconds viewing the statement)

https://claremontmcmaster.ca1.qualtrics.com/Qu EisSection/Blo cs/4jLd/GeoSurvey/PrintPreview?ContextSurveyID=V_8zU7uq7mu3D7/c&ContextLibraryID=... 3/19
**WYNGATE SUITES: MISSION STATEMENT**

At Wyngate, we appreciate the importance of creating a healthy work environment. We recognize that each employee is critical to creating products that engage and inspire customers from all over the world. Therefore, we will do our best to treat each employee as a person, rather than simply a member of a group. Instead of looking at our employees through the lens of race or gender, we see each employee as a unique individual! Our goal is to foster an environment that is an incubator for great ideas, is attractive to the best talent, and that creates a profound sense of pride across our Company. Our company-wide efforts will therefore focus on:

- Ensuring that every employee is treated as an individual, without regard to race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. *(e.g. We respect your individual and unique contributions.)*
- Creating a work environment that fosters growth and advancement
- Treating all of our customers as unique individuals, regardless of factors such as race, gender, cultural beliefs, etc.

Our company objectives, and progress towards achieving them, will be assessed annually to ensure they align with our business and talent objectives.

---

**BLM Manipulation**

Click the next button to view the Wyngate Suites 2020 statement on the Black Lives Matter Movement so that you can learn more about the company:

*(click the arrow in the bottom right hand corner to continue, you will be required to spend at least 30 seconds viewing the statement)*

---

**Black Lives Matter**

In response to the killing of George Floyd by a Minneapolis police officer and persistent patterns of anti-Black racism in our nation, I write to express both my strongest personal support and the institution’s fullest commitment to standing in solidarity with the #BlackLivesMatter movement. We have a duty to our Black members, employees, creators, and talent to speak up.

We must acknowledge the racism and disproportionate risk that black people face in our law enforcement and justice system as well as their daily lives.

In the words of Martin Luther King Jr., “Every society has its fraternities of the indifferent who are notorious for sleeping through revolutions. Today, our very survival depends on our ability to stay awake, to adjust to new ideas, to remain vigilant and to face the
After days of conversation and reflection, our board has created several actionable items that we will take on in years to come in order to combat systemic racism and white supremacy. These will be outlined in an email to come later today.

To create change, we have to reexamine our own views and actions. To the Black community — we see you. You matter and your lives matter.

– Wyngate Suites CEO, Jordan Johnson

Control Manipulation

Click the next button to view the Wyngate Suites Mission Statement so that you can learn more about the company:

(click the arrow in the bottom right hand corner to continue, you will be required to spend at least 30 seconds viewing the statement)

WYNGATE SUITES: MISSION STATEMENT

At Wyngate Suites, we believe that the key to the long-term success of any service-providing company is to offer a quality of service that cannot be matched, and this success starts with our employees. Therefore, we will do our best to foster workplace practices that are conducive to the promotion, appreciation, and growth of our employees, beginning with rigorous and meaningful core skills trainings throughout onboarding. Our goal is to foster an environment that is an incubator for great ideas, is attractive to the best talent, and that creates a profound sense of pride across our Company. We pride ourselves on being one of the best up and coming hotel chains in the nation: luxurious rooms, attractive locations, unmatched customer service, and unbeatable deals, and we are looking to maintain and grow our reputation. Our company-wide efforts will therefore focus on:

· Ensuring top benefits for all of our employees
· Creating a work environment that fosters growth and advancement

https://claremonnmicenear.co1.quartix.com/7FltdfFolcX/Mocks/Ajax/GetSurveyPrintPreview/ContextSurveyId=V_skin/747?maxId=0&ContextLibraryId=...
Holding ourselves to the highest standard for the way in which we interact and serve our customers.

Our company objectives, and progress towards achieving them, will be assessed annually to ensure they align with our business and talent objectives.

Low DD Manipulation

Next, you will view an image containing the headshots of Wyngate’s C-suite! These could be your future colleagues!

(You will be required to view this image for at least 15 seconds)
Next, you will view an image containing the **headshots of Wyngate's C-suite**. These could be your future colleagues!

(You will be required to view this image for **at least 15 seconds**)

---

**Mediators + DV 1**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** You will now complete a variety of survey measures exploring how you picture this company to be in real life along with how you envision your life at the company would be based on the materials you have read. Please take your time and answer carefully.

---

Indicate the degree to which you agree with these statements. (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Shift to FULL SCREEN if the sliders aren't working!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Emerging for Woke-Washing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate the degree to which you agree with these statements. (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://claremontmcmaster.cs1.quartrix.com/QuartrixSection/Mocks/Ajax/GetSurveyPrintPreview?ContextSurveyId=V_8sf747q7pq3Df3Ok&ContextLibraryId=...
### SEEING THROUGH WOKE-WASHING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. People at this company will sometimes reject others for being different.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is safe to take risks at this company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It will be difficult to ask other employees at this company for help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No one at this company would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Working with employees at this company, my unique skills and talents will be valued and utilized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicate the degree to which you agree with these statements. (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
<th>Score 6</th>
<th>Score 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think I would like to work in a company that has similar hiring practices as those of Wyngate Suites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think this company would have fair hiring practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Seeing Through Woke-Washing

#### 4/23/2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. People at this company will sometimes reject others for being different.

4. It is safe to take risks at this company.

5. It will be difficult to ask other employees at this company for help.

6. No one at this company would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts.

7. Working with employees at this company, my unique skills and talents will be valued and utilized.

---

**Indicate the degree to which you agree with these statements. (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I think I would like to work in a company that has similar hiring practices as those of Wyngate Suites.

2. I think this company would have fair hiring practices.

---

https://claremorrisciemma.co1.qualtrics.com/FL/Redirect/Mocks/Ajax/GetSurveyPrintPreview?ContextSurveyId=V_8tU74f7mzD3Ok&ContextLibraryId=.. 9/19
### 3. I think I would like to work under the supervision of people with similar values as the staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. I think I would be treated fairly by my supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. I think I would trust the management to treat me fairly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### On a scale of 1-5, rank the following: (1=not likely at all, 2=not likely, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat likely, 5=very likely) (under the assumption that there is a role that you are interested in and are qualified for)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely at All</th>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. How likely do you think you would be to apply to this organization in real life?

### 2. How likely do you think it is that you would want to work at this company in real life?

### On a scale of 1-5, rank the following: (1=not at all, 2=not much, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat, 5=a lot) (under the assumption that there is a role that you are interested in and are qualified for)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please respond to the following in 1-5 sentences or bullet points:

What factors were you thinking about when answering the questions in the previous three surveys?

---

**Attention**

Which of the following is not something you can drink?

- Wine
- Detergent
- Ginger Ale
- Apple Juice

---

**Cog Ability Test**

*Instructions:* You will now take a mock cognitive ability selection measure meant to determine if your general cognitive ability level is a strong match for the skills necessary at this company. There will be 13 questions, and you have 3 minutes to complete as many questions as you can. You may answer questions in whatever order you wish and may skip questions. It is okay if you do not complete all items. The page will AUTOADVANCE after 3 minutes. Please answer each question to the best of your abilities. You may want a pencil and paper! If you have extra time, feel free to check your work.

1. In the following set of words, which word does not belong?

- Sanction
- Designation
- Approval

---
2. Arrange the following words so that they form a complete sentence. Is the rearranged sentence true or false?
not Winter seasons summer are and

- True
- False

3. If 5 cookies cost $0.30, how much will 30 cookies cost?

- $1.50
- $1.80
- $2.80
- $5.30
- $30.00
- None of the Above

4. Together, Sam and Edna have 56 marbles. Edna has 6 times the amount of marbles that Sam has. How many marbles does Sam have?

- 8
- 12
- 32
- 46
- 49
- None of these

5. How many of the five pairs listed below are exact duplicates?
Truman, H.W., Truman, H.W.
Salif, O.L., Salif, O.J.
Grinberg, A.L., Grinberg, A.L.
Havanos, B.G., Havanos, B.G.
Lichtenstein, D.W., Lichtenstein, D.W.

- 1
- 2
6. A train travels 100 feet every 2 seconds. How far will it travel in 36 seconds?

○ 1,670 ft
○ 1,836 ft
○ 200 ft
○ 286 ft
○ 1,480 ft
○ None of these

7. 17 out of 20 lung diseases are curable; what is the percentage of lung diseases that are curable?

○ 17%
○ 72%
○ 85%
○ 87%
○ 90%
○ None of these

8. Which of the following is the earliest date?

○ May 3, 1986
○ March 31, 1988
○ March 3, 1986
○ May 30, 1986
○ March 13, 1986

9. The words BENEVOLENT and MAGNANIMOUS have ___?___ meanings?

○ similar
○ contradictory
10. The eleventh month of the year is:

- January
- November
- October
- May

11. There are three times elephants compared to giraffes in the safari. If there is a total of 88 elephants and giraffes, how many elephants are there in the safari?

- 22
- 31
- 43
- 59
- 66
- None of these

12. If the first two statements are true, is the final statement true?
   James bought Thomas a drink.
   Thomas bought Suzette a drink.
   James bought Suzette a drink.

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

13. A shop owner bought some shovels for $5,500. The shovels were sold for $7,300, with a profit of $50 per shovel. How many shovels were involved?

- 16
- 36
- 55
- 73
- 90
- None of these
Manipulation Checks

Which of the following represent the values of the company you read about?

- The company values and embraces different cultures, ethnicities, races, genders, sexual orientations, perspectives, experiences etc. (i.e. They respect your holidays!)
- The company treats each employee as an individual, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation, etc. (i.e. They respect your individual and unique contributions.)
- The company values Black lives and combats systemic racism and white supremacy
- The company ensures top benefits for all employees and holds itself to high standards for the way in which they interact with customers

Which of the following best describes the level of racial diversity in the headshots of people at this company?

- Low racial diversity (not many people of different races)
- High racial diversity (many people of different races)

SDO Moderator

Show how much you favor or oppose each idea below by selecting a number from 1 to 7 on the scale below. You can work quickly; your first feeling is generally best. (1: Strongly Oppose, 2: Somewhat Oppose, 3: Slightly Oppose, 4: Neutral, 5: Slightly Favor, 6: Somewhat Favor, 7: Strongly Favor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Somewhat Oppose</th>
<th>Slightly Oppose</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Favor</th>
<th>Somewhat Favor</th>
<th>Strongly Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Some groups of people must be kept in their place.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Somewhat Oppose</th>
<th>Slightly Oppose</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Favor</th>
<th>Somewhat Favor</th>
<th>Strongly Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An ideal society requires some groups to be on top and others to be on the bottom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Groups at the bottom are just as deserving as groups at the top.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No one group should dominate in society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Groups at the bottom should not have to stay in their place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Group dominance is a poor principle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. We should not push for group equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. We shouldn't try to guarantee that every group has the same quality of life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It is unjust to try to make groups equal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Group equality should not be our primary goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographics

1. What is your gender:

   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female
   - [ ] Non-binary or Gender Non-Conforming
   - [ ] I prefer to self-describe: ____________________________

2. What is your age?

   ____________________________

3. What is your race:

   - [ ] White / Caucasian
   - [ ] African American or Black
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What is your ethnicity?

- Hispanic or Latinx
- Not Hispanic or Latinx

Which most closely describes your political ideology?

- very conservative
- conservative
- independent
- liberal
- very liberal

What is your highest level of education?

- Some high school
- High school diploma or equivalency
- Some college
- 2-year college degree
- 4-year college degree
- Some graduate school
- Master’s Degree
- Doctorate (Including a Juris Doctorate/ Law degree)

Are you a U.S. Citizen?

- yes
- no
What was the total income of all members of your family living in your household during the past 12 months before taxes?

- Less than $25,000
- $25,000 - $49,999
- $50,000 - $74,999
- $75,000 - $99,999
- $100,000 - $124,999
- $125,000 - $149,999
- $150,000 - $174,999
- $175,000 - $199,999
- $200,000 or more

Debrief

Debrief: YOU WILL NOT GET PAID UNLESS YOU PRESS THE ARROW BUTTON ON THE BOTTOM RIGHT OF THIS PAGE AND SUBMIT YOUR SECRET KEY CODE FROM THIS PAGE ON CLOUD RESEARCH

Here is your unique completion ID code:
KMS[e://Field/Random%20ID]A

Copy This Value to paste into CloudResearch in the "Secret Key" box.
When you have copied the ID and read the debrief, please click the next button to submit your survey.

REMEMBER TO PRESS THE SUBMIT BUTTON ON THE BOTTOM RIGHT TO GET COMPENSATION!!!!!

My study is interested in the effects of projected diversity values and demographic diversity of companies on attitudes and performance of job applicants, and ultimately equity in workplace outcomes for minority applicants. Research has shown that colorblind diversity messaging coupled with a lack of diverse representation may trigger a lack of psychological safety, feelings of identity threat, and a lack of trust in minority job applicants. Depending on which manipulation you received, your thought processes and performance on the mock selection test may have been impacted. You were not told the true purpose of this study in order to minimize the possibility that your judgment and attitude would be affected by variables outside experimenter control. All responses are anonymous; Your name will not be connected with your data.

Thank you for participating! Remember, your participation in this study is anonymous and all analyses of the data will be averaged across all the participants. If you have any additional questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to contact me.

Please do not disclose any research procedures and hypotheses to anyone who might participate in this study between now and the end of the data collection (April 25, 2021) as this could affect the results of the study. Please PRESS THE ARROW to submit the survey!