Best Practices for Effective Diversity Training

Prepared by:

Annie Smith, MLS

Mikayla Kartchner

Karen Sturtevant, MLS

Emily Bullough, MS, MEd

Completed April 21, 2021

UVU FULTON LIBRARY UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY **Executive Research Service**

Table of Contents

Research Question

What are the best practices for the design and facilitation of diversity training?

What makes diversity training more effective? What training is recommended for facilitators? What are the most effective/productive ways that facilitators can address white fragility (and fragility about other identities)? How can facilitators support the development of relationality between participants? How do facilitators adjust language and vocabulary for different participants and topics?

Executive Summary

Best Practices

A review of the available literature on diversity training—in both the public and private sectors—revealed some best practices as well as several open questions about the most effective options in developing and implementing this kind of training. These best practices include:

- Diversity training must be reflected throughout the organization, especially by its leadership, otherwise the message of diversity training will be undermined by day-to-day practices (Bezrukova et al., 2012; Bezrukova et al., 2016; Cheng et al., 2019; Dobbin & Kalev, 2016; Goodman, 2019; Hite & McDonald, 2006; Hughes, 2018; King et al., 2010; Morse, 2016; Nguyen, 2014; Pendry et al., 2007; Roberson et al., 2003).
- Training that spans multiple hours and/or several sessions is more effective than short, single training sessions. Over and over, the research shows that diversity training is more likely to help trainees change their attitudes if it takes place over a long period of time (Carvalho-Grevious & Sabbath, 2017; Cheng et al., 2019; Guy, 2019; Hite & McDonald, 2006). Further, Bezrukova et al. (2016) found that the effects of training waned over time. Long-term training can take several forms:
  - In some studies, existing performance review and feedback structures have been modified to catch ongoing discrimination (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016; Holmes, 2004; King et al., 2010).
  - Some researchers suggested mentoring to help new employees overcome any pre-existing biases towards minorities (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016; Holmes, 2004).
  - Holmes (2004) suggested self-directed learning following diversity training.
  - Lindsey et al. (2015) discussed goal setting as a way for trainees to change biases and behaviors over time.
- Assessment should be included in all diversity training programs (Best practices for diversity training, 2011; Bezrukova et al., 2012; Hite & McDonald, 2006; Morse, 2016; Roberson et al., 2003).
- Trainer demographics matter. Research suggests using pairs of trainers that represent both the majority and minorities, if possible (Gebert et al., 2017; Kowal et al., 2013; Lindsey et al., 2015; Roberson et al., 2003).

- Diversity trainers should be taught how to facilitate discussions so that they don't become unproductive and/or fraught (Gebert et al., 2017).
- Diversity trainers should have some knowledge of the psychology of attitude and stereotype formation (Pendry et al., 2007).

The research also showed some pedagogical strategies that can help make training more effective. These include:

- Use of multiple pedagogical techniques (discussion, activities, lectures, etc.) are more effective than use of a single technique (Bezrukova et al., 2016; Guy, 2019; Holmes, 2004; Madera et al., 2011).
- Reflective learning: Many researchers in this review noted the power of having trainees reflect on and dissect their own thought patterns with regards to diversity, tolerance, racism, and other related topics (Pendry et al., 2007; Smith & Percy, 2019; Wilson, 2013).
  - Journaling: writing was frequently suggested as an effective tool for encouraging trainees to reflect on their attitudes and thoughts (Brewis, 2019; Dawson, 2013).
- Conversational learning: Researchers frequently pointed out the effectiveness of open, honest conversation in diversity training as a vehicle for undoing existing biases and addressing discrimination (Dawson, 2013; Kowal, 2013).
  - Researchers who advocated for discussion in diversity training also noted the need for ground rules to keep conversations productive and civil (Dawson, 2013; Gebert et al., 2017; Kowal et al., 2013; Wilson, 2013).
- Experiential learning: This style of learning involves creating scenarios or experiences for trainees that can boost empathy, teach skills, and help change attitudes (Best practices for diversity training, 2011; Gebert et al., 2017; King et al., 2010; Madera et al., 2011; Pendry et al., 2007).

Open Questions

The literature revealed several important questions that have not been resolved, possibly due to a) the variety of factors that can influence the effectiveness of training and b) the lack of information about the effectiveness of diversity training in general. These questions include:

- Should training be mandatory or voluntary? (Bezrukova et al., 2012; Bezrukova et al., 2016; Cheng et al., 2019; Dobbin & Kalev, 2016; Guy, 2019).
- Should training generally cover all minorities or specific groups? (Bezrukova et al., 2012; Roberson et al., 2003).
- Is awareness training more or less effective than skills training? (Hite & Mc Donald, 2006; Holmes, 2004; Roberson, 2003).
- What should the demographic composition of trainees be? (Cheng et al., 2019; Pendry et al., 2007; Roberson et al., 2003).

There are proponents of both mandatory and voluntary training. Researchers who favor mandatory training point out that it will ensure that anyone who needs this kind of training gets it (Bezrukova et al., 2016). Those who argue for voluntary training think that it will avoid backlash from trainees

who don't want to attend (Guy, 2019). Many of the arguments for and against these positions are generalizations or hypotheses that might not apply in all situations.

Bezrukova et al. (2012) in their review of the diversity training literature found that training that discusses specific groups (i.e. LGBTQ+ people, Black people, and so on) might be effective to help address specific organizational goals or issues. However, they also noted that training focused on a specific group might paradoxically cause "a backlash among participants in demographic majorities who may feel they are being held indirectly responsible for past histories of discrimination or other inequities. In contrast, training that focuses on a more general, positive, and inclusive approach may be better received by all participants" (Bezrukova et al., 2012, pp. 222-223; Roberson et al., 2003).

The question of awareness training versus skills training seems to arise from the ubiquity of awareness training (Hite & Mc Donald, 2006; Holmes, 2004; Roberson et al., 2003). While awareness-raising training can be useful to introduce trainees to racism and discrimination faced by minorities, several researchers noted the popularity of skills-based training among trainees, as it gives attendees new behaviors to practice and tools for diffusing difficult situations or avoiding lawsuits (Roberson et al., 2003). Bezrukova et al. (2016), however, wrote, "it seems that awareness and behavior-based diversity training is more effective when done together than separately" (p. 1244).

Lastly, several researchers in this review noted the benefits of having representatives of different minority groups present, either as trainers or as trainees themselves. Cheng et al. (2019) reported on research that the pool of trainees should also be diverse, "not just for their own benefit, but for the benefit of the organization as a whole" (p. 9). The researchers in Cheng et al.'s review found that sessions were more productive and helped reduce discrimination and prejudicial attitudes. However, Pendry et al. (2007) wrote, "diversity trainers should evaluate the benefits or costs of the exercise for people of colour as they are not likely to benefit greatly from an increased awareness of invisible privilege and may incur more costs by having their non-privileged status highlighted for them publicly" (p. 34).

Avoiding Backlash

Throughout the literature, researchers noted possible backlash from trainees who may respond negatively to diversity training—either by growing more resentful of minorities or because of emotional reactions to feelings of guilt. Robin diAngelo calls this "white fragility," and addresses the topic in her 2018 book *White Fragility.* Unfortunately, there are very few evidence-based options for dealing with these disruptive behaviors. In fact, many researchers talk about avoiding potential backlash without data to show how widespread the problem actually is.

Researchers who tackled the question of backlash pointed to "a 'blame and shame' approach" or confrontational approach and consequent feelings of guilt as a chief source of resistance to diversity training and resentment (Cheng et al., 2019, p. 2; Dobbin & Kalev, 2016; Guy, 2019; Kowal et al., 2013; Pendry et al., 2007; Roberson et al., 2003). Other researchers found that requiring diversity training was another important source of backlash (Bezrukova et al., 2016; Dobbin & Kalev, 2016; Guy, 2019). It follows that organizations can avert at least some of this negativity by thoughtful pedagogical design and by making training voluntary.

Annotated Bibliography

Keywords Used for Literature Review

- "best practices" AND "diversity training"
- "diversity training" AND (design OR delivery OR facilit*)
- "diversity training" AND strateg*

Peer Reviewed Journal Articles

Citation	Conclusions
Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K. A., & Spell, C. S. (2012). Reviewing diversity training: Where we have been and where we should go. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*(2), 207–227. **Abstract** We review and critically examine 178 articles whose authors have investigated numerous aspects of diversity training programs on campuses and in the workplace. We first examine the characteristics of the research, including sample, study method, and theoretical framework. Consistent with the training framework of Baldwin and Ford (1988) and Blume and colleagues (2010), we then organize the articles by the context of training, training design, trainees' characteristics, and training outputs. Although we found a myriad of different	"...Our objectives are to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the current state of knowledge regarding diversity training by identifying its relevant design elements, examining the qualitative nuances of its effects, and informing its research and the practice." (p. 207) "In line with Posthuma et al., (2002), we conducted a narrative review, which allowed us to critically examine the research on diversity training, generate recommendations for future research, show how these recommendations derive from past research, and highlight limitations in the literature (see, e.g., Jackson et al., 2003; Paluck, 2006; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998)." (p. 208) "We performed data-based searches through ABIInform, PsychINFO, Psychological Abstracts, Dissertation Abstracts International, and the Education Resource Information Center (ERIC). To capture the broadest possible sample of relevant articles, we used multiple search terms, including all words beginning with the roots 'diverse,' 'culture,' 'multicultural,' 'cross-cultural,' 'pluralism,' 'prejudice,' 'bias,' 'stereotype,' 'race,' 'racial,' 'ethnic,' 'ethnicity,' 'Lesbian Gay Bi-sexual and Transgender (LGBT),' 'gay,' 'age,' 'generational,' 'women,' and 'gender.' We crossed these terms with training-related search words, such as 'train,' 'workshop,' 'education,' 'course,' 'intervention,' 'program,' 'initiative,' 'teach,' and 'instruct.'" (p. 209) "...Within each category, we defined themes that emerged from our analysis of the articles (e.g., training approach as mandatory or voluntary) and reviewed associated literature. Here, we focused on contrasts between the different themes within categories (e.g., integrated vs. stand-alone training

forms, shapes, and combinations of diversity training in terms of its design elements, some programs (e.g., integrated training) were relatively rare, yet authors viewed them more positively than other programs (e.g., stand-alone training). We discuss gaps in the literature and provide suggestions for future research on diversity training.

Limitations
"...A limitation of this study, then, is that we can make no claims about the relative effectiveness of different types of diversity programs, as there are differences in what has been emphasized and how training programs were studied." (p. 222)

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=77351374&site=eds-live

approach). Second, we summarized findings respective to these themes and provided suggestions for future research." (p. 209)

"...As our review shows, the dominant theoretical framework across many diversity training studies has been the multicultural tradition. This perspective emphasizes a number of developmental stages through which trainees are assumed to progress to attain intercultural sensitivity (e.g., Bennett, 1993). For instance, Pedersen's (2010) study used a developmental model of intercultural sensitivity to assess diversity program effectiveness for university students. Another framework that has also received attention in the literature on diversity training utilizes the principles of social identity and social categorization theories (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and contact research (Allport, 1954). According to these frameworks, the effects of diversity training can be predicted based on the interplay of positive (recognition and appreciation of cultural differences) and negative (racial, ethnic and religious prejudice and discrimination) intergroup attitudes resulting from the saliency of the trainee's identity. Further, intergroup contact under the right conditions may increase the perception of similarity and promote liking (Allport, 1954; Gaertner et al., 1999; Pettigrew, 1998). Equal status, personal contact, cooperation for shared goals, development of intergroup norms that support constructive interaction, and institutional support for contact are important conditions affecting the outcome of contact and thus effectiveness of the diversity training program." (p. 210)

"In our review, the majority of studies have looked at stand-alone (e.g., Stewart, Latu, Kawakami, & Myers, 2010; Szpara & Wylie, 2005) training (N 903), while there is a dearth of studies examining integrated training (N 19). Yet, the relatively few studies on integrated training viewed this approach to training very positively (Bendick, 2001; Naff & Kellough, 2003; Rynes & Rosen, 1995). For example, Bendick (2001) compared two versions of diversity training—isolated diversity training versus diversity training complemented by other diversity initiatives—and found the latter to be more effective as perceived by the providers of diversity training in the United States. Evidence from the educational context typically comes from evaluating diversity courses conducted within diversity-infused curricula (supervision, coursework, writing/research, campuswide cultural 'celebration' events, cultural immersion—all with an emphasis on diversity; e.g., Alcalde & Walsh-Bowers, 1996; Caffrey, 2005; Klak & Martin, 2003; Manese, Wu, & Nepomuceno, 2001). So, the literature suggests that the impact of diversity training is related to its integration in other organizational initiatives or signals from top management that it is a priority for the organization or college and not just 'window-dressing.'" (p. 215)

"Some attempts have been made to go beyond testing simple comparison models to look at the effects of training within broader research models (Hanover & Cellar, 1998; Law, 1998). For instance, a significant body of research has suggested that support for training (e.g., top management commitment to diversity, high strategic priority of diversity relative to other competing objectives, presence of a diversity manager and other responsibility structures, and the existence of a large number of other diversity-supportive policies) was a strong predictor of training success measures such as, for example, increases in managerial diversity (Kalev et al., 2006; Kellough & Naff, 2004; Rynes & Rosen, 1995). Furthermore, a consideration of training within a broader program of multiple initiatives for comprehensive culture change has been shown to be a strong predictor of perceived training success (Bendick, 2001; Hite & McDonald, 2006; National Urban League, 2009; Rynes & Rosen, 1995; Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1998). From our review, it seems clear that scholars should direct more attention to understanding the advantages of the integrated training programs and why and how they work. Research should thus consider the underlying process behind how integrated training conveys commitment and overall organizational support, and the specific ways that an organization can signal such support that are most closely related to diversity training outcomes." (p. 215)

"In our review, we found that 43 studies examined diversity training programs that were mandatory, whereas 63 studies focused on training programs that operated on a voluntary basis (see Table 2). The argument in favor of mandatory attendance has received some empirical support—mandatory management attendance was positively associated with the perceived success of diversity training (Bendick, 2001; Rynes & Rosen, 1995). Similarly, other studies have supported the opposite argument showing that voluntary diversity training can also be beneficial (see Dobbin & Kalev, 2007; Kaplan, 2006). For instance, Dobbin and Kalev (2007) reported an increase in proportion of female and minority employees in management positions when training was voluntary. The question thus becomes one of identifying specific conditions when voluntary training is better than mandatory and vice versa. Future research should look into this question more deeply given that it might have implications for minority representation in the workforce and likely would be welcomed by the diversity training community." (p. 216)

"To summarize, about half of the studies we reviewed have focused on multiple attributes emphasizing the generic dynamics of multiple groups (e.g., race, gender, age, SES, disability, etc.). We think this is a good trend in diversity training practice since this type of training sends a positive message to everyone that they are included. This positive and inclusive approach to training is likely to be better accepted by all trainees. Given these findings, it would be helpful if future research examines the mechanism by which organizations and universities can effectively communicate

inclusiveness to trainees. Also, it would be useful to identify any conditions or circumstances where diversity training that focuses on only one group (group-specific focus) would be appropriate. For nstance, recent work on needs assessment for diversity training (Roberson et al., 2003) has suggested hat a narrowly focused training based on race only may be, in fact, beneficial when organizational oals are limited to very specific outcomes (e.g., hire more racial minorities). Other attributes such as ge, disability, and LGBT should be considered in this context as well." (p. 217)

"Our review suggests that while diversity training can indeed be impactful in organizations, some reas where diversity training would seem to have the greatest impact and promise (e.g., an integrated pproach to diversity training) have been relatively ignored. On the other hand, our review reveals that he content and effectiveness of some diversity training programs can be questionable (e.g., a stand-lone approach, focusing on specific groups, e.g., rac e, using one method of instruction, e.g., lecture). et, the increasing demand for diversity training due to major societal and organizational trends (e.g., hanging workforce demographics, firms' globalization, and continuing legal challenges) calls for etter understanding of what type of programs can make a difference in how we research and teach bout diversity." (p. 221)

"Overall, in terms of context, diversity training has been frequently found in both educational and orkplace settings across a vari ety of industries, demonstrating its pervasiveness in society. Our eview further shows that the training approach described as integrated (training is conducted as part a systematic and planned organizational development effort) has been less prevalent , yet viewed ore favorably in the literature than standalone training (e.g., Alcalde & Walsh- Bowers, 1996; endick, 2001; Caffrey, 2005; Klak & Martin, 2003; Rynes & Rosen, 1995). Approximately equal ttention has been given to both voluntary and mandator y diversity training. Yet, the appropriate use voluntary or mandatory requirements under different conditions remains unknown. Further, we ound a myriad of different forms, shapes, and combinations of diversity training in terms of its design ements. While programs with an inclusive focus (focusing together on the experiences of African-mericans, women, gay, lesbian bisexual, and transgender, GLBT persons with disabilities, etc.) were ss prevalent, authors viewed them more positively in the literature than they did training that focuses on only one group (e.g., race, as our earlier example demonstrates). Also, diversity training programs that were primarily designed to increase both diversity awareness and skills and those that employed many instructional methods (e.g., lectures, exercises, group activities and discussions, etc.) were most common. Demographic, personality, and cultural characteristics of the trainees have received some attention in the literature, yet more often than not these aspects have been ignored. In terms of training

outcomes, researchers predominantly focused on short-term effects as opposed to long-term effects with the majority of outcomes involving attitudinal learning." (p. 222)

"Our findings with respect to the design characteristics of training have implications for teaching. For example, the literature we reviewed shows that diversity training programs with a specific focus that emphasize learning about one particular demographic group at a time may be somewhat problematic, possibly because such an approach sharpens differences between participants and make reasons for inequitable treatment and discrimination more salient to participants. Such priming effects brought on by training may cause a backlash among participants in demographic majorities who may feel they are being held indirectly responsible for past histories of discrimination or other inequities. In contrast, training that focuses on a more general, positive, and inclusive approach may | be better received by all participants. More specifically, case studies where diverse workplaces have been very successfully managed, such as Cirque du Soliel (Delong & Vijayaraghavan, 2002), Google, The Metropolitan Opera, and Cityside Financial Services (Ely, 2004b) can be included in a course syllabus or discussed as part of diversity training in the workplace. Unlike programs focusing on specific groups, this type of approach may provide the illustrative examples of companies that are very diverse but also extremely successful, where the inclusiveness of different groups is a key competitive advantage." (pp. 222-223)

Citation
Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin, 142*(11), 1227-1274. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000067

Abstract

This meta-analysis of 260 independent samples assessed the effects of diversity training on 4 training outcomes over time and across characteristics of training context, design, and participants. Models from the training literature and psychological theory on diversity were

Conclusions
"Our goal is to summarize the existing literature on diversity training and education by integrating psychological theory on diversity with organizational research on training models. To accomplish this goal, we build on Bezrukova and colleagues' (2012) narrative review and framework that differentiates between training inputs and outputs to delineate the constructs that should be included in our theory. According to this framework, training inputs include training context, design, and trainee characteristics, whereas outputs include participants' reactions to training and various learning outcomes. We add to this framework by providing a theoretical explanation for the main effects as well as boundary conditions behind the diversity training effects. Identifying the conditions (when something works or does not) is one of the main contributions of our article." (p. 1228)

"We conducted a literature search for published and unpublished studies on diversity training using online databases across multiple disciplines such as ABI-Inform, PsycINFO, PsycARTICLES, Business Source Premier, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, Dissertation Abstracts International, COS Conference Papers Index, Social Services Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, and the Education Resource Information Center (see Figure 1). We used multiple search terms to identify relevant

used to generate theory-driven predictions. The results revealed an overall effect size (Hedges g) of .38 with the largest effect being for reactions to training and cognitive learning; smaller effects were found for behavioral and attitudinal/affective learning. Whereas the effects of diversity training on reactions and attitudinal/affective learning decayed over time, training effects on cognitive learning remained stable and even increased in some cases. While many of the diversity training programs fell short in demonstrating effectiveness on some training characteristics, our analysis does reveal that successful diversity training occurs. The positive effects of diversity training were greater when training was complemented by other diversity initiatives, targeted to both awareness and skills development, and conducted over a significant period of time. The proportion of women in a training group was associated with more favorable reactions to diversity training. Implications for policy and directions for future research on diversity training are discussed.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=pdh&AN=2016-43598-001&site=eds-live

diversity articles, such as diverse, culture, multicultural, cross-cultural, pluralism, prejudice, bias, discrimination, sensitivity, tolerance, stereotype, race, racial, ethnic, ethnicity, Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT), gay, age, older, generational, women, and gender. We crossed these terms with the following training-related words: train, workshop, education, course, curriculum, intervention, program, initiative, teach, and instruct. In addition to the electronic databases, we hand-searched recent issues of psychology, organizational behavior, and human resource management journals to include articles that have not been published yet (in press) or available electronically. Next, the authors manually examined reference sections of published articles to help identify articles not included in the database searches. Finally, we searched the same databases using the names of researchers who had conducted research on diversity training." (p. 1232)

"Overall, we found that the effects of diversity training vary as a function of the outcome used to operationalize its effectiveness. Consistent with our predictions, reactions to the training itself feature the strongest overall positive effects (see Table 11). This finding may be partly interpreted as due to demand characteristics—for example, 'I might have liked the program because the trainer had a really great sense of humor, but I didn't change my diversity-related attitudes and behaviors one bit.' Yet it is also possible for an inspiring or especially effective diversity trainer to bring about sustained, positive emotional responses in participants—for example, 'That diversity instructor changed my life because it helped me in how I interact with people much older than me.' Turning to other outcomes, and consistent with Kalinoski and colleagues' (2013) study, diversity training programs seem less effective in changing attitudes. This finding is in line with the notion that attitudes assessed in this research are generally strong (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993), particularly emotion-laden, tightly tied to trainees' self-identity, operate in highly connected networks, and are generally resistant to change (Dalege et al., 2016; Eagly & Chaiken, 2007; Kulik & Roberson, 2008a)." (p. 1242)

"Comparing the immediate versus long-term effects of diversity training, we found that diversity training effects on reactions and attitudinal/affective learning decayed over time. This conclusion seems inconsistent with the few prior studies that have reported evidence of successful transfer of diversity training in the work setting (e.g., Hanover & Cellar, 1998; Majumdar, Browne, Roberts, & Carpio, 2004; Roberson, Kulik, & Pepper, 2009). We show that reactions and attitudes might be malleable for participants posttraining. For example, someone who is prejudiced against African Americans before taking diversity training may experience a positive shift in attitudes and become less prejudiced. Yet, their attitudes may shift back closer to what they were pretraining in response to media accounts of riots and unrest such as that occur | ring in Ferguson or similar events, especially if the nature of such reports casts minorities in a negative light. So, as the first study that considered both

short- and long-term effects of training, we find no compelling evidence that long-term effects of diversity training are sustainable in relation to attitudinal/affective outcomes." (pp. 1242-1243)

"In contrast, training effects on cognitive learning remained stable or in some cases even increased in the long-term (see Table 11). While we cannot fully explain the relative 'stickiness' of cognitive learning, it may be that after training, cues in the workplace or elsewhere could reinforce cognitive responses that trainees learned. Perhaps people are reminded of scenarios or situations they have learned while in training, which then is more readily maintained and even strengthened over time. These cues could also come from mass media or other sources outside the immediate workplace or school. The influence of such sources on individual cognitions, sense-making, and even management decisions has been established by research based on management fashion theory (Abrahamson & Fairchild, 1999; Spell & Blum, 2005) as an important shaper of cognitions both in and out of the workplace." (p. 1243)

"Turning to specific features of diversity training itself, we found that some factors widely believed to determine effectiveness of diversity training (e.g., use of multiple training methods) did not lead to effectiveness. Yet, several features consistently associated with effective training (e.g., integrated training) are absent in the majority of programs. Overall, the effectiveness of diversity training varied as a function of diversity training context, design, and to a lesser degree the characteristics of trainees. These factors proved to be critical in shaping and moderating the main effects of diversity training on learning outcomes. Ultimately, our study shows that while many diversity training programs do not follow what we identify as best practices, the good news is that some programs do and guidelines for successful training are emerging from past research." (p. 1243)

"...In general, we find that the significance of a place or setting (i.e., organizational vs. educational setting) may have been overstated; the more important issue is the relationship between diversity training efforts and other initiatives that complement the training. Taking a closer look at setting, the difference in overall effect size as a function of diversity training setting approaches, but does not reach statistical significance. This is an important finding, because past reviews tend to focus on one or the other rather than a combination of settings (Arai, Wanca-Thibault, & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001). However, consistent with our predictions, reactions to training were higher in educational settings, which we believe is because diversity training is more easily seen as part of the overall curriculum, and not something that 'takes time away from work.'" (pp. 1243-1244)

"Our results further showed that diversity training has been most useful when training was integrated or embedded (as opposed to standalone). Indeed, as we predicted integrated efforts may signal managerial commitment to diversity above and beyond that of a single class or seminar, substantially increasing the motivation of participants to learn. Integrated training also means components are more likely to complement or support one another. For example, a social networking group of minority professionals, supported by the organization, is a follow-up outcome of a diversity course and also serves as a mentoring source. As our study is the first to include this contextual factor in quantitative analysis, the strong effects we found reveal the criticality of offering diversity programs as part of a well-thought out package or portfolio of diversity-related efforts (see Table 11). By showing us just how important it is relative to other factors, it resolves prior questions in diversity training research about 'what matters most?' in terms of contextual choices." (p. 1244)

"Turning to attendance requirements, while an overall effect was not significant, when looking at separate outcomes, mandatory diversity training seemed more effective for behavioral learning, yet voluntary training was perceived more favorably by training participants. This latter effect may be due to selection aspects—people who willingly take training already have an interest in the issue (or they would not have volunteered) and are more likely to enjoy diversity training. Seen another way, they would be less likely to bring with them negative ideologically based biases ('this will all be politically correct propaganda') than people forced to take training. Our findings also reflect an interesting controversy in the literature with respect to whether mandatory diversity training should be more effective than voluntary training or vice versa. While participants like to have a choice (Dobbin & Kalev, 2007; Kaplan, 2006), Pettigrew and Tropp's (2006) research based on the contact perspective suggests that the voluntary approach does not lead to the strongest effects. One reason for this could be that under the voluntary scenario, people participating in training already want to be there and are not necessarily the ones who would benefit most from changes in cognitive, attitudinal, or behavioral outcomes (Ellis & Sonnenfeld, 1994)." (p. 1244)

"Unlike what we predicted based on psychological theory on diversity, we did not find any strong effects with respect to the focus of diversity training (i.e., inclusive, one group, or multiple groups). Whether focusing on one or more groups (e.g., the experiences of African Americans, then women, then gay lesbian bisexual and transgender, then persons with disabilities, etc.) or discussing more generic issues such as ingroup versus outgroup dynamics that may be generalizable to all types of demographic differences does not really matter or explains any additional variation in the effects of diversity training. What matters most, however, is the length of diversity training. We found a strong and significant relationship between the length of diversity training and effect sizes suggesting that

diversity training programs that are longer tend to be more effective (see Table 11). Psychological theory on diversity and quantitative aspects of contact hypothesis predict longer programs provide more opportunities for contact. This is also consistent with training literature suggesting that more practice leads to greater skill development (e.g., Ericsson, Krampe, & Tesch-Römer, 1993)." (p. 1244)

"Most effective types of diversity training programs were primarily designed to increase both diversity awareness and skills. The overall effect across different types of diversity training (awareness only, behavior only, and both awareness and behavior) was strong and significant, as was the effect for attitudes/affective and behavioral learning when analyzed for separate outcome measures. Although some authors questioned the inclusion of a behavioral component at all, especially in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender diversity training where there is the potential for backlash from some employees who believe that such sexual orientations are inherently wrong (Kaplan, 2006), it seems that awareness and behavior-based diversity training is more effective when done together than separately. While it should be noted that our results showed training coded as behavior only was also effective, in retrospect it is hard to imagine training having no awareness element. Theoretically, these results make sense because making people aware of an issue or need for changing behavior would increase the likelihood of behavioral changes in response. Finally, unlike what we expected based on prior training research, we did not find any strong effects with respect to training instruction (i.e., one or many methods), except for the reaction measure. It seems that trainees tend to respond more favorably to programs that employ many instructional methods (e.g., lectures, exercises, group activities and discussions, etc. all together)." (p. 1244)

"Turning to the role of study rigor in the studies we analyzed, we found that contrary to our expectations and a substantial body of research in social psychology, we do not see any significant differences between experimental and nonexperimental work. This unexpected result further supports a general theme we uncovered | in this analysis. Despite differences in methodological traditions that different disciplines studying diversity training have followed, and the presumed impacts of those approaches, we find that it is the content of the training that matters most (e.g., whether it is embedded, length of the training) and not factors like empirical approach of the study and its setting. In other words, what is included in the delivery of the training, and how it is supported by the organization, and how much that content motivates participants seems more important than where the training is conducted or how data were collected." (pp. 1244-1245)

"In conclusion, we are happy to report that, contrary to charges made by our predecessors over the years, diversity training research is no longer atheoretical, irrelevant, or dull. This body of work has

been very instrumental in offering theoretical guidance and insights into our understanding of the methods, process, and outcomes of diversity training (e.g., Paluck, 2006; Pendry et al., 2007; Wiethoff, 2004). Exciting advances in the areas of learning and motivation within the diversity training literature have been realized. We are now moving this work forward by integrating theoretical traditions from training literature with psychological theory on diversity. We thus, conclude on an optimistic note by reiterating that there are several exciting opportunities for future research in this area because (a) several theoretical perspectives have gained prominence in recent times to guide research, (b) the methodologies to adequately evaluate training effects have received attention in the literature, and (c) the studies reviewed above lay a groundwork for future research that has the opportunity to impact organizations, and society, in a demonstrable and positive way." (p. 1246)

Citation
Brewis, D. N. (2019). Duality and fallibility in practices of the self: The "inclusive subject" in diversity training. *Organization Studies, 40*(1), 93-113.

Abstract
The concept of 'inclusion' has been gaining ground in a field known as equality and diversity work. Scholars have begun to both theorise what this concept means as a normative goal and to critically examine how it is mobilised in organisational practice. This paper contributes to the latter conversation by asking what comes to count as 'doing inclusion' at the level of the individual. I examine the practices of diversity training in United Kingdom organisations, in which diversity practitioners seek to transform their trainees into people who will act inclusively toward others, asking: Who is the 'inclusive subject' that is being constructed–imagined, sought and

Conclusions
"This paper contributes to our knowledge of the practices of diversity by considering how individuals are taught to be inclusive of others in an organisational setting. It asks what practices come to show that a person is inclusive of others. To do this, I examine what the employee is asked to do in order to be inclusive during diversity training in the UK." (p. 95)

"The wider empirical study from which this paper derives was conducted in the UK and largely within the period October 2012 to October 2013...In total, 37 diversity practitioners took part. Participant profiles varied regarding the sectors in which they worked and whether they were freelance consultants or held permanent positions in organisations." (p. 97)

"The diversity practitioners who participated in this research did so in two ways: through interviews with me, and in allowing me to observe their work." (p. 98)

"*Underlying characteristics of the inclusive subject in diversity training*
The practices of the inclusive subject described below are made possible and desirable by two forms of knowledge that characterise it: duality and fallibility. These are now described in turn with some illustrative data to aid an understanding of how they come to underlie the practices described in the main body of the analysis that follows.
Duality indicates that the subject is constituted by elements that are more and less stable, and more and less under the subject's control. Frameworks used to conceptualise the self which share this idea were presented explicitly during two of the training sessions that I observed, and were evoked implicitly in statements by diversity practitioners when talking about their aims in and approaches to diversity training. For instance, in the training session by James and Emily, an individual's values and

legitimised–through diversity training? What are the conditions of possibility that shape the emergence of this subject? And what are the possibilities that this subject affords to marginalised groups struggling for recognition within organisations? The analysis mobilises Foucault's notions of power/knowledge, discipline, and practices of the self to describe and discuss the performance of inclusive subjectivity in the context of diversity training in the UK. The practices described are found to be facilitated by two key forms of knowledge about how the subject is characterised: duality and fallibility. The discussion of these two forms of knowledge leads us to consider the relations of both discipline and freedom that take place in diversity training.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=134058946&site=eds-live

beliefs – in their diagram, shown in Figure 1, the term 'prejudices' is used – were presented as being 'below water'. These were talked about as being invisible, unconscious and relatively stable. These core values, it was suggested, may have been formed and set during childhood, echoing theories such as Morris Massey's three-stage childhood development (1979, pp. 7–12). Placed 'above water' are behaviours (represented in Figure 1 by the term 'discrimination'). In one of her training sessions, Ava connected the subject's core concepts directly to the nine characteristics protected under UK equality law. She rationalised that these were protected because they are things about oneself that are 'very difficult to change'. Thomas was the most explicit in his account that racist or sexist ideas are part of a surface layer of 'learned stuff' as opposed to more fixed values. Values and beliefs were regarded as primary and stable, while behaviours and actions were secondary, changeable and more under a person's control.

Fallibility, meanwhile, indicates that while some elements of the subject are within our control, we are likely to take problematic forms of action as we attempt to be inclusive of others. The idea that it was acceptable to make mistakes and that it is positive to recognise one's lack of knowledge was a recurring idea in interviews with diversity practitioners about their practice. For example, Thomas insisted, 'none of us are…so in touch with it [diversity] that we can say that we're going to be perfect at all times […] it's OK to change your mind, in fact it's a really good thing.' During her training session with prospective foster carers, Ava praised a trainee who offered a story about 'looking after a child with Afro-Caribbean hair and [expressing] their own ignorance and embarrassment [at not knowing how to do this], and [the] learning curve of looking after children' (field notes).

In the analysis that follows, the fundamental position that these two forms of knowledge take in characterising the inclusive subject becomes evident. The analysis draws on Foucauldian concepts of subject formation in order to disentangle the possibilities of these practices in two senses: in terms of the conditions of their emergence, and in terms of what they afford to marginalised groups." (p. 100)

"*Speaking practices*
Trainees were asked to speak for a number of purposes. For a start, speaking represented a way of naming problems. This took place in different ways. First, through criticism of the organisation – borrowing a scale from the Ofsted framework used in evaluating schools in the UK, Joan asked her trainees to reflect on their personal and organisational practices and to 'grade' themselves in terms of 'how you tackle discrimination, and how you foster good relationships between the different workers'. Second, as critique of other individuals – Susanne would ask trainees to read a tribunal | case, 'I want you look at them as a group manager and how you think the thing should have been handled internally so it didn't tip into the court.' Third, people were asked to articulate problems as employees: 'how you feel you should have been treated properly'; or finally, as the person on the receiving end of

discriminatory practices - Amy '[gets] people to think about a time when they were treated unfairly' and to reflect on why they think this happened. Ava and Jamil were also observed using this latter approach." (pp. 100-101)

"What is being encouraged in these instances is a practice of diagnosis. This practice has been recognised as an important part of modern therapeutic techniques: diagnosis pathologises the practices in question (Venn, 1998, p. 119) and its problematising function opens up discursive space for alternatives. Such alternatives can be suggested more or less explicitly as part of the practice, for instance, in the quote above from Joan we see a scale being used to mark out the degree of abnormality that warrants intervention: the degree of required change becomes self-evident against this neutral measure (Rose, 1990). But even without a measurement of the problem, the utterance itself is significant. The announcing of a problem is a form of truth-telling, of saying the unsaid or unspeakable. The act produces a relation of power between the trainer and the trainee; it involves both 'listener' and 'teller' of truths. The listener is a witness and authority (Besley, 2009, p. 83), required because the speaking of a problem 'binds us to others at the very moment we affirm our identity' (Rose, 1990, p. 240)." (p. 101)

"What is crucial to the truth-telling practices described above is a sidestepping of explicit self analysis and avowal. This is achieved by either reversing the position of the trainee to make them the object of the acts under critique, or by mobilising what we might name the 'unethical other' in place of the self. The 'unethical other' is variously the organisation or another individual, and serves to position the trainee as one who is already an inclusive subject. The assumption is asserted that the trainee is already committed to accommodating the needs and preferences of others. By creating a time-loop and positioning the subject as already inclusive, the goodness of the self is safeguarded. That is, confessing via the third person circumvents the threat to one's self-concept (Giddens, 1991) as a good person. In diversity practitioner accounts, when confessions did occur in the first person they were described as being spontaneous and occasional – Joan talked about how trainees realised their own mistakes during the process: 'People will leave the room and say "I'm really sorry but I need to apologise to somebody"' – or as the remembering of a self that has been somehow been distorted: Gerry said, 'They know what the right things to do are – I've just got to pull them out.' Both Gerry and Ian attributed distortions of the good self to false information gleaned from the press: 'I'd always take the view that it's about trying to get people to think for themselves…and not be led by the nose…by [a popular newspaper in UK]' (Ian). This form of knowledge therefore imagines a duality in subjectivity: a stable core that is protected while its behavioural extremities may engage in change. Within this duality framing of the self, from the perspective of the subject, the avowal of a discrepancy between

core and outer layers of the self constitutes an 'un-learning' (Foucault, 2001, p. 495) of the knowledge that comes to obscure the foundational good-self; the inherently inclusive self." (p. 102)

"A related practice, then, is the declaration of learning that is seen to be encouraged by trainers. At the end of a session, trainees were asked, collaboratively or privately, to declare what they had learnt during the session and what they still had to learn. This practice was not always verbal – I observed James and Emily asking trainees to speak aloud to the rest of the group, whereas Ava asked her trainees to draw a picture to illustrate the journey that they had taken during the training. In both cases, however, a declaration is made of having been in some way transformed. Joan talked about a trajectory of learning: 'That's the thing that gets people to think about where they're at, to say "everybody here today is at a different developmental level".' The acknowledgement that individuals usually either lack knowledge or have perspectival knowledge (see Prado, 2000) builds the notion of fallibility into the subject. This idea that subjects are essentially lacking provides a platform for action. The action that is recommended is also characterised by fallibility: rather than concrete rules of behaviour, the inclusive subject is encouraged to engage in a continual practice of fact-finding. In her use of case studies, Susanne was 'not particularly interested in what you think the result was, whether the applicant won or not'. In James and Emily's practice, too, 'It became apparent that there are no right answers for these cases […] Many of the conclusions from the trainees and diversity practitioners are, "we need more information"' (field notes), and Ava emphasised, 'complexity and case-by-case judgements', avoiding 'any procedures or outlines of things to do' (field notes). Learning is located at the level of behaviour and manifested in one's own research but also in asking questions: Rebecca asserted, for example, 'What do you know until you've asked them? Just ask them for goodness sake! […] it's convenient to put people in a box.' The construction of difference in the other is that it is something as yet unknown, but which is ultimately knowable. This understanding simultaneously achieves a resistance to stereotyping and the prompting of action." (p. 102)

"The connection made here between fallibility and the duality of the subject orients fact-finding toward two goals: (a) the realignment of erroneous prejudgements with knowledge about others (fallibility of knowledge), and (b) the realignment of knowledge and behaviours (fallibility in operationalising knowledge). The notion of intrinsic fallibility is valuable because it means that trainees are released from an experience of guilt or fear that had been a criticism with previous interventions associated with organising difference." (p. 103)

"*Thinking practices*

In this study, diversity practitioners were observed to encourage particular thinking practices to structure the way in which the inclusive subject should engage in the fact-finding outlined above. Some diversity practitioners drew upon the list of protected characteristics in UK equality law to structure a continual thought-process – Jamil recommended his trainees to 'do a mini impact assessment […] in your head' (field notes), and Ian explained 'I've got like a list of…like a menu for each of the protected characteristics just to get people thinking, you know.' This structure appeared to follow a similar logic to a writing practice that takes place in public sector organisations known as equality analysis (EA), also known as Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA). During the study, it had been noted that EA played a significant role in the way that diversity practitioners perform in public sector organisations because the practice is used to demonstrate fulfilment of the 'due regard' aspects of the UK equality legislation outlined earlier. EA is a process whereby proposals for new services or policies are systematically evaluated with respect to how they might disproportionately disadvantage or benefit certain demographic groups within the target community. Differential impact is not always an impediment to the implementation of the proposed services but it is a key requirement that any imbalance has been considered as a means of promoting equality and of avoiding discrimination. During the observed training, diversity practitioners invariably drew up a list of the protected characteristics to show their trainees. The list served as a resource for discussion of organisational and individual legal obligations, but it was also mobilised as a resource for how individuals could perform inclusion. Some practitioners proposed structures for inclusive thinking more implicitly: Isabelle talked about how the process of considering the needs of others did not necessarily need to be done on paper but could be performed through a | series of conversations. The key unifier in these thinking practices was a notion of fallibility in one's initial reasoning. Jamil emphasised this in recommending 'taking a couple more seconds to think about what you are going to say' (field notes). Within the framework of diversity training, the inclusive subject was therefore partly performed by the act of engaging in systematic thinking about the needs and preferences of others." (pp. 103-104)

"The practice of systematic thinking can be described as administrative in its inflection, ostensibly directing reflection outwards toward the needs and preferences of others rather than inward to one's values and beliefs. Foucault describes administration in the way that Seneca's 'evening examination' is performed. This reflective practice shifts the emphasis away from being judicial in character to being administrative through a language of 'mistakes' (errores) (Foucault, 1999, 'Seneca and evening examination', para. 6). In diversity training a similar shift away from a moral judgement of the self is achieved through a set of practices that are made necessary by the fallibility of the subject, and made possible by its duality." (p. 104)

"*Writing practices*
In the diversity training observed, there were fewer occasions on which trainees were asked to write, but where they were observed these practices were telling about the relation that the inclusive subject in diversity training has to one's obligations both to others and to oneself. At the end of training sessions, trainees were encouraged to write out future goals: James asked each of his trainees to start an action plan in a booklet that he provided, to which they would continue to add. Fejes and Dahlstedt (2013) term this style of writing a 'log-book'. Ava asked her trainees to write three things that they would like to achieve in the next three months and paired up trainees, asking them to agree to contact one another once the period had elapsed to check on their respective progress. These writing practices functioned to enact a pledge to oneself and to others to continue to learn and think about organising difference in the manner demonstrated in the training." (p. 105)

"The tangible document creates a lasting point of referral for the construction of subject. In this way, the writing practices described here create a relation of power that can operate 'at a distance' between the inscription and the trainee. Such practices position the subject as a project to be worked on and improved and to make the trainee responsible for this endeavour through 'the minute arts of self-scrutiny, self-evaluation, and self-regulation' (Rose, 1990, p. 222). The context in which these practices operate makes self-regulation a characteristic of the subject that is both possible and necessary. In the context of the contemporary Global North, the neoliberal vision of the subject dominates: people are regarded as autonomous and responsible (Rose & Miller, 2008, p. 18). This subjectivity favours a mode of influencing the construction of the subject that leverages internalisation; the construction of a population of self-regulating individuals (Dean, 2010). Foucault calls this the management of possibilities, that in attempting to 'govern', one seeks to 'structure the possible field of action of others' (Foucault, 1994b, p. 241). This is a particularly modern form of government, which Brewis (1996) describes as functioning through guidance of what we experience as free choice. This is achieved by making available, and making legitimate, certain forms of knowledge and certain forms of associated actions (Ahonen, Tienari, Meriläinen, & Pullen., 2014, p. 5; Lemke, 2002, p. 2). It is only through the illusion of freedom that the form of power has its grip on the neoliberal subject." (p. 105)

"Built upon duality, the less directly challenging practices of contemporary diversity training answer a legacy of resistance to past training. Two recurrent orientations to the self were noted during the analysis – self-regulation and administration – both of which are facilitated by an understanding of the self as layered. These were argued to be born of context: on the one hand a national context in which neoliberal discourses of the subject have currency, and on the other a history of prior interventions

around organising difference. A further advantage that duality offers as a form of knowledge is the way in which it reconciles a tension at the heart of the diversity and inclusion discourses when linked together: the need to change oneself to accommodate others while upholding the concept of respect for, or valuing of, diversity-heterogeneity. By setting up the notion of stability at the core of the subject, this particular construction of the inclusive subject offers a | rationale for why other people's (differing) values need to be accommodated, and can be accommodated, while one's own values remain legitimate." (pp. 106-107)

"One might say, then, that there is a tension in diversity training between duality, as a form of knowledge that ostensibly protects the core self, and the very programme of knowledge provided by diversity practitioners through training. If seen as a programme, the forms of knowledge offered about the self would seek to discipline the individual at the most fundamental level, that is, to govern them from the inside; from the core (Dean, 1994). Alternatively, as Foucault has suggested in his analyses of Greco-Roman societies, practices of the self can offer a closer relation to Truth, representing the exercise of freedom though active engagement in self-formation. I would like to suggest that in the practices examined, we have a hybrid. On one hand, trainees are encouraged to engage in continual, and considered, learning about others and about themselves, which suggests an attempt to minimise the governing of the subject by forms of knowledge that marginalise certain people within organisations and society. On the other hand, these speaking, thinking and writing practices are somewhat directed by the knowledge offered in diversity training – by the knowledge of salient differences codified in the national law, and by the notions of duality and fallibility of the self." (p. 107)

"In this paper I have sought to show how the inclusive subject is constructed through the practices of diversity training. In so doing, the analysis contributes to two main areas: first, to the critical study of diversity, especially our understanding of the concept of 'inclusion', by examining how inclusive practice is being articulated at an individual level. I have delineated its conditions of possibility and considered what this means for marginalised groups within organisations…As noted in the text, there are elements of the relations of the field that are not accounted for here: namely, forms of resistance on the part of trainees to the programmes of knowledge that they are being offered in training, and the ethics of the relations of discipline and government constructed by programmes of knowledge embedded in training. Furthermore, and importantly, while some of the forms of knowledge argued to be influential in the formation of the inclusive subject – such as discourses of the neoliberal subject – may span varied geographical contexts, this commonality will be limited. The forms of knowledge discussed are specific to the local context in which the fieldwork was conducted, the UK, particularly

in relation to the UK's legal framework around equalities and the history of interventions in organisations that I have argued to be salient in the construction of the specific inclusive subject. It is important that further work strives to understand the ways in which inclusion is understood in practice across multiple contexts to enable theorising about the possibilities of how we might organise difference and the various struggles involved. Finally, we might also look for alternatives in how we engage in practices of listening within solidarity and activist communities. While the inclusive subject as is manifest in the data offers some space for change in organisational practices, it is problematic that it does not require individuals to acknowledge issues of privilege and unequal distribution of resources and representation. The lack of time and other resources faced by diversity practitioners are certainly barriers to their engagement with such issues in organisational settings. Although benevolent and born of context, the particular construction of the inclusive subject found here is in danger of ultimately leaving power structures unaddressed and unchanged, with duality and fallibility locating responsibility squarely on the shoulders of the individual." (p. 108)

Citation
Carvalho-Grevious, M. J., & Sabbath, T. F. (2017). Uniting macro and micro practice enhances diversity training. *Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping, 23*(4), 67–75.

Abstract
Social workers with two different practice orientations developed a diversity training format that draws upon the major components of each approach. Using cultural-relational critical thinking theory as a foundation, the team engaged participants at two different types of settings to learn about racial and class microaggressions and micro-inequities. The goal of the training and workshop was to have participants assume responsibility in identifying and advocating against such oppressive behaviors.

Conclusions
"The year 2015 marked the coming together of two African American social work practitioners with different perspectives on the field. Dr. XYZ is a macro-practitioner, with years of experience as a trained mediator and organizational analyst. Dr. ABC is a micro-practitioner with family therapy systems training and years of clinical practice. We combined forces to enhance professional development for social workers to address race and class inequities in work and social environments with special attention to microaggressions. Our collaboration is a combination of systems assessment and individual experiences. The result is an approach that makes the discussion of such potent and uncomfortable topics as race and class possible for small and large groups." (p. 67)

"What can facilitators/trainers do to engage participants in discovery about their own assumptions and interpretations, as they experience diversity training? Our approach is to engage participants within the first fifteen minutes of training to develop connections among participants and us. In addition, we facilitate a shared emotion with which everyone can relate before beginning training to lay the foundation for our learning community's connecting with each other. We model and nurture the necessity to stay connected throughout the training. Making connections is what allows us as diversity trainers to take a deep dive with participants into complex and difficult discussions on race and microaggressions with ease.
We have found, also, that too often in discussions about racial and class microaggressions and micro-inequities, the terms equality and equity are used interchangeably. However, the terms are quite different in meaning and application. Clarification of the differences is necessary, since such usage

Article Link https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=129248997&site=eds-live	does not fit the experience of those who confront disparate treatment. Equality is defined as freedom from discrimination according to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (https://www.eeoc.gov). Historically, gains in equality have not resulted in access to opportunities and full inclusion. Clarification of the difference is needed since 'equality' does not always reflect the experiences of African Americans. Structural barriers can remain intact when equality is the goal, whereas equity requires an assessment of the barriers and action to remove them." (p. 71) "The training that we have developed exposes the microaggressions that African Americans confront from racism, which is not to negate similar experiences of others. Because skin color is the most immediate differentiator of inclusion/exclusion globally, hierarchical, and lateral microaggressions and micro-inequities experienced by the African American can shed light on experiences shared by other groups. Managing affective, cognitive, and behavioral reactions is an important part of facilitating diversity training and should not be overlooked. Rowe (1990) warns that people of color are perceived differently, and subtle discrimination and subtle negative messages that people of color receive can have a cumulative negative effect. Left unchecked, these problems can cause disconnection and make the training environment caustic and potentially dangerous." (p. 72) "During a college presentation titled 'Killing Me Softly: Raising Campus Consciousness of | Racial and Class Microaggressions,' we engaged diverse members of the campus community in a 6-hour diversity training and dialogue. We began by introducing them to a relational-cultural framework for building community that integrates race, socioeconomic diversity and inclusion with critical thinking, equity, and civility perspectives. The purpose was to facilitate a deeper understanding of that diverse community's need for awareness, appreciation, and connections (nurturing relationships). Since culture impacts relationships, we employed Paul and Elder's (2012) critical thinking model to enhance critical thinking about diversity and promote positive connections and equity (fairness) within the campus community. We aimed to promote change by detecting and reducing microaggressions that lead to chronic disconnection within the campus. A relational-cultural approach to diversity and inclusion involves a four-step process: Step #1 Checking implicit personal bias and incivility Step #2 Thinking critically about difference Step #3 Understanding the diversity culture Step #4 Repairing relationships damaged by diversity tension" (pp. 72-73) "In the second half of the training, we facilitated a diversity dialogic process for actively listening, especially when diversity tensions are high. Participants were divided into small groups with dialogue

facilitators. Through guided discussion and the application of the ethic of discourse (e.g., sincerity, openness, respect), we guided and modeled non-judgmental listening—without giving advice or attempting to question the motive behind the perspectives shared.

We also worked with a group of African American social workers where we conducted a two hour workshop titled "Microaggressions and Micro-inequities in Social Work Practice." This training exposed the types of hierarchical and lateral microaggressions (devaluing) and micro-inequities that African American social workers often confront within their professional roles. Participants freely shared about the tension between advocating for consumers in systems of service that consistently deny them fair treatment while needing to protect themselves from the same system that can deny them equitable treatment and professional advancement. The workshop afforded participants the opportunity to experience a powerful dialogic tool for addressing microaggressions when equity is sought. Take-aways included the importance of self-care and finding mentors to support and nurture their professional development. They learned strategies for navigating hierarchical microaggressions, so as not to expend energy unnecessarily convincing others of the legitimacy of their experiences with oppression. Considering recent events covered in the media regarding race and the criminal justice system, we offered participants a critical analysis of what happened, while engaging participants in a collective sharing and understanding of oppression, power, and culture." (p. 73)

"We affirmed the value of combining micro and macro social work practice in our approach to diversity training. Together we addressed both structural oppression and personal implicit bias. The joining of our micro-macro perspectives was needed to guide participants through a very challenging process. Without diminishing the significance of experience with racial and class | microaggressions and micro-inequities, we effectively helped participants to stay in the moment to encourage growth as opposed to revisiting old wounds. Diversity trainers have an obligation to limit the potential for harm to participants, especially when training is a requirement for continued employment or professional development. Diversity work necessitates a good degree of transparency on the part of participants. Trainers must establish trust at all levels, that is, trust in the trainer's ability to facilitate difficult conversations and trust in the dialogue process. Our collective experience ensured that we could successfully meet the participants at their point of need and leave them with a desire for more." (pp. 73-74)

"Diversity education and training must be more than an academic pursuit. A necessary component is one that builds capacity to learn new information, especially when it challenges held beliefs and values. Engaging students and professionals in a process that starts them on an ongoing learning track will be most beneficial. Our approach seeks to sustain interest on the part of participants in

confronting microaggressions and micro-inequities relative to race and class. This approach should be included in new-worker orientation as well as ongoing professional development. Our hope is to have macro and micro practitioners recognize and value that each perspective lends to interventions that holistically and strategically address the problems of exclusion and inequities." (p. 74)

"The next level of training must not only expose participants to the reality of microaggressions, especially, but also to strategies for managing them. The perpetrators must be held accountable for their thinking that allows them to voice and act out oppressively, while the targets learn how to address the microaggressions head on, thereby not absorbing the pain and shame. Further work is needed to make sure the result is equitable treatment by all parties." (p. 74)

Citation
Cheng, S., Corrington, A., Dinh, J., Hebl, M., King, E., Ng, L., Reyes, D., Salas, E., & Traylor, A. (2019). Challenging diversity training myths: Changing the conversation about diversity training to shape science and practice.
Organizational Dynamics, 48(4), 1-11.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2018.09.001

Abstract
We identify and challenge diversity myths. We first extracted 19 myths and misconceptions through dual pronged mechanisms: directly, from major online agencies proclaiming to address such myths, and indirectly, through reviews of popular news outlets, which claim 'Diversity Training Doesn't Work,' explain 'Why Your Unconscious Bias Training Isn't Working,' and question 'Why Doesn't Diversity Training Work?' We organize these myths thematically around

Conclusions
"...We believe diversity training has great potential to be effective. Certainly questions do exist about how to maximize the utility and effectiveness of diversity training. By closely examining myths, addressing them with interdisciplinary research, and synthesizing findings, this review will thus integrate diversity training wisdoms. To this end, we identify and challenge diversity myths. We first extracted 19 myths and misconceptions through dual pronged mechanisms: directly, from major online agencies proclaiming to address such myths, and indirectly, through reviews of popular news outlets, which claim 'Diversity Training Doesn't Work,' explain 'Why Your Unconscious Bias Training Isn't Working,' and question 'Why Doesn't Diversity Training Work?' We organize these myths thematically around the key components of the science of training including content, design and delivery, and evaluation. Finally, we addressed each of these myths through targeted, empirically-based research, offering much-needed clarifications and best practices." (p. 2)

"*Diversity Training Does Not Work*
...The truth is that any assertion that diversity training does or does not 'work' is false. The question must shift from whether or not diversity "works" to more careful considerations of for whom, how, when, where, and in what way (or to what end) does each training work. For example, a recent meta-analysis demonstrates that diversity trainings can be effective when they target awareness and skills over a prolonged period of time (Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(11), 1227.). Unfortunately, organizations do not typically explore these core questions adequately, resulting in problematic conclusions and interpretations downstream. It is no surprise, then, that confusion abounds around the conditions that give rise to effective diversity training. This confusion is perpetuated by myths about potentially irrelevant consequences." (p. 2)

the key components of the science of training including content, design and delivery, and evaluation. Finally, we addressed each of these myths through targeted, empirically-based research, offering much-needed clarifications and best practices. Perhaps one of the clearest conclusions that we can make is that most interventions are not grounded in theory or backed by empirical support; hence, we cannot fully understand impact of diversity training. As a whole, the field must move towards sounder, more science based applications of diversity training, which first begins with the dispelling of myths. Accordingly, we provide research-based counter arguments for each of the identified misconceptions. We begin by discussing the myths that directly relate to the question of diversity training effectiveness and evaluation, before describing the narrower myths related to the content, design, and delivery of training.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2019-75586-001&site=eds-live

"*There is Always Backlash with Diversity Training*
Organizations may hesitate to implement diversity training because of the perception that it may result in backlash from employees. Backlash is a strong and negative reaction, often by a significant number of people, to an attempt at some political or social situation that is gaining prominence. A number of researchers have discussed and found evidence for backlash, particularly when it overemphasizes a 'blame and shame' approach and/or enhances (rather than decreases) stereotypes about group members." (p. 2)

"Despite this, the majority of evidence from primary and meta-analytic studies concludes that diversity training can have many positive effects on affective, cognitive, and skill outcomes. For example, diversity trainings can improve employee attitudes, knowledge, and on-the-job behaviors. In their meta-analysis, Bezrukova and colleagues (2016) found that the overall effect size for diversity training on these outcomes was .38 and that diversity training had the largest positive impact on reactions ($g = .61$). As backlash is, in itself, a reaction to diversity training, this finding directly contradicts the notion that diversity training always elicits backlash. While diversity training may carry potential for backlash, organizations have ample opportunity to design programs that avoid backlash and improve learning | outcomes for trainees. Bezrukova and colleagues (2016) noted several moderators impacting trainee reactions, including a positive effect for voluntary (versus mandatory) training, as well as a boost in reactions for training groups with a larger percentage of women. Organizations might benefit from leveraging this information in designing their interventions to avoid backlash." (pp. 2-5)

"*Diversity Training Always Does More Good than Harm*
Despite the aforementioned positive effects of diversity training, there are also a number of potential negative outcomes, including backlash, discomfort, or even reinforcement of group stereotypes. Since diversity training often emphasizes sensitive topics and highlight blind spots or biases, it can elicit feelings of anger, defensiveness, and threat, particularly from members of high-status groups. These feelings can hinder the potential positive impacts of diversity training, diminishing trainees' motivation to learn and transfer the appropriate knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs). In fact, these feelings can engender increased resentment and deepen divides between different groups. In addition, diversity trainings can potentially de-legitimize discrimination claims, since such diversity initiatives can lead to an assumption of an organization's fairness, reducing the detection and condemnation of discrimination. Since many minority groups are already wary of claiming discrimination due to the accompanying social costs, such as less favorable evaluations, this is an important consequence to

understand and combat. As a result, although diversity trainings are often well-intentioned, it is important for organizations and diversity trainers to be aware of potential negative outcomes and what impacts these outcomes within training content, design, and delivery. Employees should also be made aware that diversity trainings are not a cure-all, prejudice and discrimination can still occur post-training, and any future discrimination claims are still legitimate and should be taken seriously." (p. 5)

"*If People Did Not Like the Diversity Training, It Did Not Work*
Another related myth that complicates understanding of diversity training is that organizations and trainers will assume that negative responses on a "smile sheet" or a trainee reaction survey is indication that a diversity program "failed". Administering a reaction survey is one of the easiest and most popular ways to obtain an immediate metric of a training's success. Consequently, using satisfaction to measure training success is common organizational practice. An inherent issue with this logic is that this perspective falsely equates training success with trainee satisfaction; however, this should not be the only outcome variable of importance to an organization. Some training is difficult due to high skill level or challenges to one's (often core) beliefs. In these cases, a trainee might not enjoy being challenged, but the training could still result in other desired outcomes. Training can and should be evaluated on a diverse nomological network of training outcomes. This likely includes measures of learning and behavioral outcomes." (p. 5)

"*The Diversity Training Return on Investment (ROI) is Unfavorable*
To the extent that diversity training programs are designed and implemented effectively, they might target skill development or behavioral adaptation that have the proximal outcome of reducing discrimination and improving cultural competence. The experience of discrimination has itself been linked with a variety of meaningful negative psychological and job consequences including increased turnover, and degraded engagement and well-being. These outcomes, taken with the financial costs of litigation, make reducing discrimination and enhancing cultural competence a lucrative proposition for organizations. Despite the myth, it is likely that the actual ROI for diversity training programs — taking into account the range of distal outcomes — is quite favorable." (p. 5)

"*Diversity Training is Just Like Any Other Training*
Although the science of training can provide general guidelines for all training programs to follow (i.e., strong evidence supports the need for leader support, feedback, and conducting a needs analysis across different types of training programs), this does not mean that diversity training is just like any other training. First, conducting a needs analysis determines the specific issues in the organization that demand attention and can inform the content of the training. The content of the training has an

influence on the specific outcomes of the training. For example, focusing on race, gender, and disability can change diversity perceptions of these groups, whereas a training program focused on technical skills should only influence the individual's ability to improve that specific skill rather than change their diversity perceptions.

Diversity training programs also may have unique strategies for delivery and design methods that impact effectiveness. Rather than assume that a design method that works for leadership training also will work for diversity training, we need to conduct evaluations to see whether the effect remains. For example, Bezrukova and colleagues' metaanalysis on diversity training found that — contrary to other kinds of training programs — mandatory programs had larger effects on behavioral learning and lower positive reactions than voluntary programs. It is possible that trainees are more impartial to being mandated to learn leadership skills as compared to diversity skills. This suggests that design and delivery methods need to be tailored for the specific type of program." (p. 7)

"*One Session is All That is Needed*
Empirical research has shown that one diversity training session can indeed be meaningful. For example, one session is all it takes to provide trainees with new information, such | as content related to legal and compliance issues or cultural differences. Moreover, one session may be allow trainees to self-reflect on their own biases or engage in perspective taking. However, although one diversity training session can be meaningful and impact diversity-related outcomes, the EEOC (https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/publications/promising-practices.cfm) and scientific consensus on learning and training suggests that training sessions delivered in a larger quantity, over a longer period of time, lead to greater learning and transfer for participants. In general, individuals whose practice is spaced over a period of time perform reliably better on tasks and develop more skills than individuals whose practice is massed into a single point in time. Indeed, meta-analytic studies of diversity training efforts support these theories: Bezrukova and colleagues' analysis found that diversity training programs which are longer tend to be more effective. In their study, programs typically included around 24 h of training total. While longer, temporally spaced diversity training in general leads to better outcomes, quality of training design should still be emphasized in program development." (pp. 7-8)

"*Diversity Training Should Always Be Mandatory*
The question of whether diversity trainings should be mandatory or voluntary has incited some controversy. There exists a large school of thought that believes mandatory training demonstrates organizational buy-in and support, resulting in greater trainee effectiveness. Moreover, requiring participation will also ensure that the training is not just preaching to the choir, but reaching those who

most need it. Many experts thus believe that diversity initiatives must be institutionalized. However, this notion has been challenged by many researchers, who cite the importance of avoiding defensiveness and increasing motivation in trainees. First, voluntary trainings, rather than focusing on remedying past ills, could emphasize the value and organizational benefits of diversity —— that is, not "punishing" but constructively engaging trainees. Second, voluntary programs might enhance trainees' motivation to learn and, ultimately, implement what they learned. At worst, mandating training can increase backlash in its participants. Given these two extremes, experts must approach developing training structures with nuanced understanding. In their review of 43 mandatory and 63 voluntary diversity trainings found evidence for both mandatory and voluntary training effectiveness, Bezrukova and colleagues (2016) found that mandatory management attendance was positively associated with perceived training effectiveness. Ultimately, this area is not yet well-defined; further research should identify the specific conditions under which mandatory enforcement would be superior." (p. 8)

"*Anyone Can Lead Diversity Training*
While it may seem that evidence-based diversity training content should be sufficient regardless of who delivers the training, research indicates that who delivers the training is integral to its effectiveness. Trainers, in particular, hold an influential role in legitimizing and shaping diversity trainings. Given the highly complex and sensitive nature of diversity issues, it is critical to choose experts with appropriate qualifications. Trainers must have both professional/academic knowledge (such as expertise in evaluation, group dynamics, and historical diversity issues) and personal/ interpersonal skills (including communication skills, perspective-taking, and conflict resolution abilities). Rather than defaulting to individuals in the HR department, organizations can carefully consider the needs of their employees and content of the training in order to select the optimal trainers. Research examining the social psychological principles behind these phenomena have illustrated a number of potential causes for these reactions. When confronted about prejudiced viewpoints, perpetrators see a target's confrontation as more of an overreaction than an identical non target confrontation, and target confrontations elicited greater feelings of irritation and antagonism amongst more prejudiced perpetrators (Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. 2003. Confronting Prejudice (Literally): Reactions to Confrontations of Racial and Gender Bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(4): 532-544.). This reaction may be fueled by how perpetrators of discrimination process and interpret ally messages. In particular, when a source's unexpected position violates individual self-interest, they are perceived as more trustworthy; conversely, when it violates group interest, it enhances message processing." (p. 8)

**"*Organizational Leaders Do Not Need to Be Involved in Diversity Training to Maximize Its Effectiveness*

Leaders are important symbols and actors in organizations who establish organizational culture and can have significant effects on their followers through their vision and inspiration. These leaders engage the self-concepts of their followers in the organization's mission and consequently inspire greater motivation. The power of leadership extends to a power to affect and motivate in the context of diversity training. The success of diversity training depends on visible and active leadership, organizational culture, and motivation. Support of diversity from management is necessary to create a diversity climate across an organization.

Leadership participation and valuing diversity training improves that effectiveness of diversity trainings. According to Shen and colleagues (Shen, J., Chanda, A., D'Netto, B., & Monga, M. 2009. Managing diversity through human resource management: An international perspective and conceptual framework. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20: 235-251.) there are three levels of human resources management involvement in managing diversity: strategic, tactical, and operational. At the strategic level, leaders must engage as the driving force behind a vision, mission, and culture supporting diversity. The operational level includes more granular facets or an organization such as training. Both levels of involvement interact to affect diversity in an organization. Leaders should be visibly involved in diversity training to maximize its effects by establishing an organizational culture of diversity and consistently supporting diversity." (p. 8)

"*People from Marginalized Groups Do not Need to Go to Diversity Training*

Because one of the primary ultimate goals of diversity training is to decrease prejudice, stereotypes, and other | biases, and marginalized groups are typically on the receiving end of such biases, it may seem — at the surface — logical that members of these marginalized groups do not need to participate in diversity training. They are not the ones who need to improve, right? Well, not quite. This would be an oversimplification of the nature of bias. " (pp. 8-9)

"While members of marginalized groups are targets of discrimination, they are not immune to holding biases themselves. Biases and discrimination exist both between and within each and every group within society, and this is part of what makes diversity work so challenging. For example, there exists racism in the LGBT community and homophobia in the Black community. These are but two examples of members of marginalized groups possessing biases toward and discriminating against members of other marginalized groups. Categorizing things and people are what humans do, and it is most often unintentional. It is our way of making sense of the world without spending an inordinate amount of cognitive effort sorting through all the information we perceive and need to process.

The benefit of the inclusion of marginalized group members in diversity training does not stop at the reduction of their biases, however. In addition to reducing bias and discrimination, diversity training intervention should enhance knowledge about other social groups; facilitate positive intergroup interactions; and improve trainees' skills, knowledge, and motivation to interact with diverse others –— all goals that would not be possible without the presence and input of members of marginalized groups. Indeed, in their diversity training meta-analysis, Bezrukova and colleagues (2016) found that the more female trainees there were, the more favorable reactions to diversity training were. Moreover, in a similar diversity training metaanalysis, Kalinoski et al. (Kalinoski, Z. T., Steele-Johnson, D., Peyton, E. J., Leas, K. A., Steinke, J., & Bowling, N. A. 2013. A meta-analytic evaluation of diversity training outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(8): 1076- 1104.) found larger training effects on cognitive-based outcomes for training groups that were less than 40% Caucasian, compared to training groups that were greater than 60% Caucasian, and for training groups that were greater than 60% women, compared with training groups that were less than 40% women. These studies underscore the importance of including members of marginalized groups in diversity training —–— not just for their own benefit, but for the benefit of the organization as a whole." (p. 9)

"*Diversity Training is the Only Real Diversity Initiative That an Organization Needs*
Implementing change in people's attitudes and behaviors does not stop at a single training program. The science behind training suggests that they are most effective when complemented by other initiatives. When the organization reinforces the desired attitudes and behaviors, it signals the importance of the training to the trainees. Otherwise, trainees may not understand the true value of the competencies taught and will struggle to sustain the positive outcomes over time. Creating a supportive climate involves implementing initiatives such as organizational and leader support, access to related resources, follow-up sessions, policies, consequences and rewards, continual feedback, and further opportunities to foster continual improvement. This is no exception for diversity training. Many initiatives paired with diversity training can be implemented to magnify its impact. As Bezrukova and colleagues (2016) point out in their meta-analysis, positive outcomes of diversity training were greater when coupled with other diversity initiatives." (p. 9)

"Our review confirms that diversity training is certainly not a passing trend. By addressing relevant myths, we work to dispel inaccuracies in order to improve the implementation of diversity training. By carefully curating the content, design, and delivery of trainings, we can increase overall evaluative accuracy and effectiveness of these trainings. The evidence we described contradicts lay assumptions about training and, in so doing, points to several key features of effective diversity training." (p. 9)

"In sum, we hope this article changes the conversation about diversity training. A large number of varied, sometimes even contradictory, inaccurate beliefs exist. These inaccuracies may arise from a number of sources such as entrenched political ideologies, sensationalized media coverage, and information processing biases. Herein, we leverage common misperceptions toward new theory and practice; by challenging common myths about diversity training, we gain new insight into the many nuances of people and contexts that maximize its effectiveness." (p. 10)

Citation

Dawson, G. A. (2013). Using conversational learning to enhance teaching of diversity. *E-Journal of Business Education & Scholarship of Teaching, 7*(2), 31–38.

Abstract

To function in today's diverse and multicultural environment, workers must be properly prepared; yet teaching diversity is not an easy task. This article explores some of the challenges of diversity and proposes the use of conversational learning to make teaching more effective in preparing students and employees for the workplace. In addition, a model of conversational learning is discussed along with ways to facilitate its use in teaching diversity.

Article Link

https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eft&AN=103281846&site=eds-live

Conclusions

"Conversational learning is a 'process whereby learners construct new meaning and transform their collective experiences into knowledge through their conversations' (Baker, Jensen, & Kolb, 2005 p. 412). This concept has | enormous potential when applied to diversity because it actively engages students in the learning process requiring them to interact with others to listen to and reflect on their experiences. Coombs & Smith (1998) conceptualizes conversational learning as a two-level process – one involving internal reflection framed by the individual's mental model and the other based on social interactions and relationships with others. Martin (1985, p. 10) describes conversation as being circular, cooperative, and constructive interchange of ideas among those who 'come together to talk and listen and learn from one another.' The conversational learning process can conceived as an iterative process of social interaction and internal reflection which is framed by the individual's mental model; yet through the course of conversational learning, the mental model is being reshaped by both the social interaction and the internal reflection." (pp. 33-34)

"So, instead of students relying on the instructor to provide the 'right answer,' each participant brings their individual knowledge and experience, which collectively is much greater, finds meaning, and makes sense of the information. Instead of simply memorizing definitions and examples provided by the text or the instructor, students add their knowledge and personal experiences to the conversation. Through this exchange, students create and share their own interpretations and ideas which expand the knowledge and thoughts regarding the topic or as Neville (2008, p.105) suggests, 'learners are constructing meaning among themselves as well as within themselves and that learners transform their collective experiences – both tacit and explicit – into knowledge.' Each participant not only becomes an active learner, but a contributor in the creation of knowledge. Although the conversation may challenge the way one views the world, it also allows participants to get an understanding of how others view and interpret the world and ultimately creates a broader view and better understanding. The key to making this a successful process lies in getting the participants to talk openly and | constructively about diversity, which is a difficult conversation which Stewart et al. (2008) acknowledges is challenging to facilitate." (pp. 34-35)

"In conversational learning, the role of the instructor is critical and even more challenging than a traditional class. The instructor first has to create a safe environment in which students feel comfortable discussing the 'undiscussable' and engaging in conversational learning. This requires a psychologically safe space that encourages participation, openness, risk taking, nonreactive and nonjudgmental behavior, self-disclosure, and mutual support (Baker, 2004; Sims, 2004). One tool that may assist in this process is the collaborative development of norms for acceptable behavior that faculty and students can use to monitor their own and each other's interactions (Baker, 2004). Giving students reassurance that their comments, experiences, and ideas will be heard, valued, and most importantly that they will not be criticized, helps students feel more comfortable discussing even the most difficult of topics. It is important that students understand the necessity of sharing experiences and ideas as well as listening to and learning from each other. As Martin (1985, p.10) points out, 'A good conversation is neither a fight nor a contest,' and participants should not view each other as adversaries. Even when ideas, experiences, and interpretations differ, we can listen, learn, and be informed by the perspectives of others without having to agree with their point of view. Having students participate in establishing and reinforcing class rules builds a more supportive atmosphere for conversational learning. " (p. 35)

"Once a positive climate is established, Lee & Bertera (2007) suggest the use of technology in the form of an online discussion can be useful. This can allow students who may be self-conscious about talking in class or fearful of not phrasing their questions and comments in a politically correct way to take their time composing their comments before posting them on the online discussion; thus providing an opportunity for all students to contribute to the discussion and learning. In addition, an online discussion board allows for increased conversation and interaction among students outside of the normal class time." (p. 35)

"Conversational learning also requires some shifts in the mindset and the role of the students who need to be actively engaged and take responsibility for the learning process which involves: listening with the intent of learning; reflecting to gain understanding; moving away from the assumption that there is one way of thinking and one right answer or approach; and avoiding reactive behavior by anticipating differences and finding ways to learn from differing perspectives (Sims 2004). In essence, students need to view learning as more of a 'sense-making' process analogous to Karl Weick's question – 'How can I know what I think, until I see what I say?' (Weick 1995, p. 61). To assist in this process, students can be required to maintain a | journal in which they reflect on the class content as well as the discussion. Through this, students engage in an ongoing process of discussion and

reflection to develop the critical thinking skills necessary to handle diversity and to be effective in a business environment characterized by speed, agility, and flexibility (Huber, 2003). In addition, students can be provided with time during class sessions to reflect on the topic and events. One way of doing this is to use a 'think, pair, share' method in which students are given time to process their own thoughts first and then pair up with a classmate to share their thoughts about a topic. This provides for reflection and interaction. In addition, having processed and shared their thoughts with a classmate may enable students to share their insights with the class more freely." (pp. 35-36)

"This shift in the mindset and role of the students also requires a bit of a shift in faculty who will have to be willing to let go of control of the process and outcome to a certain extent (Baker, 2004). This casts faculty as less of a 'sage on the stage' or a 'guide on the side' role and more as a position of a 'meddler in the middle' who is actively involved in co-creating value (McWilliam, 2005, p. 5). This may be somewhat uncomfortable for faculty members who are more commonly the expert and source of information. In a topic such as diversity where each person has experience from their own unique perspective that adds value to the collective knowledge, having the instructor in the role of a co-creator and co-learner is beneficial to all involved. However, it is not an easy role as the instructor carefully balances between monitoring conversation and being careful not to stifle the thoughts and contributions of students, while making sure inappropriate comments are reframed in a positive way that supports and encourages exploration of different views (Kirk & Durrant, 2010)." (p. 36)

"**Practical Tips for Using Conversational Learning**
• Create a safe environment for conversational learning. Collaboratively develop norms for acceptable behavior that can be used to monitor interactions. Encourage students to share in monitoring interactions and creating a positive environment.
• Encourage an environment of mutual respect where students understand that they can disagree without having to be confrontational.
• Encourage students to be open-minded and to listen and learn from the experiences of others.
• Provide opportunities for students to get to know each other through sharing information and trust-building exercises.
• Empower students to take responsibility for their own learning through preparation, sharing, and reflection. Hold students accountable for reading all materials prior to class and engaging in classroom discussions and exercises. |
• Provide opportunities for reflection both inside and outside of the classroom. Use think, pair, share for in-class reflection and journals to encourage students to reflect on the material outside the classroom.

• Monitor interactions and reframe comments when necessary, being careful not to stifle thoughts and contributions of students." (pp. 36-37)

"Using conversational learning in teaching diversity has the potential to make a significant impact in the knowledge gained by students as well as their ability to deal with the diverse environments they will face. Self-reflection and hearing the input and experiences of others allows them to make sense of the diversity issues from multiple perspectives which will better inform their decision-making and interactions with others. In addition, conversational learning will facilitate the development of interpersonal and critical thinking skills as they process the information from different perspectives. This will provide them with a broader base of knowledge as well as the tools to handle the complexity of diversity issues where there are few clear-cut, black/white answers, but many shades of grey." (p. 37)

Citation
Fujimoto, Y., & E.J. Härtel, C. (2017). Organizational diversity learning framework: going beyond diversity training programs. *Personnel Review, 46*(6), 1120-1141.
https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-09-2015-0254

Abstract
To overcome the shortcomings of diversity training programs, the purpose of this paper is to conceptualize an organizational diversity-learning framework, which features an organizational intervention for employees' joint decision-making process with other employees from different statuses, functions, and identities. Borrowing key principles from the diversity learning (Rainey and Kolb, 1995); integration and learning perspective (Ely and Thomas, 2001; Thomas and Ely, 1996), and the key

Conclusions
"The organizational mindset advocated in Ely and Thomas' (2001) integration and learning perspective sees diversity as a valuable resource for rethinking primary organizational activities, thus multiplying organizational insights, skills, and experiences for the main work of an organization (Thomas and Ely, 1996). Ely and Thomas' (2001) approach to diversity learning promotes organization-wide learning between minority group members (who often hold lower hierarchical status) and majority group members (who often hold higher hierarchical status) by challenging 'normative assumptions about organizational strategies, functions, operations, practices, and procedures' (Lorbiecki, 2001, p. 353).
We build on Thomas and Ely's diversity learning perspective by including in our organizational diversity learning framework a method to promote the willingness of managers/employees to learn from others by crossing boundaries of demographics, hierarchies and divisions in a workplace in order to achieve common organizational purposes (cf. Hauser and Benoit-Barne, 2002). The intervention may include direct communication from top management on the importance of learning from different perspectives to achieve organizational goals through various mediums such as company intranet sites, newspapers, posters and leaflets. Research on the institutionalization of deliberative democracy indicates that successful collective decision making often depends on organizational/institutional commitment to devote 'time, energy, funds and patience to its process and be prepared to learn from one another to grow' (Hartz-Karp and Briand, 2009, p. 135). In order to generate effective diversity learning at the organizational level, social capital based on trust needs to be built through continuous reciprocal interactions amongst workers from different backgrounds, hierarchies and functions (cf. Pretty, 2003). Therefore, the organizational diversity learning approach presented in this paper

practices informed by deliberative democratic theories (Thompson, 2008), the authors develop a new organizational diversity learning framework for behavioral, attitudinal, and cognitive learning at workplaces. They conclude with directions for future research.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=124903550&site=eds-live

requires an on-going organizational invitation to workers from different backgrounds, status, and hierarchies to jointly make decisions at the organizational level. Although this process requires time, energy, funds and patience in materializing new perspectives for business growth, it may in turn prove be a more effective utilization of organizational resources as a whole (Hauser and Benoit-Barne, 2002)." (p. 1124)

"With these perspectives as our foundational framework, we incorporate key deliberative democracy practices (Thompson, 2008) for minority and majority group members to jointly | make organizational decisions. Deliberative democracy's practical implementations and empirical studies have proliferated in the political realm, providing a useful insight as to how perspectives of minority group members can be integrated into an organizational decision-making process (Fishkin, 2011; Thompson, 2008). In particular, we emphasize the organization's practical interventions to enhance minority voices and coordinate constructive learning about multiple perspectives in a non-threatening environment for every learner (cf. Lorbiecki, 2001)." (pp. 1124-1125)

"The framework is organized into three phases: before, during, and after participation, laying key conditions for participants' behavioral, cognitive, and attitudinal learning about differences in each phase. Based upon the diversity learning concepts of Rainey and Kolb (1995), we define the behavioral learning of diversity as different social groups learning the utility of an equal opportunity to develop and utilize multiple perspectives; the cognitive learning of diversity as different social groups learning to obtain multiple perspectives and rethinking their own perspectives; and the attitudinal learning of diversity as different social groups learning to enhance appreciation of different perspectives." (p. 1125)

"*The before-participation phase*
This phase provides the pre-context for participants to acquire: behavioral, cognitive, and attitudinal diversity learning.
Behavioral learning pre-context. Before selecting participants, employees and managers need to be informed about the organizational learning initiatives through company newsletters, e-mails and intranet sites through selected organizational topics such as 'Work-Life Balance for All' and 'Inclusive Workplace.' The message can be accompanied by an explicit clause, stating that anyone in the organization is invited to make contributions to making organizational decisions (Hartz-Karp and Briand, 2009). In order to minimize the feeling of discrimination through perceptions and biases of tokenism by | majority and minority members, this open invitation is deemed as a critical first step. Subsequently, applicants are invited to write to top management or the human resource department

stating the reason for their interest in participating (Einsiedel and Eastlick, 2000). Their justification will be used to narrow down a list of potential participants. Third, a final list is produced based upon the following deliberative democratic principles to minimize the context of minority-majority setting and threat/hierarchical effects during participation." (pp. 1125-1126)

Citation
Gebert, D., Buengeler, C., & Heinitz, K. (2017). Tolerance: A neglected dimension in diversity training? *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 16*(3), 415–438.
https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2015.0252

Abstract
To reduce discrimination and achieve a sustainable integration of an increasingly diverse workforce, organizations invest considerable time and money into diversity training. Despite these efforts, corporate diversity training oftentimes is not effective, as it does not sufficiently enable training participants to constructively deal with diversity. We specify the underlying barriers to learning that may cause diversity training to fail: The trainees' tendency to keep quiet about their thoughts or to voice them in a dogmatic manner, which is likely to lead to latent or manifest conflicts, hindering learning. We also show why the currently dominant diversity-training models-- labeled according to their objectives as "equal opportunities," "integrating minorities," and "inclusion via 'me' within 'we'"--do not suffice to overcome these

Conclusions
"As an alternative to the three currently practiced diversity-training models, we propose a tolerance centered diversity training. We define tolerance as acceptance of (a) everyone's right to sustain and express values even if these differ from others' values, and of (b) the obligation to a dialogue oriented practice of communication in which both actor and receiver abstain from superiority claims regarding their own values (cf. Berkovich, 2014; Buber, 1958). According to the first part of this definition, tolerance helps to reduce trainees' not voicing their real thoughts and, as the second part of the definition describes, tolerance also counteracts dogmatic communication. We thus see tolerance as a vehicle to overcoming the barriers to learning in diversity training." (p. 416)

"Dogmatic communication (Stewart et al., 2008) stimulates a spiral of conflicts (Weingart, Behfar, Bendersky, Todorova, & Jehn, 2015) that intensifies this way of communicating. By contrast, the nonvoicing of opposing/deviant views can turn into a spiral of silence (Avery & Steingard, 2008; Bowen & Blackmon, 2003; Jaworski, 1993: 132f), reinforcing non-voicing. Hence, both the dogmatic voicing of deviant views that can lead to an exaggeration of differences and polarization within the training group (Harrison & Klein, 2007), and the non-voicing of deviant views are barriers to learning, because they hinder the emergence of a 'zone of understanding' (Avery & Steingard, 2008: 276). Here, understanding means comprehending the other person's view as reasonable, which in turn increases one's motivation to engage in an exchange with the other. This is essential for a constructive climate of learning in the training group (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011: 217f).
We argue that a positive attitude concerning tolerance as we define it can help overcome the two barriers to learning, dogmatic voicing and non-voicing of opposing/deviant views. Mutual tolerance not only diminishes the two barriers to learning that impair a zone of understanding, but also implies mutual appreciation, thereby facilitating a zone of understanding directly. This underlines the dual relevance of tolerance for learning processes. These learning processes (Figure 1) comprise experiential learning, and thus, a reflection on concrete experiences (Fenwick, 2003: 22f; Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2007: 159ff); dialogue oriented value inquiries (Harms, 1999: 65ff); relational learning as collaborative knowledge creation and coaction (Gergen, 2009: 250); model learning processes through feedback (Hoover, Giambatista, & Belkin, 2012); and unlearning (Hislop, Bosley, Coombs, & Holland, 2014). Over time, these learning processes that in turn benefit the zone

barriers to learning, largely due to dysfunctional beliefs of the trainers, as these shape learning processes, and thus, training success. Proposing that tolerance acts as a vehicle to overcoming the barriers to learning in diversity training, we introduce a training model focused on fostering tolerance and sustained by tolerance-supportive trainer beliefs. We discuss training measures that could aid the development of tolerance in trainees, limitations of our tolerance-centered diversity training, and venues for future research.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=125377234&site=eds-live

of understanding can promote a positive attitude concerning tolerance, even though this attitude might not have—or might have only weakly—existed before. Through a feedback loop, the conditions for learning keep improving through the stepwise reduction of the two central barriers to learning. A positive attitude concerning tolerance is thus a condition and a consequence of tolerance-centered learning. Repeated cycles of this dynamic process may enable constructive dealing with value diversity, even if the respective values are highly salient to people's identity and thus identity-relevant. 'Constructively' dealing with diversity is dealing with diversity in ways that serve the mutual growth of those involved and increases the chance that people will be able to engage in a dialogue—even in the case of opposing values that are highly salient to people's identities—as a means of preventing conflict. In our view, such constructive dealing with value diversity is an essential objective of diversity training (cf. Stewart et al., 2008), and can benefit employee integration, thus fostering fruitful cooperation and company success." (p. 418)

"...We propose to intensify and extend the management of diversity, such that it incorporates the promotion of tolerance as one that involves understanding different social and personal identities, but not necessarily appreciating them blindly. Our model thus aims to protect social and personal identities from potential impositions that arise from some trainers' manifold dogmas. Respectively, the educational goal is not to emphasize a 'spirit of relatedness' but a 'spirit of inquiry' (Baker, 2004: 697)." (p. 423)

"Diversity-training participants will put an emphasis on being valued and accepted by (at least part of) the training group, while simultaneously expressing their uniqueness (Ashforth et al., 2008; Polzer et al., 2002). In contrast to Chavez and Weisinger's (2008) inclusion model that assumes compatibility of the 'me' and the 'we,' we base our model on the theoretically and empirically supported assumption of an incompatibility between the 'me' and the 'we' (Brewer, 1991; Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2006). People must avoid fulfilling one need at the expense of the other (Brewer, 1991). A one-sided focus on one's personal identity ('me') bears the risk of isolation; a one-sided focus on one's social identity ('we') bears the risk of depersonalization. Thus, the required balancing of needs (Kegan, 1982) and their fulfillment reflect a latent intrapersonal conflict that only mutual | tolerance can at least alleviate: The right to express differing values, which comes with the mutual obligation to dialogic communication and abstaining from superiority claims, facilitates individuals' authenticity and belonging to the group." (pp. 423-424)

"To promote the required learning processes (Figure 1), corporate diversity training must appropriately account for its target group: adults (Knowles et al., 2011: 10ff; Merriam et al., 2007).

Adults consider experience reports—which are substantiated by the situation and biographical characteristics of the reporting individual—more stimulating and helpful than recommendations deduced from academic theories only (Fenwick, 2003: 139ff). Even more, an essential goal of many participants in training and education programs is to integrate their own experiences (e.g., as a minority-group member concerning the tension between the 'me' and the 'we') within a broader context, and thus, to deepen understanding of their experiences (Merriam et al., 2007: 423)." (p. 424)

"Against this background, experiential learning (Figure 1) may be suitable in the context of a tolerance centered diversity training (Knowles et al., 2011). Within experiential learning, the interplay of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation is crucial (Kolb & Kolb, 2005). Through reflecting on concrete experiences, the learner develops an overarching meaningful, explanatory, and action related model, termed abstract conceptualization (Harms, 1999: 68). This, in turn, leads to a renewed concrete experience through probing the model by way of active experimentation (Whitehead, 1947: 33ff; 45ff).
In the context of tolerance-centered diversity training, experiential learning can help the learners' emancipation from prejudicial value systems (Kayes, 2002: 139). " (p. 424)

"Throughout the training, the diversity trainer has to point out that values are not necessarily 'revealed,' but can result from the social environment, personal experiences, identity crises, and from the respective coping behaviors that result from these (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Lazarus, 1991). Values and value changes often ensue from social inclusion and exclusion (Shore et al., 2011), and thus, from forms of identification with social groups or from emancipation processes from them (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). To illustrate this, the trainer should act as a role model by using him- or herself as an example (Bandura, 1965; Herdman & McMillan-Capehart, 2010). In terms of educational measures, trainers should first clarify how their own biography has shaped their values. Second, the trainer should make plausible that (and how) these values can be questioned. Third, trainers should also illustrate that they nonetheless endorse these values (and how), as well as elaborate on how they feel in response to this (Berkovich, 2014). Through model learning, a joint reflection upon the trainer's experiences could enable constructive irony as an attractive form of coping with life, rather than just a theoretical option or an escape from the inability to justify one's values." (p. 424)

"To ensure that the trainees tentatively relate this understanding of 'values as socially constructed' and 'socially constructed as opportunity' to themselves, the trainer can use the following questions as educational measures: 'What are the guiding principles in your life?'; 'From your point of view, are those guiding principles linked to your biography or special experiences you made in your life?';

'Have your values changed over the course of your life?'; 'Could you specify at which point in your development you have distanced yourself from the values of others (e.g., parents, peers, church)?'; 'Was this your own decision?'; 'What was the reason for this?' and most important, 'How were you feeling afterward—better or worse?' To employ this 'values as socially constructed' and 'socially constructed as opportunity' approach successfully, a trainer needs to be capable of identifying suitable starting points in the trainees' reports. In this case, educational measures are questions that enable learning by reflecting upon concrete (one's own and others') experiences for the individual and the group (Fenwick, 2003: 190). Given that reports of these experiences are in the form of narratives and stories, inducing narrative learning (Merriam, 2007: 207), this simultaneously stimulates questioning, and thus, a deepened reflection (Merriam et al., 2007: 207ff).

By interpreting values as constructed (Gergen, 2009), alternatives emerge. People can live authentically if they have made their own choices concerning alternative guiding principles (Erikson, 1968). One of the main challenges for the trainer in this context is to highlight that the constructed character of values can imply the loss of taken-for-granted certainties (Fiumara, 1990: 152), but this can also mean an opportunity for autonomy and development. The loss, so to speak, is the price for the potential gain. However, the trainer should refrain from dismissing, for instance, religiously founded values as odd, as this would contradict the tolerance model." (p. 425)

"One educational measure to make trainees reflect on the limits of the justifiability of values could be to raise identity-salient value-related issues that sooner or later matter to everybody, but can be handled in different ways. Examples include self expression values, such as taking care of one's parents at home or accommodating them in a nursing home, adopting an active or passive role in the children's partner choice and marriage, accepting or rejecting divorce or adultery, favoring monogamy or polygamy, adopting prolife or prochoice positions on abortion, or seeing religion as given or chosen. Raising these issues could help highlight people's culturally differing and thus socialization-based approaches to them. As a central educational measure, we suggest a systematic process of reframing. In the first phase, the objective is to discuss and discern the values that can explain differing attitudes toward the above issues. The second phase serves to question these values. This requires a trainer able to reframe values as plausible that may initially seem implausible, as well as those as implausible that at first might seem plausible. This kind of reframing (Cornelissen & Werner, 2014) renders the limits to the justifying one's values as plausible and allows for a stimulating engagement with value dissimilarity.

If the trainees experience that even the opposite of their opinions is coherently justifiable (e.g., concerning divorce), self-critical thought processes can be evoked. As a result, previous tacit assumptions become explicit and hence reflexive (Kayes, 2002; Merriam et al., 2007: 172), and a

tolerance-supportive distance to the trainee's own justification can be promoted. As an educational measure, we therefore do not emphasize the confrontation with different values as such, but specifically with opposing values given that in our understanding diversity training should particularly teach the trainees how to constructively deal with these." (p. 425)

"In this sense, Stewart and colleagues (2008) recommend assigning certain trainees the role of **devil's advocate.** Doing so helps legitimate opposing positions, especially from minorities, which counteracts trainees' belonging to a minority group feelings of exclusion. For minorities (e.g., Black women) who for years have suffered from the pressure to assimilate, to submit to the values of White men and be ashamed of the associated identity losses, to witness this process of loss and to be able to articulate it accordingly is especially important (Hinsdale, 2015: 19; Jaworski, 1993: 118f; Oliver, 2001: 61ff; 147ff). When trainees become trainers, the whole group becomes increasingly independent from the formal trainer, opening up the possibility to engage in self-directed learning (Knowles et al., 2011; Merriam et al., 2007: 122ff). To overcome political correctness that hinders constructive dealing with value differences, trainees then scrutinize their central assumptions. We also recommend that diverse teams of trainers (male and female teachers, teachers with different ethnic backgrounds, or scientists and practitioners) lead single training sessions. This allows showcasing positions opposing | that of the primary trainer or the dominant politically correct position in the teaching process. In our view, this strategy also instigates a critical evaluation of the value-in-diversity and the value-in-equality perspectives and enables an examination of implicit weaknesses of misunderstanding what tolerance means. All above-mentioned educational measures serve the purpose of facilitating reframing aimed at a value related breaking up of formerly favored, socially imparted, and more or less taken-for-granted attributions of definitive truths (cf. Kayes, 2002)." (pp. 425-426)

"The message that there are many truths (Baker, 2004) can serve a bridge-building function. In the inclusion model described by Chavez and Weisinger (2008), this message is already assigned veracity by documentation of the diversity of value related traditions within the commonalities shown (e.g., sharing food or music). In our tolerance model, this message refers to the demand of relativizing one's own position in light of irresolvable barriers regarding the justifiability of values. Compared to the inclusion model that is dominated by emotions and emotional learning (Chavez & Weisinger, 2008), the focus of our tolerance-centered training is more on (experience-based) reflective learning (Boud & Walker, 1991). Our training model may be particularly attractive for more highly educated groups, given their presumed higher willingness to deal with complex problems (Ramsden, 2003: 72f)." (p. 426)

"...Necessary inquiry of value differences results from an understanding of tolerance that enables releasing the burden of endorsing others' values. Inquiring occurs at the core of a dialogue, where potential for engendering learning would remain unused if the dialogue were reduced to an unquestioned exchange of ideas (Berkovich, 2014; Buber, 1958). We see the latter as a risk of the inclusion model, because according to Chavez and Weisinger (2008), it does not explicitly include critical inquiry and the possibility to say no.
Following Gadamer (1975: 326) and Harms (1999: 83), both parties' open questions are imperative for a dialogue to occur. Openness is the process of exposing a matter to different alternatives; open questions thus refer to questions that leave their outcomes undetermined (Harms, 1999: 72). This undetermined nature of mutual questions enables a sufficiently deep inquiry and thus relational learning (Figure 1); that is, learning with and through the respective other (Gergen, 2009; Merriam et al., 2007: 173)." (p. 426)

"Certain preconditions are necessary for both sender and receiver to experience an inquiring dialogue as attractive (Avery & Steingard, 2008). Both parties have to pose questions and answer authentically. At the same time, they must practice a high degree of sensitivity by considering the feelings of the other person. This requires authentic listening— not just listening out of politeness, for tactical reasons to motivate the trainee to continue speaking, or for reasons of narcissistic mirroring in the response of the trainee. Rather, trainers should listen because they consider the trainees' responses potentially conducive to their own learning (cf. Fiumara, 1990: 143ff). This combination of high (content-related) authenticity and high (style-related) sensitivity enables a zone of understanding (Avery & Steingard, 2008: 276)." (p. 426)

"We put forward that this zone of understanding is more likely to emerge when more trainees are willing and able to practice tolerance, as the right to express values and the renunciation of superiority claims facilitate the psychological safety necessary for the inquiry of differences (Baker, 2004) (Figure 1). In this context, the literature points to the relevance of silence (e.g., Baker, 2004: 697). However, the meaning of silence is ambiguous (Ayim, 1997: 28f; Jaworski, 1992: 12ff). Silence can be caused by fear | and can, in turn, elicit fear, reflecting trepidation, which people sometimes try to drown in the "noisiness of idle talk" (Dauenhauer, 1980: 127). This hinders a real dialogue. Silence can however also reflect a meditative thoughtfulness and the listening to one's inner voice, which prompts the individual to revisit his or her own problematic behavioral patterns (Zembylas & Michaelides, 2004). Such silence can mean the origin of new ideas and insights and thus promote dialogue (Dauenhauer, 1980: 140ff; Fiumara, 1990: 143ff). The trainer should minimize silence caused by fear that may dominate at the beginning of the training, and reinforce silence conducive to

dialogue. Encouraging trainees to comment spontaneously may help achieve the latter, which requires mutual trust. This implies that the trainer takes a certain risk through the unpredictability of the training process, which stands in the way of many trainers' wish to control learning processes (Argyris, 1994; Oliver & Gershman, 1989: 162f). Although taking this risk makes trainers vulnerable, it signals to the trainees a willingness for trust and dialogue (Baker, 2004: 697). This in turn supports the psychological safety required to enable the form of silence that is conducive to dialogue." (pp. 426-427)

"From the viewpoint of fostering a dialogue, we must elaborate on preconditions on the side of the trainees as well. Traits such as arrogance, complacency, narcissism, and fault finding may hinder a dialogue (Ayim, 1997). In contrast, open mindeness (Rokeach, 1960) may foster a dialogue and critical self-reflection (cf. Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001). In addition, a dialogue requires trainees to possess specific competences (Roberson, Kulik, & Pepper, 2009). Based on the previous arguments, we consider the following competences conducive to dialogue: First, at the interpersonal level understanding the meaning of a dialogue and its behavioral implications constitutes an important competence, because it simultaneously fosters the willingness to behave dialogically. This competence refers to the three process components of a dialogue: questioning, answering, and listening. With respect to questioning, it comprises understanding the purpose of posing open questions and the negative effects of Plato's closed-question strategy. Answering entails an understanding of the rules of dialogue-oriented answering (understanding, e.g., why using 'correct' in response to one's own remarks and "incorrect" in response to the remarks of one's counterpart contradicts the idea of dialogic communication). Listening requires understanding the meaning of authentic listening and thus listening as a medium for learning rather than a discussion technique." (p. 427)

"Second, the ability to act in ways that benefit dialogue is essential at the interpersonal level as well. In particular, the trainee's ability to self-reflect and self-monitor (cf. Clore & Huntsinger, 2007) in the sense of emotional and cultural intelligence (Erez et al., 2013; Goleman, 1995) is important. With this, we stress the relevance of the ability to view—and, if required, to correct—one's own questioning, answering, and listening (also nonverbally) from the perspective of the respective other through role taking (Bandura, 1965)." (p. 427)

"Third, in addition to these interpersonal competences, we consider the competence of understanding and accepting the basic rules of inquiring about values at the group level important. This competence comprises the understanding and acceptance of how desirable cooperative communication strategies are, such as equal opportunities to initiate or enter the discussion and how undesirable hierarchical

communication strategies are, such as silencing minorities through disregarding their contributions, hogging of conversation, or rude interruptions (Ayim, 1997: 86ff). Because trainees provide one another with feedback—intended or unintended—with respect to their communication behavior, knowledge of basic feedback rules (e.g., to provide specific feedback; Shute, 2008: 177) and the willingness and ability to apply these rules form a vital part of the competence that trainees should acquire. Also, given the considerable potential for conflict in the context of diversity training, it should be of particular importance to raise the trainees' awareness of the dangers of evaluative (instead of descriptive) feedback (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Michaelsen & Schultheiss, 1988)." (p. 427)

"To develop the above-mentioned competences, reflection on concrete experience in the context of experiential learning seems to constitute a promising basis for learning (Merriam et al., 2007). The trainees can actively experiment with new verbal, nonverbal, and strategic (cooperative versus hierarchical) communication behavior and may use feedback to develop a new behavioral model through subsequent reflection on concrete experiences. There are indications that trainees will manage the latter more easily when they have been able to develop a mental model of the respective behavioral pattern ahead of time through observational learning from the trainer's modeling (Hoover et al., 2012). This should be particularly relevant when the trainees' learning requires an unlearning | in the sense of Hislop et al. (2014; see Figure 1). Hislop et al. (2014: 2) define unlearning in contrast to forgetting as a conscious and intentional process of abandoning previous beliefs and practices. Assuming that trainees intend to unlearn certain behavioral patterns in response to negative feedback, they will succeed more easily when they can learn new behavioral patterns from the trainer's modeling to replace their old behavioral patterns." (pp. 427-428)

"Diversity-training groups should be composed as diversely as possible with respect to race, gender, nationality, religion and, more generally, characteristics reflecting minority/majority membership (cf. Homan, Buengeler, Eckhoff, van Ginkel, & Voelpel, 2015). Last, in case of a compact course, participation should be voluntary, even at the risk that those who would need it most may not participate (Homan et al., 2015), because research has repeatedly documented some students' resistance toward such programs (cf. Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009; Stewart et al., 2008)." (p. 428)

Citation	**Conclusions**
Hite, L., & Mc Donald, K. (2006). Diversity training pitfalls and possibilities: An exploration of small and mid-size US organizations. *Human Resource*	"This exploratory project responds to the need for more research on diversity training in smaller organizations by critically examining the diversity training efforts of nine organizations (each with fewer than 4,000 people) located in a mid-size Midwestern US city as an illustration of common concerns of diversity training in small and mid-size systems. This location is reinforced by the Urban

Abstract

This qualitative, exploratory study examines the development and implementation of diversity training in small and mid-size organizations in a Midwestern region of the United States. The results are contrasted with diversity best practices and found lacking in key elements identified as most likely to yield success. Specifically, the organizations in this study did not provide training beyond awareness level, failed to conduct front-end needs assessment, provided little if any in-depth evaluation of diversity training and showed varying support for diversity endeavors from the leadership and through connecting diversity training with other systemic initiatives. The article concludes with recommendations for additional exploration of adapting effective diversity training practices to minimize pitfalls and maximize possibilities in small and mid-size systems.

Limitations

"...The small sample is a limitation of this study." (p. 369)

Article Link

League findings that, compared to the rest of the country, those employed in the Midwestern region of the United States were in the least favorable position regarding their companies' diversity initiatives (National Urban League, 2004)." (p. 366)

"Since there is a dearth of research on this topic, a qualitative approach was chosen for this exploratory study. The goal was not only to discover what diversity training was being offered in small to mid-size organizations, but also to learn how it was approached and supported. Consequently, individual semi-structured interviews were chosen over other methods to gather in-depth information on each organization." (p. 368)

"Organizations were considered for inclusion in the study if they met three criteria: they were in the geographic focal area, anecdotal knowledge suggested they might | have a diversity training program and the organization represented one of the business sectors targeted for the research. A total of twenty-seven companies met the research criteria. Of those, only ten indicated they actually had a diversity training program. The human resources department in each organization was contacted, and nine agreed to participate. Each organization identified those individuals who were involved in a significant way with their diversity training. These individuals, most of whom were affiliated with HR functions, served as the study participants. Three of the interviewees conducted most of the diversity training for their organizations. The rest served as administrators of their diversity programs. Two interviews involved two participants; the other seven included just one interviewee. Eight of the interviewees were female; three were male." (pp. 368-369)

"Variations were evident regarding trainers. One organization developed the program, but had it delivered by outside trainers. Another had their program designed by | an outside firm, but facilitated by people within the organization. Four organizations used a mix of in-house trainers/facilitators and outside presenters, and three relied on staff within the system for all the training. Participants indicated that selection was based on expertise along with interest in and understanding of diversity issues." (pp. 370-371)

"Most of the training discussed by the respondents could be labeled as 'awareness-level training'. Topics included: an explanation of diversity and other terminology (e.g. culture, stereotyping), why diversity is important to businesses, conflict, communication and legal issues. The interviewees listed a variety of instructional methods used in the training. Videos, group discussions, PowerPoint presentations, cases, role plays and workbooks were cited as methods used in the training offered. An interesting contrast in content was noted between two interviewees from different organizations. One

advocated pushing diversity training participants out of their comfort zones, while another clearly wanted the training to avoid controversy and not alienate conservative constituents. This interviewee stressed the importance of finding a 'balanced, tempered approach' to training." (p. 371)

"There was a wide variation in the amount of training available across the organizations studied. The shortest time allotment was one hour, which limited the content to a basic introduction to diversity and its importance to the organization. The longest was approximately eight hours. One interviewee stated that diversity was an integral part of their three-day management training program. Others indicated four hours was a common time allotment. Just as experts vary on the wisdom of mandating diversity training for all (Joplin and Daus, 1997; Wentling and Palma-Rivas, 1998), these organizations varied on requiring diversity training. Four respondents were emphatic about mandatory training; two indicated that, although the training was not mandatory, it was strongly encouraged; two others noted that training participation was left to the discretion of the person in charge of each work unit; and one simply indicated it was voluntary and not enough people attended." (p. 371)

"A common strength cited among most of the programs studied was that the training had a good reputation among recipients. It was so well received in one organization that the representative affirmed, 'It's become embedded in the organization's fabric.' Another respondent echoed this sentiment, stating that 'everyone must live it, like it or not'.
Limitations cited fell into three main categories: level, time and support. Three interviewees acknowledged that the awareness-level training was a limitation and that it was time to offer something more advanced to build beyond awareness and to keep employees engaged in applying what they were learning. Eight of the nine interviews cited time or scheduling concerns as major obstacles, including the challenge of scheduling to accommodate other work priorities, the limited amount of time allotted for training and time to further develop the diversity curriculum. Concerns about support included lack of firm commitment from the senior staff of the organization, as well as comments about limited staffing and money to further develop and conduct diversity training." (p. 371)

"While participants acknowledged the value of training evaluation in determining the progress of diversity initiatives, they indicated that, to date, their organizations had done little to quantify the value of training. Most described using participant satisfaction forms that focused primarily on trainer delivery and perceived usefulness of the session. Those from multinational affiliates outlined plans to implement additional levels of evaluation, such as comparing performance data and feedback with baseline information or focusing on managerial perceptions of training application. Another

interviewee noted that the primary metric was numbers trained, but that the system also monitored recruitment and retention data in comparison with the demographics of the community. A representative from one of the organizations that did not conduct any type of evaluation indicated that was a weakness and that they were exploring ways to gather meaningful evaluative data." (p. 372)

"Responses varied regarding how diversity training supported other initiatives in the organization. Eight of the nine groups in this study noted some connection between the training and one or more other initiatives within their organizations. Six indicated substantive alignment, noting diversity training was part of the culture or supported their mission statements, strategic plans or hiring practices. However, only one of these respondents mentioned specific metrics for tracking diversity infusion. Two participants cited very specific programs like harassment policies and conflict mediation endeavors, rather than systemic-level connections. One clearly felt there was no link with other aspects of the system." (p. 372)

"Several interviewees addressed the importance of leadership support of this initiative. One was disdainful that the organization's leadership had not supported the effort and that the initiative was suffering as a result. Another noted the reduction in time devoted to diversity training when new leadership took over. On the other side was an interviewee in the top leadership position of an organization that had long included diversity in its mission statement. She expressed her personal passion about the topic, stating 'we never do enough'. Another respondent noted that company leaders made a point of addressing every training session as a visible means of support for the program. 'From the time I went to the first train-the-trainer, and I've been through a couple, [the CEO] walks in and when he finishes you are so geared up and motivated...he not only talks the talk, he walks the walk.'" (p. 372)

"One of the points made in the Urban League study (National Urban League, 2004) was that, despite some exemplary work in diversity in large companies, smaller firms, particularly those located in the Midwestern United States, seemed to be far less effective. The results from this study affirm that conclusion, while providing more specific rationale for why that might be so. Three points stand out as particularly problematic: program level, assessment and systemic support.
Despite the well-known limitations of awareness-level-only diversity training, the results of this study show that was the focus of these organizations. Some participants acknowledged that limitation, but there was little indication their programs would change in the near future. To yield credible outcomes, diversity training must encompass understanding and implementation of knowledge and skills. Small and mid-size systems may think they lack the resources for multifaceted training. However,

implementing programs that are either ill conceived or that leave participants frustrated because they lack the skills to use what they have learned will lead to negative, or at best, marginal outcomes." (p. 374)

"To fit the needs of an organization and its associates, training development and delivery should be supported by assessment data, yet the results of this study indicate that these organizations did not employ sufficiently rigorous preliminary or post training assessment. Without a front-end assessment to gather baseline data, to guide potential program focus or to gauge commitment, training is less likely to be effective or to be evaluated at the systemic level. Without adequate post-training assessment, organizations cannot determine if goals actually were met. Data are limited to anecdotal stories to make the case for continuing or modifying diversity initiatives. In general, the lack of training evaluation data results in the loss of reliable indicators of employee behavior changes, data regarding systemic change and training improvement, and participant accountability." (p. 374)

"Systemic support is another critical component of successful diversity initiatives. This is evidenced by visible leadership involvement, allotment of time and resources to the endeavor and a demonstrated connection between diversity training and the culture of the organization. Leadership investment is a well-known criterion for success in diversity endeavors, and one might argue that it is particularly critical for small and mid-sized firms where the senior management is likely to be highly visible and training funds limited. This study revealed instances of too little commitment or lack of prolonged support from senior staff, resulting in training that was hampered by few resources, short duration and insufficient connection to the work of the organization. Unfortunately, these results reinforce Hill and Stewart's observation that small firm 'HRD activities are essentially informal, reactive and short-term in outlook' (2000, p. 114). However, for diversity training to have significant impact, participants must find support in the organizational culture for their new awareness and skills. Otherwise, the discrepancy between what is being taught and what is being practiced is likely to yield resentment. Not to connect what is being taught with what is rewarded means that the organization will fail 'to capitalize on their initial training investment by modeling, supporting, and reinforcing trained behaviors over the longer term' (Rynes and Rosen, 1995, p. 264).

Even without the resources of large multinational corporations behind them, small and mid-size firms can implement credible diversity training initiatives. Their strongest approach is to employ an effective assessment system. While they may have limited staff to devote to training or may even use outsourcing, they can draw upon assessment data to close the learning loop and to solidify the case for continuing or modifying diversity initiatives. Recognizing it may not be feasible to conduct extensive evaluations, data readily available in the organization can be employed for pre- and post-training

	assessment. For example, employment data on hiring, promotions, turnover and salaries may be used as initial benchmarks and later to track diversity progress. A sampling of direct observations or critical incidents may be employed to determine training needs and to gather information about post-training changes in performance. While smaller systems often have fewer resources to devote to evaluation efforts, that limitation reinforces the need for determining how effectively those resources are being used. By effectively accessing and using front-end and post-training assessment data, they are in a better position to advocate going beyond awareness level training and to garner leadership support for integrating diversity training into the strategic goals of the organization." (p. 375) "Rapidly changing workplace demographics and a global economy continue to reinforce the importance of incorporating diversity into organizational culture. Research supports that training is a key factor in establishing and enhancing diversity within systems, but too little is understood about how to maximize success in organizations that lack a large, well-funded infrastructure to support and sustain quality, in-depth training. While it is essential to set goals by highlighting best practices, realistically not every system will be able to initiate the work done in benchmark institutions (Usry and White, 2000). Often, smaller organizations lack the time, resources and depth of support needed to implement an exemplary training program. This is a prime opportunity for collaborative efforts between HRD practitioners and researchers. The challenge for researchers has a dual focus. The first is to foster more research on small to mid-size organizations to better identify how multifaceted diversity training can most effectively and efficiently be implemented in limited resource systems. The second, to push evaluation of diversity training beyond simplistic, self-report, anecdotal data so that practitioners can build stronger cases for the implementation of systemic initiatives that are well thought out, well supported and well received, even in small systems. For HRD practitioners in small and mid-size systems, this study advocates adapting diversity training best practices to fit their organizational cultures and needs. This is a two-fold endeavor. First is recognizing the strengths and limitations of their current systems and deciding which practices hold the most promise, given the culture, available resources and readiness for change. While best practices can provide ideas, efforts to replicate them without recognizing similarities and differences between the organization of origin and the adopting system can lead to negative consequences or a lack of alignment with other systemic processes (Lervik et al., 2005). This concern leads to the second part of the endeavor, determining how to revise or recreate those practices to prompt the most effective implementation and evaluation for their systems." (p. 376)
Citation	**Conclusions**

Holmes, T. A. (2004). Designing and facilitating performance-based diversity training. *Performance Improvement, 43*(5), 13-19. **Abstract** No abstract available. **Article Link** https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=62426372&site=eds-live	"To create culturally empowered environments, organization members must develop a core set of attitudes, behaviors, and skills that allow them to communicate, resolve conflicts, and solve problems with a diverse array of individuals. These culturally empowered professionals possess the ability to create and support environments that improve performance and maximize the likelihood of success for a diverse range of organizational members. This article describes these competencies and introduces a diversity intervention model that can be used to facilitate activities that will improve performance in each of these competency areas." (p. 13) "Unfortunately, fairly few initiatives have had a significant impact on overall performance (Hayles & Russell, 1997). One reason for this is a lack of systematic analysis and intervention, which can lead to a positive impact on individual and organizational performance. Specifically, many organizations have failed to achieve success because the interventions they use lack a coherent framework designed to facilitate development and behavior change in specific areas. The diversity competencies that follow offer such | a framework by identifying the specific skills and abilities needed to perform effectively in culturally diverse settings. The competencies include self-awareness, diversity knowledge, multicultural communication, conflict management, empowering environments, professional development, recruitment and selection, and coaching and mentoring." (pp. 13-14) "The diversity intervention model is offered as a way to identify specific activities and interventions that can be used to improve development in each of the eight diversity competency areas. It is based on the notion that all performance based diversity training should be geared toward developing one or more of three primary learning domains: awareness, knowledge, or skills (Pedersen, 1994). Awareness is the affective domain that involves learning about oneself and the impact that one's behavior, style, and values have on overall effectiveness. **Knowledge** consists of the cognitive domain that focuses on information, concepts, and theories that contribute to effective communication, human interaction, and performance. **Skills,** which is the most significant learning domain, consists of developing behaviors and abilities needed to effectively interact with others and to solve problems in culturally diverse environments (Pedersen, 1994). An effective, performance-based diversity training system can incorporate various educational activities that will facilitate learning in these domains. These activities include skills-based training, feedback programs, developmental assignments, developmental relationships, and self-directed learning activities." (p. 16) "Skills-based training includes classroom sessions and workshops that typically involve one or more of five basic methods: lecture, case study, role play, behavioral modeling, and simulations

(McDonald-Mann, 1998). Lectures can be used to present content-specific information to a large group of people over a relatively short period. They can also incorporate two-way interaction using small group discussions.

Case studies present participants with a specific organizational situation or scenario. The participants review the situation, the outcome, and the behavior of the individuals involved to determine if alternative actions might have yielded a superior result. case studies are effective in provoking thought, facilitating discussion, and improving overall knowledge (McDonald-Mann, 1998).

Role plays are participative exercises in which participants act out characters assigned to them in a specific scenario (Thiagarajan, 1996). They provide each trainee with the opportunity to practice skills he or she has learned and are useful for developing interpersonal skills such as conflict management, communication, and coaching.

Behavioral modeling, which is based on social learning theory (Bandura, 1986), takes role playing one step further. It provides participants with an opportunity to observe behavioral models, to practice the desired behavior, and to receive feedback on their performance. Of all the skills-based training methods, behavioral modeling is the most important because it provides learners with an opportunity to observe the desired behavior and continuously practice the behavior in a relatively safe environment. The primary benefit of this form of development is enhanced skills and increased ability to employ specific behaviors as needed (McDonald-Mann, 1998).

Finally, simulations are also similar to role plays in that they apply a specific scenario and ask participants to act out identified roles. However, simulations provide information that is more detailed and structured for the learner. In practice, simulations are typically longer in duration and more complex than standard role plays." (p. 16)

"Feedback programs are specifically designed to enhance participants' self-awareness through the use of various assessment inventories and feedback sources. Trainees have the opportunity to learn more about their strengths and weaknesses in a particular area (e.g., communication skills) by systematically receiving both positive and constructive input from relevant sources such as customers, employees, colleagues, and supervisors.

One of the most popular types of feedback programs is 360° feedback. This consists of systematically collecting opinions about an employee's performance from superiors, subordinates, and colleagues. The main purpose of this process is to give the people receiving the feedback a clear understanding of how others view them and how their behavior impacts those around them (Chappelow, 1998)." (p. 16)

"Another type of feedback is delivered through feedback intensive programs. Guthrie and Kelly-Radford (1998) describe feedback-intensive programs as a comprehensive approach to assessment and

feedback that focuses not only on skills and behaviors, but also on the values and personality-based preferences that influence our behavior. An intense classroom-based learning experience typically takes place away from work and offers participants feedback from multiple perspectives through various instruments and experiences. Feedback-intensive programs differ from 360° feedback in that there is greater depth about underlying personality aspects and how they affect the individual's behavior. Whereas 360° feedback provides the person | with a broad picture of strengths and weaknesses in several work-related areas, feedback-intensive programs look deeper into personality traits and concomitant needs, preferences, and values." (pp. 16-17)

"Developmental assignments such as on-the-job training are among the oldest forms of employee development. They give participants the opportunity to learn by doing since they are working on real problems and concerns related to the desired areas of development. Indeed, research indicates that many individuals, especially those in leadership positions, have reported that job experiences are their primary source of learning (McCaIl, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1988; Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1987; Wick, 1989).
Developmental assignments include both structured and unstructured on-the-job learning experiences. Structured experiences are far more effective than unstructured activities in terms of efficiency and overall learning results (Jacobs, Jones, & Neil, 1992). Structured activities incorporate a systems approach that includes planning, designing, implementing, and evaluating the learning experience. Training goals are identified beforehand, and an on-the-job intervention is created to achieve those specific goals (Jacobs, 2002).
Developmental assignments can take various forms. They can consist of an entire job, a particular piece of a job, a new job, or duties added to a current job. They can be short term projects, or activities that last for a longer period (Ohlott, 1998). Whatever the form, the most important aspect of the assignment is that it provides the learner with a chance to learn new information or develop specific skills in a predetermined area that will positively impact individual performance." (p. 17)

"Developmental relationships are another common form of management and employee development. Most people can articulate a specific instance in which they benefited from the guidance and advice of another person, whether it was a boss, colleague, friend, or relative. What these situations have in common is development of a relationship with someone who takes a personal and professional interest in the individual's success.
Developmental relationships can take various forms, but two of the most popular are coaching and mentoring. Both are designed to provide interactions that allow individuals to improve their personal and professional development. As discussed earlier, coaching and mentoring have some differences,

but they share three common elements: assessment, challenge, and support-roles played by the coach or mentor (McCauley & Douglas, 1998).

Assessment is the process, both formal and informal, of providing feedback. In a developmental relationship, one of the key roles the coach or mentor plays is that of feedback provider. The person serving in this role observes the protégé and provides proper feedback. This person also serves as a sounding board to provide feedback on strategies and ideas, and as a feedback interpreter to help the protégé make sense out of input received from others.

Challenge refers to pushing the protégé beyond his or her comfort zone to achieve higher levels of performance. This includes offering different points of view, providing challenging assignments, and being a good role model by showing examples of both high and low performance in the areas being developed.

Finally, support refers to the socioemotional support that is needed to help protégés deal with difficult developmental experiences. Coaches and mentors provide encouragement, allow individuals to vent frustrations, and listen during difficult situations without being judgmental. Support also includes helping protégés feel that they are not alone in their struggles and helping them understand that success is possible, even in the most difficult of times." (p. 17)

"Self-directed learning refers to training and development interventions that are primarily managed by the learner. The learner takes full responsibility for his or her development by determining educational needs, identifying self-managed interventions that will meet those needs, and creating a schedule to use those interventions. This can result in a more cost-effective, flexible way to meet training requirements (London, 1989). Self-directed learning activities include, but are not limited to, books and periodicals, audiotapes and videotapes, e-learning, and distance learning.

Books, periodicals, audiotapes, and videotapes can be an efficient means of collecting information on a particular topic. E-learning, which has grown significantly in popularity, includes a wide range of educational activities such as computer-based training, web-based training, electronic performance support systems, webcasts, listservs, and other Internet discussions. E-learning can include anything from off-the-shelf CD-ROM training to accessing course materials and instructors through the World Wide Web (Broadbent, 2001]. Distance learning involves physical and/or temporal separation between the learner and instructor. In this instance, some application of technology is typically used to bridge the gap and to facilitate the learning process." (p. 17)

"The diversity intervention model outlined in Figure 1 describes specific activities and interventions that can be | used to improve development in each of the eight diversity competency areas. Most importantly, it helps identify the learning interventions that will be most effective given a trainee's

diversity development needs. For instance, self-awareness is most closely tied to the awareness learning dimension. To improve this competency, it is best to provide learners with feedback-oriented interventions such as the 360° feedback or feedback-intensive programs discussed earlier. Skills-based training with a self-assessment component can also be effective at helping participants gain a better understanding of their behavior and its potential impact on others." (pp. 17-18)

DIVERSITY COMPETENCY	KEY ATTITUDES, KNOWLEDGE, AND SKILLS	PRIMARY LEARNING DIMENSION	PRIMARY INTERVENTIONS
Self-Awareness	Aware of own communication style, work style preferences and biases, and impact on interactions with others	Awareness	Feedback programs Skills-based training with a self-assessment component
Diversity Knowledge	Knowledge of diverse cultures and how various diversity issues affect the workplace	Knowledge	Skills-based training Self-directed learning
Multicultural Communication	Communicates effectively with people who are culturally different and possesses a wide variety of interpersonal communication skills	Skills	Skills-based training Developmental assignments
Conflict Resolution	Resolves conflicts, particularly those that are diversity based, and can apply various conflict-management techniques	Skills	Skills-based training Developmental assignments
Empowering Environments	Knows and follows all policies and laws about harassment and discrimination, and challenges biased and discriminatory behavior	Knowledge	Self-directed learning Skills-based training
Professional Development	Involves self in continuing, diversity-based development activities; receives both positive and constructive feedback and seeks mentoring	Knowledge	Developmental relationships (protégé) Skills-based training
Recruitment and Selection	Applies various tools and techniques to recruit high-quality, culturally diverse candidate pools and makes valid selection decisions	Skills	Skills-based training Developmental assignments
Coaching and Mentoring	Develops effective mentoring and coaching relationships with a diverse array of individuals; provides both positive and constructive feedback, and helps employees effectively network	Skills	Skills-based training Developmental relationships (coach or mentor)

Figure 1. The Diversity Intervention Model.
(p. 18)

"Multicultural communication, conflict resolution, recruitment and selection, and coaching and mentoring are most directly linked to the skills learning dimension because the primary focus is on developing the ability to employ specific behaviors. Therefore, skills-based training-where learners

can observe behavioral models, continuously practice the behavior in a safe environment, and receive feedback on their performance-is ideal. To facilitate training transfer and provide the greatest opportunity for proficiency in the desired skills, it is important to provide complementary job experiences where learners can use their newly developed skills (McDonald-Mann, 1998). This can be done through structured on-the-job experiences or, in the case of the coaching and mentoring competency, developmental relationships with the learner serving as a coach or mentor. Diversity knowledge, empowering environments, and professional development are most closely tied to the knowledge learning dimension because the educational focus is on learning specific information and concepts. Self-directed learning and content-focused skills-based training (e.g., case studies and discussion activities) can be effective at facilitating the cognitive development necessary to perform well in these competency areas, especially the diversity knowledge and empowering environment competencies. Improving the professional development competency can also be facilitated through content-focused skills-based training and creating developmental relationships where the learner serves as the protégé." (p. 18)

Citation Hughes, C. (2018). Conclusion: Diversity intelligence as a core of diversity training and leadership development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 20*(3), 370–378. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422318778025 **Abstract** Problem: Leadership development is a core part of training, education, and career management strategies in organizations. Yet, leaders are not translating what they learn about protected class employees during leadership development initiatives back to the workplace. Solution: Diversity intelligence should be added to organizational diversity and leadership development training and education	**Conclusions** "This journal issue helps to answer the question: How can DQ [diversity intelligence] (Hughes, 2016) influence employee performance if follower trust in the leader has the most impact on employee performance? (Mayer & Gavin, 2005; McColl-Kennedy & Anderson, 2002)." (p. 371) "Human Resource Development (HRD) professionals and scholars have suggested that diversity training and/or education is the solution to the problems; yet, the treatment of protected class employees is still a concern in many workplaces. Perhaps, the content of the training and/or education needs to change. A focus on the historical context and specific examples should be shared. First, there needs to be an acknowledgment that much of what has been done has not succeeded. Second, an acknowledgment that many HRD professional and scholars have not studied or valued the lived experiences of protected class group members and have been selective in which topics are deemed worthy of mass attention (i.e., sexual harassment and gender issues). Issues of racism and disability have received less coverage in the HRD literature. There is a significant difference between one's understanding and frame of reference for racism in theory versus those of us who have had lived experiences of racism in practice. Finally, for DQ to work, one must first hear those who are affected by discrimination, understand discriminatory actions and effects, and respond in ways that are nonbiased and/or non-detrimental. Discrimination and discriminatory actions and actors must be challenged. Those who challenge discriminators must be encouraged and equipped to and for change. Discriminators must also be held accountable for their actions." (p. 372)

initiatives. With DQ as a core of the training and education initiatives, leaders may acquire the needed ability to translate what they learn to actual practice. A conceptual model for DQ as a core of leadership development and typology of leaders with low and high DQ are provided. They will be able to better lead their protected class followers because they will know who they are and how to enhance their performance. Stakeholders: Workplace leaders, diversity trainers, educators, and career management professionals are provided ideas for enhancing their diversity improvement efforts. Implications for Human Resource Development professionals and researchers are also offered.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=130723472&site=eds-live

"DQ has the potential to influence change within leadership development if it is integrated into diversity training and education programs. The DQ conceptual model brings together key theorizing and findings from different authors into one framework. The emphasis in DQ is on understanding diversity, equitable treatment of protected class followers, development of diversity leadership capability, workplace productivity of all employees, reduced turnover because of discrimination, and motivation of protected class followers.

If content developers are willing to adjust their content and activities to include DQ concepts, leader behavior may change through better understanding of protected class groups, equity treatment of all employees, and they will gain diversity leadership capability. One has difficulty leading those who do not trust them (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Leaders will potentially gain followers whose well-being are protected from discrimination which may subsequently lead to a reduction in turnover, improved job productivity, and increased motivation." (p. 373)

"The DQ model (Hughes, 2016) describes a mind-set and behavior change for leaders and followers. The majority of employees in the workplace are in protected class groups even if they do not know it. Perhaps, if they understood this better, internal fighting may be reduced, a level playing field could be developed through equitable treatment of all employees, and valuing of all employee contributions. A minority of employees are not in protected class in the workplace. Presumably, if this was known, an elimination of denial would occur to the extent that some employees, particularly, White males, would | stop feeling threatened by true minority employees while holding power. White males introduced the term diversity in the workplace so they could be included in perceived preferential treatment initiatives and to displace Affirmative Action (Peterson, 1999)." (pp. 373-374)

"DQ is different than just acceptance of differences and bias reduction which are often the targets of diversity training. Although discussion of DQ seems to cover very familiar content (e.g., knowledge of laws and regulations), these articles reveal that it is much more than that. It is a call for actionable change by leaders. From a typology based theorizing perspective, there is a difference between leaders who have high DQ and those who have low DQ (see Figure 2)." (p. 374)

DQ	Leader Behavior	Follower Well-being
High DQ	• Understanding • Equity • Diversity leadership capability	• Protected from discrimination • Reduced turnover • Improved job productivity • Increased morale and motivation
Low DQ	• Lack or low understanding • Inclusion but not equity • Inability to provide diversity leadership for protected class followers	• Exposed to unfettered discriminatory actions • High turnover • Low productivity • Low morale and motivation

Figure 2. Typology of DQ and leader behavior and follower well-being.
Note. DQ = diversity intelligence.

(p. 374)

"Most of the literature on training emphasizes accounting for the organizational context in which trainees have to transfer their learning. DQ is the capability of individuals to recognize the value of workplace diversity and to use this information to guide thinking and behavior. Through participation in leadership development programs that contain diversity lessons, leaders can acquire, develop, and integrate DQ. Without effective DQ, adverse relationships between and among employees occur, and the effectiveness and productivity of employees is lessened (Hughes, 2016). Organizations are diverse and must address diversity of thought and behavior of all employees despite their class affiliation." (p. 374)

"Leaders are provided IQ, EQ, and CQ training and development to develop their ability to lead followers. Leaders are also provided diversity training; yet, quantifiable success has been eluded, as some leaders' and employees' thoughts and actions have not improved. The search for the right type of diversity training including inclusiveness and equity may be futile when those providing the training have little to no frame of reference to provide the training and leaders receiving the training have little desire to transfer what they learn back to the workplace (Hughes 2016; Hughes & Byrd, 2015; Sternberg, 1999). DQ bridges this gap within diversity training initiatives. DQ may also provide consistency of content using a definition of diversity clearly understood by leaders. When followers and leaders embrace their personal role in the change process to integrate diversity into the organization, change efforts will be successful. Leaders often serve as extrinsic motivators for followers (Isaac, Zerbe, & Pitt, 2001; Park & Rainey, 2008; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). DQ is one more tool to add to leaders' skill-set." (p. 375)

	"Scholars in this compilation of articles have provided many examples of how HRD researchers and practitioners could examine the extent to which leaders use DQ to make employee development decisions. For the American economy to significantly improve, corporate leaders must harness human resources more efficiently by utilizing the talent of all employees (Etsy, 1988; Frank, Finnegan, & Taylor, 2004; Jayne & Dipboye, 2004). To do so, leaders need to possess DQ. DQ arms them with the skill to not just understand emotional, cultural, and intellectual differences, but equips them to | integrate people with different skill levels and cultural backgrounds to contribute at an optimum level toward meeting corporate goals. Within globalized workplaces diversity is commonplace but despite millions of dollars expended on diversity training, leaders and employees are often frustrated because of unrealized goals, discomfort, and feelings of underutilization. Protected class employees are often described as not a fit for the organization. Helping leaders to understand that protected class employees already fit into and their contributions need to be better integrated into the workplace benefits all employees." (pp. 375-376)
Citation King, E. B., Gulick, L. M. V., & Avery, D. R. (2010). The divide between diversity training and diversity education: Integrating best practices. *Journal of Management Education, 34*(6), 891–906. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562909348767 **Abstract** The fields of diversity training and diversity education have developed in a disconnected manner. This divide ensures that each field advances slowly and with narrow focus. The authors argue here that the divide should be bridged with attention to the best practices that diversity training and diversity education offer. By integrating the best that each perspective has to offer as outlined here, both fields of inquiry and practice may be enhanced.	**Conclusions** "Both types of programs, diversity training and diversity education, have become increasingly common…In the current article, we argue that emerging research and practice should take advantage of the frameworks supported by these parallel research streams by integrating these previously isolated areas." (p. 892) "Based on a survey of more than 100 diversity trainers, Bendick et al. (2001) developed a comprehensive list of benchmarks for diversity training that echo the three themes described in this article: linking diversity to main organizational goals, tailoring training for clients, possessing strong support from top management, including employees from all levels, influencing the corporate culture, employing experienced and qualified trainers, discussing discrimination as a general process, addressing individual behavior, and aligning training with HR practices. Many of these characteristics are helpful for the successful implementation of most HR interventions, but the complexity of the content in, and extremity of reactions to, diversity training make these benchmarks necessary. In each of these ways, research and practice regarding diversity training informs an understanding of effective approaches for communicating information regarding diversity. Research and practice in diversity education takes a somewhat different approach, thereby offering an additional perspective." (p. 894) "Although traditional models of university education emphasized rational thought and intellectual capacity (Harrison & Hopkins, 1967), more contemporary educational perspectives have integrated experiential-based forms of learning that include the acquisition of knowledge, awareness, and skills.

Article Link https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2010-24086-008&site=eds-live	Best practices in education include student–faculty contact, cooperation and reciprocity among students, active learning, prompt feedback, high expectations, and respect for diverse talents and ways of learning (Chickering & Gamson, 1991). With regard to diversity education, drawing from Raelin's (1997) model of learning, Avery and Thomas (2004) suggested that diversity courses should address both explicit and tacit knowledge through strategies such as making the business case for diversity, encouraging self-evaluations and the application of concepts through experiential learning, and providing structured opportunities for intergroup contact." (p. 895) "...A training framework underscores the need for careful analysis of the needs of participants, the importance of context and top-down and bottom-up influences, the benefits of focusing on skills and behaviors, and the importance of demonstration and practice. Unlike the training framework, the educational | model highlights the need to address awareness, appreciation, and understanding of one's personal attitudes and beliefs, as well as global and specific knowledge regarding diversity. In the next sections, we will describe specific ideas regarding the manner in which these best practices may be implemented." (pp. 896-897) "In accordance with the advice given to diversity trainers (Roberson et al., 2003), educators might consider implementing precourse assessments of student characteristics. Individual-level needs analysis would facilitate understanding of students' knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) regarding diversity competence. In particular, Roberson et al. (2003) emphasized the importance of assessing the strength and direction of trainees' attitudes toward diversity (e.g., how committed trainees are to gender equity), exposure to diversity-related issues (e.g., previous diversity training experience), potential inconsistencies between diversity-related attitudes and behaviors (e.g., desire to be egalitarian but engagement in unintentional discrimination), and trust in the instructor and classmates (e.g., whether students are familiar with each other). The work of Wiethoff (2004) suggests individuals' motivations regarding diversity might also be of relevance for assessment. These constructs might be assessed through self-report survey methods with existing scales such as the Receptivity to Diversity Survey (Soni, 2000), the Pluralism and Diversity Attitude Assessment (Stanley, 1992), diversity related variations of the Implicit Associations Test (Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2008) or the attitudes toward workplace diversity scale (De Meuse & Hostager, 2001). The nature of this assessment could vary depending on the preference of the instructor; an e-mail could be sent prior to the first day of class, or the first class assignment might be to complete a series | of measures. Moreover, the questions and/or scores on these measures might serve as a springboard for classroom discussion." (pp. 897-898)

"...Diversity trainers have also emphasized the importance of top management support (Bendick et al., 2001) in creating and sustaining positive climates for diversity as well as enhancing outcomes of diversity training programs. Although it is not necessarily typical for instructors to involve the overarching university in their classes, consideration of the status of the university with regard to composition and climate may be critical (Avery & Thomas, 2004). In addition to this macro-level consideration of the institution as a whole, it may also be helpful to focus more narrowly on the composition and climate experienced directly by students; for example, it is important to consider not only the cultural composition of university staff but also the student population. An organizational needs analysis might be implemented to formally evaluate contextual and top-down influences that emerge from the overall institution as well as the student subpopulation of the institution. This would elucidate relevant factors by examining the results of employee and student climate surveys, university equal employment opportunity statistics, and written statements regarding institutional values and missions related to diversity among faculty, staff, and students (Roberson et al., 2003)." (p. 899)

"Understanding the nature of the institution as a whole will help instructors predict student expectations and, perhaps more important, the barriers that students might encounter in enacting the KSAs achieved in the course. Research on training outcomes has demonstrated that the climate of the organization dictates the likelihood of posttraining transfer (see Salas & Canon-Bowers, 2001), or in other words, that the implementation of trained knowledge and skill is most likely in conditions that enable and support practice of these behaviors. This logic can be applied to diversity education; instructors must give students a realistic preview of the world in which their diversity competency will be implemented after the conclusion of the course. There are two primary dimensions that instructors might consider: demographic diversity and climate for diversity in the organization (see Cox, 2001). Institutions characterized by high levels of demographic diversity and support for diversity likely represent ideal environments for the transfer of diversity management competencies obtained in diversity courses. This type of environment can be contrasted with universities wherein the representation of diverse individuals is scarce despite genuine effort to create a supportive climate. In such contexts, educators may need to offer students opportunities to engage with communities external to the institution to practice and master the skills they have learned (e.g., service-learning experiences). Instructors teaching in universities where a positive climate for diversity has not yet been established might incorporate a case study assignment that requires students to critically analyze the school and develop suggestions for its improvement. Like diversity training, diversity education may benefit from careful consideration of organizational-level influences." (pp. 899-900)

"An 'action learning' approach (e.g., Paluck, 2006) might involve students identifying a diversity-related issue they have encountered, discussing the problem and options for its resolution, formulating an action plan, and monitoring of outcomes. An instructor might also include an action-oriented project that integrates classroom topics by requiring students to develop and implement a diversity-related program in their school or workplace. The first author of the current article requires graduate students in a diversity seminar to develop a program that would address a diversity-related issue that they have encountered in their daily lives. Group projects have included brochures | outlining strategies for confronting peers about their prejudice, recruitment materials designed to appeal to minority job applicants, and blueprints for an organizational change initiative. Student evaluations of these projects are generally positive with regard to both learning and enjoyment; they report feeling challenged but excited about the opportunity to apply the information that they are learning to real-world diversity-related obstacles. The assumption that underlies these projects, as well as many of the strategies employed in diversity training, is that providing learners an opportunity to apply their knowledge will enhance the likelihood that they will do so once the course has concluded." (pp. 900-901)

"One strategy trainers use to increase the likelihood that diversity-related skills are implemented beyond the class itself involves practice. Research has demonstrated that the timing and type of practice can influence its effectiveness (e.g., Holladay & Quinones, 2003). These findings have direct implications for education; it is critical that instructors incorporate sufficient opportunities to practice the diversity-related skills. Moreover, it is important that students are exposed to a wide range of practice experiences so that they do not automatize a particular set of responses that may not generalize outside the classroom or across situations. This means that instructors in diversity management courses must not rely on a single case study or role play exercise but rather include multiple and diverse opportunities for students to practice diversity-related skills. In our own classes, we have found service-learning projects particularly useful in this regard. Working with students and contacts in the community, we have designed projects that allow students the opportunity to interact with and learn from individuals who are demographically different than themselves. For instance, we have established volunteer programs at homeless shelters and retirement communities and a tutoring program at a local school for the blind. Participating in these ventures allowed our students to apply and refine knowledge and skills they learned in the classroom in real-world settings." (p. 901)

"Our primary focus here is on informing diversity management education, but we argue that parallel contentions can be made with regard to the implications | of diversity education on diversity training. For example, the focus in education on knowledge and attitudes highlights the possibility that

diversity training may move too quickly to skill development without sufficient exploration of the cognitive and affective processes that underlie prejudice and discrimination. Trainers might benefit from integrating exercises and activities that educators use to address diversity-related attitudes and beliefs such as the brown eyes/blue eyes activity (see Stewart et al., 2003), a racial awareness exercise (e.g., Kulik, 1998), or one of the dozen activities described by Muller and Parham (1998). Focusing solely on behaviors without addressing the attitudes underlying them may prove ineffective in reducing bias in organizational decision making." (pp. 901-902)

"In addition, the education model encompasses testing procedures that require learners to achieve a standard (i.e., passing) level of performance. Progressive organizations (e.g., Sodexho) have begun to integrate metrics related to diversity competence in performance management systems. Kalev et al.'s (2006) findings suggest that these efforts might not increase the representation of minorities in managerial roles, but rewarding behavioral indicators of diversity management competence may be a powerful way to ensure that employees enact the objectives of training. Thus, performance standards may be helpful outside the classroom. As an interesting example, a university for which one of the authors worked required Web-based diversity training seminars for faculty and staff. In addition to mandatory 'attendance,' participants also were required to pass an online proficiency exam at the conclusion of the seminar to receive credit. This provided the university some degree of quality control in assuring that attendees of the training program met or exceeded the preset performance standard." (p. 902)

"Finally, high-quality diversity education includes frequent and structured feedback that may not be common in diversity training. Feedback can include performance scores on tests and assignments, but the term is used here to refer to the broader process of advising individuals on the areas in which they might be strong as well as those in need of improvement. Many organizations rely on annual review systems that do not incorporate assessment of diversity related behaviors, and diversity training evaluation systems do not typically | assess longitudinal effects. This type of feedback can easily be included in assessment tools such as 360-degree feedback, where an individual is rated by supervisors, peers, and subordinates on their exhibition of appropriate and desired diversity-related behaviors. This information provides individuals with feedback on their current behavior and can provide the opportunity to monitor progress over time, if assessed at multiple time periods. Feedback is an integral component of behavioral change; thus, provision of constructive and immediate feedback regarding performance of diversity-related behaviors may help improve the efficacy of diversity training programs, as well as potentially enhance trainee motivation." (pp. 902-903)

"The amalgamation of these and other best practices in education and training may guide future research and practice. Moreover, bridging this divide should result in more effectual diversity instruction across settings, producing more informed graduates and more effective organizations. We contend that careful consideration of the strengths of each approach will provide insight into future efforts to improve university and organizational settings." (p. 903)

Citation
Kowal E., Franklin H., & Paradies Y. (2013). Reflexive antiracism: A novel approach to diversity training. *Ethnicities, 13*(3), 316–337.

Abstract
This article introduces the concept of reflexive antiracism as a response to two major critiques of antiracism theory and praxis: the dangers of essentialism and the elicitation of counter-productive emotional reactions. The article explores these critiques as they apply to two broad approaches to diversity training: cultural awareness and antiracism. Reflexive antiracism offers an alternative to existing approaches through a focus on racialisation and the formation and maintenance of racialised identities in particular. An emphasis on the paradoxes of racialisation and the contingencies of minority and white antiracist identities can promote a realistic and productive understanding of diversity training that may avoid the pitfalls of existing approaches. To conclude, an outline of factors that contribute to reflexive antiracism praxis are presented, drawing

Conclusions
"...We have sought to develop an approach to antiracism that seeks to avoid essentialism and provide tools to effectively manage reactions such as guilt and anxiety. The experience of two of the authors (EK and YP) in teaching, over a nine-year period, a diversity training course for white people working with Indigenous Australians informs this approach. Operating through the lens of reflexivity, this approach is premised on three theoretical foundations: constructionism, racialisation and processes of identity formation." (p. 324)

"Reflexivity is both a theoretical tool and a research method in many academic disciplines. Used as 'a strategy for situating knowledges' (Rose, 1997: 306), it requires that the researcher reflect on their own background and 'cultural baggage', and their relation to research subjects (De Jong, 2009). Whilst the notion of reflexivity has been employed extensively in academia (e.g. Bourdieu, 2004; Etherington, 2004), it is gaining increasing recognition as a tool to critique cross-cultural practices within health care and social work (De Jong, 2009; Kondrat, 1999; Murray-Garcia et al., 2005). Reflexivity has been found to enhance learning in diversity training and lead to more flexible behaviours (Lillis and Hayes, 2007; Chick et al., 2009). In relation to prejudice, greater awareness of the process of one's own | thinking has been associated with minimising bias (Murray-Garcia et al., 2005). Reflexive individuals may be more willing to 'take risks, to view mistakes as part of the learning process and to grow and change' (Johnston, 2009: 649) and to engage 'with issues such as racism and colonialism' (Pon, 2009). To be effective antiracists, particular aspects of reflexivity are required. Specifically, there is a need to avoid essentialising minorities as 'good' and essentialising white people as 'bad'. White people, in particular, need to recognise how they benefit from privilege without becoming mired in guilt and anxiety. Although they can and should try to be ever cognisant of their privilege, they need to accept that they cannot erase their whiteness." (pp. 324-325)

"Drawing from Paradies (2005: 3), racialisation is defined here as: Societal systems through which people are divided into races, with power unevenly distributed (or produced) based on these racial classifications. Racialisation is embodied through attitudes, beliefs, behaviours, laws, norms, and practices that either reinforce or counteract power asymmetries. Racialisation is used here in a

on examples from an existing diversity training course.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.43586587&site=eds-live

descriptive sense rather than a critical one.10 Within a racialised societal system, actions can either enhance or reduce power asymmetries between two (or more) racial/ethnic groups. Racism and antiracism can be defined on this basis. For instance, antiracism can be defined as action that reduces power differentials. This usually occurs through advantaging subordinate racial groups and/or disadvantaging dominant racial groups (Paradies, 2005). Racism can be defined as the opposite (i.e. action leading to an increase in power differentials between two racialised groups). This usually occurs through advantaging dominant racial groups and/or disadvantaging subordinate racial groups." (p. 325)

"Reflexive antiracism allows antiracists to recognise that, within a racialised field, the division between racism and antiracism is often unclear and in flux. As white people working in a racialised field where members of minority groups routinely experience race oppression, they are perpetually susceptible to accusations of racism, either by other white antiracists or by members of minority groups. Consequently, they need to be secure enough in their identity to respond reflexively in such situations. Reflexive antiracism is therefore characterised by a reflexive stance towards one's own and others' attitudes, beliefs and behaviours while striving towards both equanimity in emotional reactions and a positive white identity. A reflexive antiracist approach encourages reflection on, and ultimately acceptance of, these tensions (Helms, 1994). This is similar to what O'Brien has termed 'reflexive race cognizance' (2001: 56) and to the inherent ambiguity and tensions between white privilege and antiracism recognised within 'White dialectics' (Todd and Abrams, 2011)." (p. 326)

"Reflexive antiracism has some elements in common with Helms's final autonomy stage of WRI [White racial identity development]. Like those Helms describes in the autonomy stage, reflexive antiracists are comfortable with their white racial identity while acknowledging that white people individually and collectively contribute to the oppression of minority groups. Those in the autonomy stage are flexible, 'no longer react out of rigid world views', and 'no longer feel a need to oppress, idealise or denigrate people [including white people] on the basis of group membership characteristics such as race' (Thompson and Carter, 1997: 25). In this sense, they are aware of the processes of racialisation and identity formation, and able to understand, and respond effectively to, these processes that arise in the course of their work and personal lives." (p. 326)

"In this example, participants are encouraged to be reflexive about the norms of antiracism, or, in Foucauldian terms, the knowledges associated with the subjectivity of those who identify as antiracist. While antiracism training programmes regularly discuss white privilege and its effects on non-white minorities (content which is also covered in our course), it is also useful to explore aspects of white

antiracist identities that generally escape attention because they are considered morally positive. In this case, reflexivity about why antiracists consider certain attitudes to be 'politically incorrect' allows participants to better appreciate how the maintenance of their own identities (as antiracist whites) intersects with their perspectives on Indigenous disadvantage. Developing a reflexive understanding of the interplay between identity formation and antiracist practice is a key aim of reflexive antiracism." (p. 327)

"In the session in question, participants are asked to think of all the reasons that Indigenous Australians suffer from particular health and social problems at higher rates than non-Indigenous Australians (each small group is assigned a particular health or social problem). Participants are specifically asked to include 'politically incorrect' reasons that they were unlikely to agree with personally, but that they had heard from others or the media. After brainstorming many different reasons for each of the four health problems, participants from each of the four groups are asked to come together to arrange their reasons into categories of their choosing. The outcomes of more recent course cohorts are similar to the result of the 2003 course that is detailed by Kowal and Paradies (2005). The exercise reveals a clear tendency towards structural attributions for Indigenous ill-health, including reasons grouped under the health system, historical context, money/financial and remoteness categories. Complementary to this, there is clear discomfort with explanations that stressed agency, demonstrated by the fact that nearly all the reasons that were identified as politically incorrect were within the category that participants described as individual/behavioral. Participants were more likely to blame the system, and were reluctant to nominate Indigenous people's choices or actions as even a partial cause of their ill-health (Kowal and Paradies, 2005)." (p. 327)

"It is clear that antiracists are uncomfortable in associating Indigenous agency with Indigenous social problems because of a fear of 'victim-blaming', an attribute associated with racism. In an attempt to avoid racism, motivated Australian antiracists are inclined to attribute Indigenous disadvantage to structural factors that are seen to constrain and limit choices, rather than to the actions of Indigenous people themselves. Since both structural and agential factors are deeply interrelated | and are both required to explain poor health and other axes of disadvantage, the exclusion of Indigenous agency from any explanations may have a significant impact on how social problems are viewed and which solutions are proposed (Kowal and Paradies, 2005). This effect, which we dubbed 'overstructuration' (Kowal and Paradies, 2005), has been recognised recently by others who note the tendency for race scholarship to minimise agency for people of colour and instead focus on racial structures (Emirbayer and Desmond, 2012). Antiracists are usually not aware that the maintenance of their own identities may influence the way they view Indigenous disadvantage. Reflexive antiracism can facilitate insight

into the effects of racialised discourses and identities on the way that antiracists understand disadvantage and construct potential solutions." (pp. 327-328)

"Aside from the content of the training course, a number of additional factors help to engender reflexive antiracism in a training context. It is useful to approach the training as a facilitated discussion, rather than a transmission of ideas from instructors to participants. This is first established in the course through the statement and circulation of 'ground rules':
There are no right or wrong ideas or expressions. Raise your hand for clarification (there is no such thing as a stupid question). Be respectful of, and listen to, what others have to say before responding. Critique ideas, don't criticise people.14 Emotional expressions and discussion of feelings are encouraged (framed as 'I' statements). Please contribute, as together you have more knowledge and expertise than we have as the presenters." (p. 328)

"Facilitators reinforce this list of ground rules by asking follow-up questions of participants to help clarify their position or critique, ensuring that the group considers all comments, and framing their own views as opinions on equal footing with participants rather than suggesting that a view is 'wrong' or 'incorrect'. Participants are encouraged to comment on and respond to these ground rules before agreeing to respect them for the duration of the course.
The structure of each session encourages such discussion by providing stimulating material, using small group work to complete an analytical task and then concluding with facilitated discussion of the whole group. We have found that keeping the group to a maximum of 24–28 participants (four groups of six or seven) is also important to maintain the intimacy and trust required." (p. 328)

"The racial identity of the presenters is also a factor in establishing a context that supports training effectiveness. Research conducted within the US government suggests that pairs of diversity trainers who differ in terms of race/ethnicity or gender produced significantly more learning among participants than homogeneous trainer pairs (Hayles, 1996), with more recent scholarship suggesting that race/ethnicity rather than gender is of particular importance in a diversity training context (Liberman et al., 2011). In our case, one presenter identifies as an Aboriginal-Asian-Anglo-Australian man (YP) while the other identifies as a Jewish-Polish-Australian woman (EK). Not infrequently, the presenters | respectfully disagree with each other on a range of issues. This works against a form of unreflexive antiracism in which there is a desire to agree with any Indigenous person present, instead facilitating honest and open discussion." (pp. 328-329)

	"A theoretical grounding in constructionist approaches is also important to reflexive antiracism. In the first session of the course, the concepts of discourse and construction are introduced to participants, drawing on Foucault and Latour (Foucault, 1983; Latour, 2003). Discourse is presented as 'constituting knowledge, together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations which inhere in such knowledges and relations between them' (Weedon, 1987: 108). Constructivism is presented as one of a range of approaches to the relationship between 'reality' and 'perception', which range from positivism to radical deconstructivism to multinaturalism. This material is made accessible by working through examples of how knowledge, social practices and subjectivities about gender have been constructed over time (Laqueur, 1990). This is followed by an identity exercise wherein participants discuss their range of identities with a partner. A discussion follows about the categories of identity that are more or less common (place, professional identity, marital status, hobbies, ethnicity – particularly indigeneity and non-indigeneity – gender and age) as well as those that are usually absent, such as sexuality, religion and ableness. Combined with the theoretical grounding, this practical exercise illustrates how identities are contingent, dependent on both societal norms and specific context (such as a training course), change over the life course, and are not reducible to essentialised elements such as race. This provides an excellent grounding for the discussion of more challenging material such as white privilege and white racial identity later in the course." (p. 329) "We have offered here a detailed case for how reflexivity can address the pitfalls of diversity training and antiracism in general. The concept of reflexive antiracism introduced in this article has the potential to counter the detrimental effects of essentialism and negative emotional reactions through a focus on racialisation and reflexivity, particularly in relation to white antiracist identities. To develop reflexive antiracism, white people need to avoid essentialising minorities as 'good' | and white people as 'bad'; need to recognise how they benefit from privilege without being overwhelmed with guilt and anxiety; need to accept the 'fact' of their whiteness; and need to recognise how their need to maintain an antiracist identity effects the way they conceptualise, and act to counter, racial oppression. We have outlined a range of theoretical, pedagogical and structural approaches to diversity training that constitute a reflexive antiracist praxis. Further research, both qualitative and quantitative, is required to determine the effectiveness of this approach in promoting antiracist action that better achieves racial equity and justice. However, we hope that our synthesis of existing critiques of antiracism and proposal for a concrete approach for addressing them reinvigorates scholarship on diversity training and antiracism." (pp. 329-330)
Citation	**Conclusions**

Abstract
Purpose The purpose of this paper is to examine method, motivation, and individual difference variables as they impact the effectiveness of a diversity training program in a field setting. Design We conducted a longitudinal field experiment in which participants (N = 118) were randomly assigned to participate in one of three diversity training methods (perspective taking vs. goal setting vs. stereotype discrediting). Eight months after training, dependent measures on diversity-related motivations, attitudes and behaviors were collected. Findings Results suggest the effectiveness of diversity training can be enhanced by increasing motivation in carefully framed and designed programs. Specifically, self-reported behaviors toward LGB individuals were positively impacted by perspective taking. Training effects were mediated by internal motivation to respond without prejudice, and the model was moderated by trainee empathy. Implications These findings serve to demonstrate that diversity training

"...In conducting this study, we hope to unveil not only the relative effectiveness of diversity training methods, but also why and for whom they are effective when they do indeed work as intended." (p. 606)

"Hypothesis 1: Training methods involving perspective taking and goal setting will be associated with more favorable diversity-related attitudes and behaviors when compared to the stereotype discrediting method." (p. 608)

"Hypothesis 2: Internal motivation to respond without prejudice will partially mediate the relationships between diversity training methods and diversity-related attitudes and behaviors." (p. 609)

"Hypothesis 3: Empathy will moderate the mediating role of internal motivation to respond without prejudice, such that the indirect effect will exist for those who are low in empathy, but not for those who are high in empathy." (p. 609)

"In sum, we propose a first stage moderated mediation model in which diversity training methods impact diversity-related outcomes through their influence on internal motivations to respond without prejudice, but this indirect relationship is moderated by the empathy of diversity training participants (see Fig. 1). We test this model using diversity training sessions focused on African Americans and LGB individuals in order to examine any differences and/or crossover effects. This contribution should not be overlooked, as this will unveil whether positive effects of diversity initiatives can generalize across different training methods and different targets of prejudice. For example, it may be the case that taking the perspective of one stigmatized group causes one to engage in more perspective taking toward other stigmatized groups, leading to a positive crossover effect. Similarly, it may be the case that training focused on stigmatized groups with concealable stigmas (e.g., LGB individuals) could expand the way training participants think about diversity, leading to | positive crossover when compared to training focused on more classically studied stigmas such as gender and race differences." (pp. 609-610)

"The final sample consisted of 118 students (a 24 % retention rate) who were 61 % female and 93 % heterosexual. In terms of ethnicity, the final sample was 62 % White, 12 % Asian, 10 % Black, 6 % Hispanic, and 10 % were of another ethnicity." (p. 610)

participants react differently to certain training methods. Additionally, this study indicates that taking the perspective of others may have a lasting positive effect on diversity-related outcomes by increasing individuals' internal motivation to respond without prejudice. These effects may be particularly powerful for training participants who are low in dispositional empathy. Originality/Value This study is among the first to examine trainee reactions to diversity training exercises focused on different targets using different training methods. Additionally, we identify an important mediator (internal motivation to respond without prejudice) and boundary condition (trainee empathy) for examining diversity training effectiveness.

Limitations
"...We conducted our study in a sample of predominantly white and straight individuals at a southern school. Thus, our results should be replicated to ensure that they generalize to more diverse training populations and individuals from other regions of the country...Our measures of diversity attitudes and behaviors were very specific. Future research should seek to replicate our findings using specific and broad measures of diversity attitudes in order to assess transfer of training and

"This study involved three time points. First, all incoming students were contacted via email prior to their arrival at the university and asked to complete an online survey, which included our measure of empathy. Second, all incoming students were required to attend a two-hour standard diversity workshop during their orientation to the university. The training was developed and delivered by students and the same trainers were used across all conditions. Additionally, the trainers were diverse with regard to ethnicity and sexual orientation. In the first 15 min of the training, trainees were randomly assigned to experimental conditions. This involved a 3 (training module: goal setting vs. stereotype discrediting vs. perspective taking) x 2 (target of training: African Americans vs. LGB individuals) fully crossed between-subjects design. To accomplish random assignment, the materials for each condition were printed separately. Before distributing the materials (and thus, prior to assigning participants to conditions), the copies were combined, shuffled, and reshuffled. Participants took the top copy on the stack and passed the inter mingled materials to the next participant. Third and finally, the dependent measures were collected via internet survey 8 months after training (at the end of the school year) to determine if the training had a meaningful effect over time. This eight month time lag lined up well with the academic school year, but was also chosen in order to maintain consistency with previous diversity training research (e.g., Madera et al. 2013) and to ensure that no demand characteristics from the training would be present when the final outcomes were measured." (p. 610)

"The diversity training that was conducted as a part of this study varied between subjects as a function of the type of | diversity training module that was received (perspective taking vs. goal setting vs. stereotype discrediting). Those participating in the goal setting diversity training were asked to personally set specific, challenging, and attainable goals related to the diversity training. For instance, a participant may have opted to make a goal to challenge jokes about marginalized groups when they heard them in the future. Those participating in the stereotype discrediting diversity training were shown several discredited stereotypes (e.g., 'Just like Caucasians, most African-Americans are NOT lazy') and asked to write about the discredited stereotype that they most agreed with. Those participating in the perspective taking diversity training were asked to consider the challenges faced by marginalized groups. With these challenges in mind, these participants were asked to write a short narrative about what a typical day would be like for a member of a marginalized group to gain a better understanding of the challenges they face." (pp. 610-611)

"To assess the generalizability of effects across targets of prejudice, the marginalized group which was the target of the diversity training (African Americans vs. LGB individuals) varied across participants. When African Americans were the focus of training, participants were asked to perform

examine how broad the effects of diversity training really are...Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the lack of participation incentives and the longitudinal nature of the design, our experiment was relatively underpowered. Although this makes the effects that we did discover even more impressive, we would encourage future researchers to continue testing the effectiveness of the perspective taking and goal setting diversity training exercises with larger samples...Finally, our lack of a control group precludes us from making conclusions regarding whether these forms of training are more or less beneficial when compared to receiving no training at all." (p. 615)

Article Link

https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsggo&AN=edsgcl.425154384&site=eds-live

one of the diversity training methods while focusing specifically on African Americans (e.g., setting a goal to take a class to learn more about African American history). When LGB individuals were the focus of training, participants were asked to perform a diversity training method while focusing specifically on LGB individuals (e.g., taking the perspective of an LGB individual while writing about a typical day in his/her life." (p. 611)

"...Overall, the results suggest that the relative effectiveness of diversity training can be enhanced by increasing motivation in carefully framed and designed programs that appeal to particular types of people." (p. 614)

"Our first hypothesis received only weak support in that those who participated in the perspective taking method showed more supportive behaviors of LGB individuals when compared to the other training conditions. While we were unable to provide support for the idea that both perspective taking and goal setting would work more effectively than stereotype discrediting, perspective taking set itself apart from the other two training conditions. This main effect is particularly interesting in that it existed regardless of the focus of the training (African Americans or LGB individuals). Thus, perspective taking appears to be capable of producing positive crossover effects, wherein behaviors toward a diverse population may be more positive even if that group was not explicitly mentioned in the training exercise. One plausible explanation for why the goal setting method did not enjoy similar success is that individuals were able to develop external justifications for the goals that they set (given that they were asked to create the goal by someone else), causing them to abandon these goals over time. By comparing these methods, we have provided a rare test of the relative explanatory power of these training methods and the theoretical viewpoints upon which they are based. Theoretically speaking, this study indicates that taking the perspective of others may have a lasting positive effect on diversity-related outcomes, regardless of the focus of training, when compared to setting diversity-related goals or discrediting commonly held stereotypes about stigmatized groups. Practically speaking, this study supports the continued use of the perspective taking method in various diversity training initiatives. Empirically speaking, our models examining the target of training and training method accounted for seven percent of the variance in ATLG and LGB supportive behaviors (see Table 2). Thus, these are important variables to account for in future diversity training research." (p. 614)

"Our second hypothesis was partially supported in that internal motivation to respond without prejudice served as a partial mediator between the perspective taking training method and diversity-related attitudes and behaviors toward LGB individuals. These findings highlight the potential of

	internal motivation to respond without prejudice as an explanatory mechanism for effective diversity training programs. Given the current lack of understanding of why diversity training programs work when they are | effective (Bezrukova et al. 2012), these findings serve as substantive contributions to the diversity training literature. In the future, motivation to respond without prejudice should be investigated as a potential mediator of other diversity training methods. Additionally, this variable could serve as a more proximal predictor of attitude and behavior change in future diversity training work." (pp. 614-615) "Our third hypothesis was supported in that our mediated model was only supported for individuals who are low in empathy. This result likely occurred because while high empathy individuals are attuned to the needs of diverse populations and thus internally motivated to respond without prejudice toward them, low empathy individuals may require diversity training to promote motivation and ultimately reduce prejudice. These findings highlight an important boundary condition on effective diversity training while also providing an important individual difference characteristic to examine moving forward. Despite the fact that trainee individual difference characteristics have been identified as an important factor to consider in the training literature more broadly (Brown 2006), they have been rarely studied in the diversity training literature (see Bezrukova et al. 2012). This finding is also important because it means that specific types of diversity training (i.e., perspective taking) may be particularly beneficial for individuals who need the training more than others (i.e., individuals who are low in empathy). In fact, previous researchers have noted that empathy 'involves an understanding of experiences, concerns and perspectives of another person, combined with a capacity to communicate this understanding' (Hojat 2009, p. 412), which indicates that dispositional empathy may be particularly important to consider in terms of the effectiveness of perspective taking. Indeed, perspective taking seems particularly well suited to foster empathy within training participants, and this notion is supported by previous empirical research (Madera et al. 2011)." (p. 615) "The current study provides novel evidence regarding the relative effectiveness of three diversity training methods on diversity-related attitudes and behaviors. Specifically, | while the perspective taking method was most successful overall, we showed that diversity trainers and researchers may need to consider the empathy levels of the individuals in their sample before deciding which training method to use. Appealing to individuals who are low in empathy may be a fruitful opportunity for research and practice." (pp. 615-616)
Citation	**Conclusions**

Madera, J. M., Neal, J. A., & Dawson, M. (2011). A strategy for diversity training: Focusing on empathy in the workplace. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 35*(4), 469–487. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348010382240

Abstract
The purpose of this study was to test the effectiveness of a diversity training exercise using perspective taking to increase positive attitudes toward non-English-speaking individuals. Ninety-six participants were given a pretest (survey) followed by the training and a posttest. Participants were randomly assigned as a 'manager' or an 'employee.' The managers were provided with a recipe and instructions in English, and the managers' employees provided with the recipe and instruction in an abstract, non-English language. The results of a repeated-measures ANOVA showed a significant effect of perspective-taking training on attitudes toward non-English speakers, such that attitudes were more positive posttraining than pretraining. The effect of the training on the attitudes toward non-English-speaking individuals was moderated by the status role (i.e., manager or employee). In addition, participants' empathy mediated the relationship between the perspective-taking training and attitudes, such that perspective taking

"An important caveat in the literature is that the perspective-taking paradigm uses a cognitive manipulation, namely, participants are asked to imagine a day in the life or being in the shoes of the target rather than actually experiencing it (e.g., Dovidio et al., 2004; Galinsky & Ku, 2004; Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000). The current study used a behavioral manipulation of perspective taking; participants experienced what it is like to work as a non-English-speaking individual through an experimental manipulation. In addition, the study used perspective taking in the context of diversity training. There is very little empirical evidence of the effect of diversity training and, importantly, what factors contribute to its effectiveness (Bell & Kravitz, 2008; Holladay & Quinones, 2008). Thus, the current study contributes to the literature by testing a behavioral perspective-taking manipulation to increase positive attitudes toward non-English-speaking individuals." (p. 473)

"The participants included 132 students majoring in hotel and restaurant management (30 men and 58 women; 8 did not respond gender). The majority of the participants (68%) held a part- or full-time job. Forty-five of the participants were Caucasian, 18 Asian, 12 Hispanic, 3 Black, and 18 reported as 'other.' The final sample consisted of 96 participants who completed both set of measures." (p. 475)

"A 2 × 2 within–between design was used, with time (before and after perspective taking) as the within-subjects variable and status role as the between-subjects variable (manager or employee). All participants completed a questionnaire that measured their attitudes toward non-English-speaking individuals in a classroom, as well as their state empathy. The participants provided their first and last names for the purpose of tracking their responses over time and demographic information. One month later, the students participated in a perspective-taking exercise in a kitchen laboratory.
For the perspective-taking exercise, students were randomly assigned into groups of three to four. Status role was experimentally manipulated by randomly assigning students to one of two roles: one student was assigned as a 'manager' and the remaining students as 'employees.' The manager-student was provided with the recipe and instructions in English, but the employee-students were provided with the recipe and instruction in an abstract, non-English language using Cyrillic letters. Employing a behavioral manipulation of perspective taking (Batson, Early, et al., 1997; Galinsky & Ku, 2004; Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000), both manager- and employee-students were instructed to complete a recipe in silence, imagining that they could not speak and understand English. The groups completed the recipe in silence and used only nonverbal methods of communications. Using a within-subjects procedure, the students completed the same questionnaire that was completed a month prior in the classroom immediately after the experiment. Ninety-six students completed both set of questionnaires." (p. 475)

induced empathy, resulting in more positive attitudes.

Limitations
"This study is not without limitations. This training module employed hospitality students who do not have formal experience managing people. This lack of experience for the student created additional stress because the participants in the employee role have not worked in an organization that does not use their language. As a result, it is unknown whether or not the effect of the experiment can partially be contributed to this lack of experience." (p. 482)

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2011-23118-003&site=eds-live

"The current study found that negative attitudes toward Non-English-speaking individuals decreased once participants received perspective-taking training. By completing a recipe in silence, imagining that they could not speak and understand English, and using instructions in an abstract, non-English language, the participants experienced how non-English-speaking individuals work in the kitchen. The change in attitudes suggests that the participants were less likely to view non-English Speaking individuals as out-group members (i.e., social identity theory; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In addition, the test for mediation confirmed that the change in attitudes was through empathy. By experiencing non-English-speaking individuals' perspective, the participants experienced empathy, which led to more positive attitudes toward them. Furthermore, participants believed in more equality for non-English-speakers after training. Interestingly, the results were not modified by the participants' race nor by the participants' gender, suggesting that regardless | of a person's race or gender, the perspective-taking manipulation leads to more positive attitudes toward non-English-speaking individuals." (pp. 480-481)

"Additionally, the results of the findings suggest that participants who were placed in the role of an employee were more empathetic toward non-English speakers than the participants who were placed in the role of managers. The manipulation simulated the asymmetric work relationship between managers and employees (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). That is, the participants in the employee role did not know what to do because of the non-English instructions and solely depended on the manager's direction to develop a menu item and to employ cooking techniques that were new to many. The managers, on the other hand, experienced less ambiguity because their instructions were in English. The results suggest that if someone is placed in an environment where they cannot understand the language and verbally communicate, they empathize with others who face this situation and have more positive attitudes toward them." (p. 481)

"...Given the large effect sizes and the significant findings in this study, perspective-taking training contributes to the hospitality diversity training literature by providing another management tool that can broaden awareness of the challenges posed in a multicultural work environment. This exercise can be used by hospitality organizations who want to employ diversity training for the management staff. Managers would have to take the status role of an employee and be asked to produce a recipe based on nonverbal cues from someone else. Previous research (Wilborn & Weaver, 2002) has demonstrated that once employees are exposed to diversity management training initiatives, their perceived level for the importance of it increases." (p. 482)

"Given the fact that the workforce is becoming more diverse because of demographic trends and immigration and national origin is a protected class under Title VII of the Civil rights Act, it is

important for hospitality firms to be proactive in creating a multicultural work environment. Diversity training is one way to achieve these ideals, and the current study provides an important first step in examining methods to increase positive intergroup attitudes and attenuate communication barriers in a diversity training context. In line with past research on perspective taking (e.g., Dovidio et al., 2004; Galinsky & Ku, 2004; Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000), the current study suggests that when people actually 'puts themselves in the shoes of another,' an understanding develops. Perspective-taking training exercise does indeed foster empathy. Once managers gain perceptive of employees who do not speak the language and are struggling to learn, a new sense | of community emerges rather than a sense of in-groups and out-groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). A multicultural environment develops where the employees are given the tools and training to do the job tasks, yet at the same time gain a perspective of one another promoting a culture of shared identities working toward similar goals." (pp. 48-484)

Citation
McDougall, A. (2005). Diversity in the spotlight. *Industrial & Commercial Training, 37*(5), 240-243.

Abstract
Purpose - This paper aims to address the problems that diversity, by its nature, throws up for training professionals, and to highlight the various ways in which drama, as a learning tool, offers solutions to those problems.
Design/methodology/approach - The theory of experiential learning forms the back-bone of the arguments proposed by the paper, and has many applications To the development and assessment of groups and individuals. While it focuses on a technique called' `forum theatre", all forms of drama-based learning are founded on the theory "learning by doing". Findings - The findings of the

Conclusions
"The case for effective diversity training remains undisputable, of course. The potential benefits have been well documented. As well as helping to spare organisations the embarrassing and damaging upheaval of the public tribunal, there are benefits for the working environment. Organisations that embrace diversity are happier places to work because they necessarily promote openness and creativity, and consequently they enjoy lower staff turnover and increased productivity.
Not only that, by valuing diversity an organisation opens itself up to a wider client base as well as a greater talent pool through its recruitment processes. Indeed, rather than being simply a reactive measure, the diversity development process should be viewed as the first step in addressing an organisation's values and long-term goals and developing a culture in which differences are embraced and valued, not feared.
Quite a compelling case, then. But is it realistic to be looking at culture shifts? After all, it's one thing to establish a diversity policy and communicate the reasons behind it to the masses, but it's another to get people to buy into the principles behind it. Consider the nature of prejudice. The fact is, to a greater or lesser extent we all have them. As a result of our upbringing, our parents, our friends and any other number of influences, we establish beliefs from an early age; beliefs that are often based on a lack of knowledge, fear and assumptions." (p. 241)

"So how do you begin to address such deep-seated beliefs? Clearly, you can't expect to win hearts and minds overnight, but an effective learning programme is the first step. There are many approaches to diversity development to choose from, of course. And in recent years, more and more organisations have used drama as a means of raising awareness and promoting ideals." (p. 241)

paper focus on the benefits of illustrating learning points through drama; encouraging creative thinking, risk-taking, empathy and the use of conflict in a simulated environment to examine issues from all points of view. Practical implications - These findings point to a need for an artistic and non-directive approach to diversity training, one that is responsive to the sensitive and emotive nature of the subject. It also calls for organisations to encourage the embracing of differences within their workforces. Originality/value - The learning points discussed offer a fresh perspective to diversity trainers. It suggests opportunities to address the root causes of prejudice without the risks that traditional training methods necessarily bring with them, and it is relevant to anyone involved in the design and delivery of diversity training.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=18144320&site=eds-live

"The fact is though, far from being an excruciatingly embarrassing or touchy-feely training tool, drama-based learning works on many levels and has countless practical applications in the areas of assessment and development. Central to it is experiential learning, or learning by doing. By empowering learners to take risks and try new approaches to existing problems, you make the development process more relevant and meaningful.
A roleplay workshop, for example, typically takes the form of a one-to-one encounter requiring a learner to interact with a character played by an actor. It's a tool that is immediately responsive to the individual's style and development needs and provides the delegate with the opportunity to test newly-acquired skills and techniques in an entirely safe environment before applying them in the workplace 'for real'." (p. 241)

"Another drama-based tool, used widely in diversity training, is forum theatre. Forum theatre is essentially a piece of interactive theatre based on a scenario which reflects key learning points, and requires the audience to direct the actors in order to resolve their conflict. As such, delegates become the directors and their decisions determine the course and outcome of the scene.
For many reasons, forum theatre lends itself particularly well to development in diversity. For one thing, it does not require delegates to put themselves in the spotlight, something many are reticent about doing in-group situations, particularly when the subject matter addresses emotions and feelings. Forum theatre avoids this potential embarrassment by using actors as the performers. Furthermore, it allows you to present serious and potentially sensitive issues in a light-hearted way. And while it's important not to trivialise the message, it's also vital for delegates to engage with the process from the beginning. By presenting and facilitating forum theatre effectively, you can address emotive issues in a fun and interesting way, thereby getting buy-in from delegates and making the learning points more memorable." (p. 242)

"Forum theatre is entirely non-directive. As a learning tool, it does not prescribe best practice, impose opinions or push delegates towards any specific conclusion. So it's ideal as a means of illustrating the issues related to diversity, which by their nature we will all approach from a slightly different standpoint. Indeed, because forum theatre is replayable in an infinite number of ways, it is responsive to opinions and learning needs at both individual and group level. What's more, by influencing the way the characters interact - through changes in language, body-language and voice tone, for example - delegates are more likely to take ownership of the issues and retain them outside the training environment. It is therefore an extremely powerful learning tool.

Forum theatre also seeks to promote empathy and understanding, as well as encourage delegates to explore all points of view. Indeed it's an opportunity to focus not only on the affects of prejudice but also the reasons for it. The reality is, what people regard as acceptable is bound to vary to some extent. While company policy is necessarily black and white, the issues at the heart of it are most definitely not. And though knowledge of and adherence to company policy is vital, you cannot hope to develop understanding and acceptance of differences within a workforce without addressing the root causes of prejudice." (p. 242)

"Imagine a scene in which a woman confronts a sexist male colleague. You assign ownership of the female character to one half of the delegates, and ownership of the male character to the other half. Each group must then script their relevant actor and justify their arguments to each other.
This method throws up some interesting points. First of all, it creates a conflict between the two groups of delegates within which the effects of and reasons for sexism can be explored. Without conflict, it's all too easy for the learning process to focus solely on best practice. After all, in an environment in which sensitive issues are raised and political correctness scrutinised, it's understandable that delegates may prefer not to contribute for fear of being labelled or misconstrued." (p. 242)

"But by establishing a debate based on the conflict between the fictional characters in the scene, opposing points of view can be voiced and their relative merits discussed. The point being, that any opinions given are representative of the characters, not the delegates. This avoids disputes becoming personal and ensures that differences of opinion do not spill over into the workplace.
Crucially, though, this type of forum theatre allows you to focus less on what official policy prescribes as right and wrong and more on the human issues - the reasons for prejudice, the emotional effects, ways of challenging prejudice and instances of unintentional discrimination. It's through a clearer understanding of such issues that you can begin to develop a working culture in which differences are not just tolerated but valued. For many organisations, such culture changes represent a significant challenge, yet bring with them huge benefits." (p. 243)

"The Jerry Springer - The Operas and the Behztis of this world may be controversial works of art, but they fill an important role in society. For we may disagree with their content and be offended at the opinions they represent, but the crucial point is we get the opportunity to decide for ourselves rather than have the decisions imposed on us. Using drama as part of the diversity process offers the same opportunity." (p. 243)

Citation

Nguyen, S. (2014). The critical role of research in diversity training: how research contributes to an evidence-based approach to diversity training. *Development & Learning in Organizations, 28*(4), 15-17.

Abstract

Purpose The purpose of the paper is to outline a diversity training framework in which research literatures and findings in psychology and human resource management (HRM) are used to guide organizations in the delivery of diversity training. The author proposes improvements to the current state of diversity training practices and implementations within organizations through the use and integration of research literature. Design/methodology/approach The paper is both a conceptual and a general review paper. It involves the discussion of research on diversity training, as well as diversity and training separately (conceptual), and includes a general analysis of diversity training (review). Findings The paper offers a general review about how psychological and HRM research findings can help organizations better implement diversity training. It suggests that successful diversity training involves a three-part approach: follow established psychological theory to guide selection of

Conclusions

"Ninety-three percent of companies with diversity initiatives include training. But a generic, one-size-fits-all training will not do. Diversity training must be tailored to the specific needs and culture of each organization." (p. 15)

"Before jumping into diversity training (tactical level), a framework of HR diversity management helps provide a roadmap. Beginning with diversity management issue (equal employment opportunity and affirmative action as well as appreciating and making use of diversity), HR needs to consider three levels (strategic: culture, vision, mission, business strategy; tactical: staffing, training; and operational: flexible employment, work–life balance). It is imperative that line managers are actively involved at all levels. The diversity management objectives include benefits for organizations and their employees (Shen et al., 2009)." (p. 16)

"Jayne and Dipboye (2004) contend there are five practical steps to better manage diversity efforts and improve outcomes:
1. build senior leadership commitment and accountability;
2. conduct thorough needs assessment;
3. develop well-defined strategy linked to business results;
4. emphasize team-building and group process training; and
5. establish metrics and evaluate effectiveness of diversity initiatives." (p. 16)

"Coverage of all five steps would be beyond the length permitted for this article, but a brief mention of steps 2, 3 and 5 is warranted.
Step 2 – needs assessment: One of the biggest errors in diversity training is failing to conduct a needs assessment. A needs assessment that comprehensively assesses the employees, the jobs and the organization 'ensures that diversity issues related to diversity are framed accurately and that the right interventions are identified' (Jayne and Dipboye, 2004, p. 416).
Step 3 – link diversity strategy to business results: The foundation of a strong and successful diversity initiative includes tying the diversity initiatives to business results in a realistic and practical way. HR professionals must state how diversity efforts contribute to and meet specific business objectives (Jayne and Dipboye, 2004).
Step 5 – metrics and evaluation: This is perhaps the most valuable component of all, the pièce de résistance of diversity training. Without a meaningful way to measure the diversity training or larger diversity initiatives, an organization will not know whether some or all of its efforts work or not. Because there is a lack of research about the efficacy of one diversity effort over another,

diversity training initiatives, use a framework for HR diversity management and adopt practical steps to better manage diversity initiatives (paying careful attention to a needs assessment, linking diversity strategy to business results and establishing metrics and evaluating effectiveness). Practical implications Diversity training has not been and continues to not be research- or evidence-based. This paper outlines some suggestions for integrating psychological and HRM research findings into the delivery of diversity training. The practical implication is that organizations and stakeholders will use a more evidence-based approach to diversity training. Originality/value This paper meets the needs of organizations seeking a more research- and evidence-based approach to diversity training. **Article Link** https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=99125949&site=eds-live	"establishing metrics and evaluating the effectiveness of diversity initiatives will allow organizations to make data-driven decisions about how to leverage resources most effectively" (Jayne and Dipboye, 2004, p. 420)." (p. 16) "Researchers have discovered that despite many organizations offering diversity training, the majority of these training programs simply reinforce the prevailing values and practices | of the dominant culture in an organization. Many organizations do not have diversity practices that value diversity or benefit from the use of diversity (Shen et al., 2009). In fact, 'ineffective diversity management [. . .] is most likely to result in conflict, demotivation, higher employee turnover and low organizational performance' (Shen et al., 2009, p. 246). Therefore, the need to use research to inform diversity training is critical." (pp. 16, 17) "...Even though research about the effectiveness of diversity training is still quite young (Pendry et al., 2007), this article demonstrates that there exists enough evidence-based information to guide organizations in delivering and evaluating diversity training." (p. 17)
Citation Pendry, L. F., Driscoll, D. M., & Field, S. C. T. (2007). Diversity training: putting theory into practice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*(1), 27-50. http://doi.org/10.1348/096317906X118397	**Conclusions** "...This article will consider how and why joint ventures between diversity trainers and academics can produce a more functional strategy for tackling stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination." (p. 28) "There are many different strategies and techniques in the diversity trainer's toolkit, but which methods work best and for which population? Social psychology researchers have noted that it is about time we began to provide answers to such questions (Dovidio et al., 2004; Stephan & Stephan, 2001). Our goal here is to highlight a few approaches that are commonly used by diversity trainers,

Abstract
Diversity training initiatives are an increasingly large part of many organizations' diversity management portfolio. Little is known, however, about the effectiveness of such initiatives. In this article, we demonstrate how increased adherence to the principles of established social psychological theory can guide and make more coherent the development of diversity initiatives. Likewise, outcomes of diversity training can inform and make more practical social psychological theory and research. In short, both diversity trainers and academics would benefit from greater dialogue, as well as grappling with the tensions that naturally arise when theory and practice collide.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsggo&AN=edsgcl.161921484&site=eds-live

suggest some new approaches that capitalize on the social cognition approach to stereotyping (Driscoll, 1999), and seek a preliminary evaluation of their likelihood of success based upon our knowledge of the extant social psychological literature and their initial success in DT sessions." (p. 30)

"**Dissonance or guilt-inducing approaches**
...DT approaches attempt to elicit trainees' emotional reactions by using more confrontational and interactive methods, which increase the likelihood that an individual will feel dissonance or guilt and consequently take personal responsibility for inequity. Two approaches that have garnered some attention from social psychologists and have been frequently used by DT practitioners are the Walking through White Privilege exercise (McIntosh, 1988) and Jane Elliott's Blue-Eyed/Brown-Eyed simulation." (p. 32)

"*Walking through White Privilege (WTWP) exercise*
This exercise was developed by McIntosh (1988) to raise Whites' awareness of invisible privileges extended to them and denied to people of colour. Participants in the training session line up on one side of a room and respond to a number of statements (e.g. 'I can easily find a doll for my child that represents his or her race') by taking a pace forward if they agree (i.e. have the privilege). Statements increase in severity regarding the consequence of the privilege. Typically, White participants take many more paces forward than participants of other ethnic or racial groups as they acknowledge their privileges, thereby providing a spatial demonstration of what happens in society. After reading the final statement, DT practitioners ask participants to face one another and tell each other what they are thinking and feeling. Typically, there are some very strong negative feelings and thoughts expressed from those left behind (e.g. anger, tears, disbelief). Those on the other side of the room, predominantly Whites, typically express the guilt that they feel about being privileged and/or anger at being blamed for privileges extended to them through no 'fault' of their own." (p. 32)

"It is unlikely that DT practitioners would be surprised by the defensive responses of some participants. Rather, they would argue that it is the discussion after the exercise – with the DT practitioner competently facilitating the session – that results in participants learning the 'correct' lesson. Having watched and facilitated this exercise numerous times, and in the light of Powell et al.'s (2005) preliminary empirical demonstration, we generally concur and think the exercise has training value. However, we would further suggest that diversity trainers might best employ the WTWP with more diversity competent participants (i.e. those experienced with diversity issues and interactions) or with participants that have facilitated an introductory DT session already (e.g. trainers). For example,

when training a group of individuals who had themselves some experience of facilitating introductory DT sessions, this exercise has worked well according to evaluations administered afterwards. These participants are likely to have worked through their anger and/or guilt response (see also Monteith, 1993; Stephan & Stephan, 2001; Tatum, 1997), and are able to understand that being uncomfortable is natural and even a constructive part of the process." (p. 33)

"It has not, though, worked as well in sessions with less diversity competent participants. With a less diversity experienced group of participants, responses were polarized. What we have commonly found is that participants with no prior exposure to such diversity issues will often get 'stopped' by their anger and/or guilt response, and | such defensive responses make it difficult to progress, particularly in a group setting where those having such negative responses are likely to band together and resist any efforts to move forward and deal with the implications of White privilege. It is therefore better to begin with a less threatening way to examine White privilege or even begin with ways that bias still might be operating in society." (pp. 33-34)

"Finally, diversity trainers should evaluate the benefits or costs of the exercise for people of colour as they are not likely to benefit greatly from an increased awareness of invisible privilege and may incur more costs by having their non-privileged status highlighted for them publicly. People of colour typically already know and are aware of White privilege. They are regularly subjected to daily, minute insults, known as microinsults (Bell, 2005; Pierce, 1992). These offensive mechanisms (non-verbal and kinetic) are designed to ensure that Blacks stay in the inferior, dependent, helpless role (e.g. when a White person asks a well-dressed Black male waiting in the hotel lobby to carry the luggage). A lot of the impact of the exercise is how it opens the eyes of Whites about the inequity still in society (i.e. that there is not an equal playing field as they had thought). Thus, the exercise does not usually benefit people of colour in this way." (p. 34)

"The WTWP exercise provides a clear example of how improved outcomes may be obtained by considering theory and research from social psychology. However, any conclusions about the success or failure of DT exercises need to be tempered by how DT practitioners employ the actual exercise and handle its aftermath. Consequently, conversation and information exchange between theorists and practitioners would clearly benefit trainers utilizing the WTWP exercise." (p. 34)

"*Blue-Eyed/Brown-Eyed exercise*
The Blue-Eyed/Brown-Eyed exercise was designed by Jane Elliott and has been conducted for over 30 years (Byrnes & Kiger, 1990; Stewart, LaDuke, Bracht, Sweet, & Gamarel, 2003; Weiner & Wright,

1973). Although originating in the USA, the exercise has been used on both sides of the Atlantic for DT purposes (see http://www. neishtraining.com/jane_elliott.htm) and indeed, one of Jane Elliott's most recent UK simulations was featured in a BBC Radio 4 broadcast entitled 'the business of race' (9 December, 2005). In one illustrative demonstration (Stewart et al., 2003), student participants were assigned to one of two treatment conditions: the experimental group (i.e. Blue Eyed/Brown-Eyed exercise) or a control group (who received a presentation on intergroup relations). The experimental group was further sorted into two groups by eye colour (brown and non-brown/blue)." (p. 34)

"While blue-eyed students were taunted by the session's facilitator (Jane Elliott), made to wear neck collars, and sent to an uncomfortable room for almost 90 minutes, the former group were given breakfast and asked to behave in a discriminatory way towards the other students, even if they found this uncomfortable. For several hours, blue-eyed participants were subjected to many discriminatory practices and personal attacks by the facilitator (and intermittently, by brown-eyed students). At least two blue-eyed | students broke down in tears as a result of the simulation, one of whom left the room and ceased participation." (pp. 34-35)

"On conclusion of the simulation, participants discussed the activity and were given follow-up activities and readings. They spent further time watching an anti-prejudice video, followed by a brief question and answer period. College counsellors held three optional follow-up sessions, which were attended by about half the original participants, to provide participants with opportunities to express their feelings and reflections upon the exercise. Following these three sessions, the facilitator returned to conduct her own follow-up discussion session." (p. 35)

"Stewart et al. (2003) are the only authors to have examined the effects of the full, 8-hour exercise in reducing prejudice and discrimination (see Byrnes & Kiger, 1990, for evaluations of a shorter version). Degree of prejudice was assessed using three measures: the Social Desirability Scale, which is a scale assessing participants' degree of comfort with various types of relationships with members of minority groups (SDS; Bogardus, 1925); the Modern Racism Scale (MRS; McConahay et al., 1981) and the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale (MCPR; Dunton & Fazio, 1997). Results (taken 4–6 weeks after the exercise) suggested that participants in the experimental group reported greater comfort with relationships with members of other groups (compared with control group). This effect was, however, stronger for certain ethnic groups (Asian–American, Latino/Latina) than for the African–American group. There was no difference in MRS scores between groups (so, no evidence of less prejudice in the experimental group). For the MCPR, participants in the experimental group were

more likely to report that they felt angry at themselves when experiencing a prejudiced thought or feeling.
While it is clear from these studies that the simulation certainly does elicit emotional responses from participants, on the whole, such reactions are not positive (Byrnes & Kiger, 1990; Stewart et al., 2003). More troubling, it also seems that while this exercise has powerful and immediate impact, its long-term effect on intergroup attitudes and behaviours is unclear (Stewart et al., 2003)." (p. 35)

"To maximize the effectiveness of the Blue-Eyed/Brown-Eyed simulation in its present format, it would be mutually beneficial for diversity trainers and social psychologists to communicate and collaborate further in exploring its effects. In particular, it is still not clear what factors may moderate these results (e.g. whether participation is mandatory or voluntary, individuals' prior exposure to different types of training, individual differences such as prejudice level, in-group identification). Equally, as noted, researchers need to explore more closely the impact of a range of negative emotions (guilt, anger, distress, etc.) as mediators of results obtained. There are ethical issues that also need to be considered. Social psychologists adhere to a particular code of ethics (British Psychological Society in the UK, American Psychological Association in the USA) and these codes provide clear directions regarding protection of participants involved in | potentially risky situations (e.g. http://www.bps.org.uk/the-society/ethics-rules-chartercode-of-conduct/code-of-conduct/ethical-principles-for-conducting-research-withhuman-participants.cfm). Trainers considering using this type of exercise would be well advised to consider how such principles might impact upon the design, delivery and aftermath of the exercise." (pp. 36-37)

"The exercise may not even need to be delivered, as such. Some trainers use DVD presentations of the exercise to make many of the same points without necessarily obliging people to go through the exercise for themselves. Such a method is likely to minimize potential risk to participants although it remains to be shown, empirically, what the impact of this alternative approach is likely to be. Finally, there is a definite need to assess effects in the longer term, and to provide follow-up opportunities for participants to deal with anger responses in a constructive way that can hopefully counteract the very real possibility that diversity competency is harmed, as opposed to facilitated, by participation in such an emotionally charged exercise (Stewart et al., 2003)." (p. 37)

"**Social identity approaches**
Social identity approaches focus on the 'we' or group part of the self and how these groups influence one's thoughts, feelings and behaviours. An example of an exercise used within this approach is the 'Who Am I?' exercise. The exercise asks people to list the social groups they belong to, select those

they feel are most important to them, rank them in terms of relative importance to self and then discuss. It shows people that they differ not only in terms of which groups they belong to, but in terms of which they consider important to their identity. Often, the exercise has some interesting surprises. For example, trainees from groups that appear to differ along core group dimensions (e.g. race, gender) may still show strong consensus in terms of the importance they assign to other group memberships such as workplace groups. Hence, this type of diversity exercise increases the salience of co-workers' common social identity (while allowing them to maintain other, personally relevant social identities). In social psychological terms, this process allows for recategorization (i.e. being able to think of someone as an in-group member when categorized one way, but an out-group member when categorized in another way; e.g. Dovidio et al., 2001). Recategorization is important because failing to construe the wider organization as an in-group to which both of the former groups belong leads to less interdependent and cooperative behaviour. In contrast, diversity exercises which increase the salience of co-workers' common social identity – while allowing employees still to benefit from other, previously important group memberships – may in turn improve cooperative behaviour among employees. Social identity researchers have already begun to make use of recategorization methods for diversity management, for example, the ASPIRe model (Actualizing Social and Personal Identity Resources: Haslam, Eggins, & Reynolds, 2003). More generally, it has recently been suggested that making salient the complexity of social identities can influence intergroup attitudes and behaviour in ways that minimize bias and discrimination (Brewer & Pierce, 2005; Roccas & Brewer, 2002). For example, more complex social identities have been shown to be associated with greater tolerance and positivity towards out-groups (Brewer & Pierce, 2005). These exercises work well in training sessions and the sound theoretical basis that underpins them leads us to be more confident that they may prove a beneficial tool in DT." (p. 37)

"**Approaches that use cognitive tasks to create awareness of own bias**
Thus far, our illustrations are drawn from fairly established approaches to DT. Throughout, we have tried to demonstrate how certain social psychological perspectives can promote a clearer understanding of ways in which these approaches can work more successfully. Clearly, no one perspective is ideal in all situations. As the field of social psychology evolves, it may prove beneficial to consider other approaches which then, in turn, may be informed by other theoretical perspectives. One candidate here, we suggest, is the social cognition approach to stereotyping and prejudice. As noted by Driscoll (1999), there needs to be a symbiotic relationship between DT and social cognition researchers studying prejudice and stereotyping. Essentially, the study of social cognition promotes a better understanding of the mental processes that underlie human social behaviour (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). As Fiske (2004, p. 122) explains, 'Social cognition analyzes the steps in people's train of

thought about other people'. Within the domain of stereotyping, recent social cognition research has highlighted a number of so-called automatic reactions and biases (for reviews see Bargh, 1999; Devine & Monteith, 1999). The basic thinking behind much of this research is that many of our reactions towards members of other groups can occur automatically, without awareness or intent. In our own training research, we have started to look at ways of using such demonstrations of bias in DT in an educational way. Although not all are established or systematically appraised approaches as yet within the DT field, we have found them promising. In the spirit of this article, and in the hope that they generate new debate, we share three of these illustrations: The Implicit Association Test, the Father–Son exercise and the Intergroup Attribution exercise." (p. 38)

"*Implicit Association Test (IAT)*
The IAT provides trainees with a tangible demonstration of their own biased behaviour (e.g. http:/buster.cs.yale.edu/implicit). The IAT procedure requires participants first to check their attitudes towards two groups (e.g. in Race IAT, White Americans and African–Americans). The IAT takers complete a reaction time task in which they are asked to differentiate between members of two targeted groups by pressing a key to their left if presented with members from one group (i.e. an African–American face) and a key to their right if presented with members from the other group (i.e. a White American face). These trials are interspersed with trials in which participants differentiate between two concepts (positive or negative) by similarly hitting a key to their left or right. The idea is that the more closely associated a group is with a concept at the implicit level, the easier it is to respond when they are on the same response side. Hence, if White American and good are strongly associated by the participant, it should be easier to respond faster when both require hitting a designated key to the left.
The IAT score is then calculated and converted into an IAT result that suggests strength of association (e.g. 'I moderately prefer White Americans to African Americans'). This is provided to test takers as a measure of their 'hidden' or implicit bias**.** The assumption, as mentioned earlier, is that the discomfort that arises from learning of unintentional bias will impact in a positive way on future behaviour towards members of that group (e.g. Monteith et al., 2001)." (p. 38)

"Our current position is that when used carefully, and with experienced, knowledgeable diversity trainers, the IAT may have the potential to help promote tolerance and an understanding of the power of unconscious stereotypes. We would like to reiterate, though, the vital part trainers can play in the debriefing process, clearing up misunderstandings and inaccurate interpretations of IAT test results. Debriefing becomes especially relevant and important because if the test is not appropriately explained, it can really backfire (Driscoll et al., 2005). In some related social psychological work,

Blanton et al. (in press) have recently argued that the disclaimers provided on the IAT website about what the test is really measuring are somewhat brief and may lack the force necessary to allow test takers to modify their often extreme reactions to what they think the test is telling them (see also Ross, Lepper, Strack, & Steinmetz, 1977). The same argument, we suspect, is applicable to trainers failing to debrief test takers adequately. Illustrations of why debriefing is vital in this sense may be apparent from some of the comments made by test takers ('I did not take this test to have you force me to be negative about a group. This is wrong!'; 'I was sad to be told that I have a preference for whites'; 'I was alarmed to be told that I was biased').

To safeguard IAT takers more reliably and to help prepare diversity trainers and educators to administer and explain the IAT responsibly, we recommend that diversity trainers go through a type of 'Train the trainer' programme for the IAT. The debriefing session that we propose would be theoretically based and would be critical in redirecting any negative affect, inferences or blaming of the targeted group (e.g. Devine, 1989; Monteith, 1993). Indeed, handled appropriately, it is possible to convey that many negative discrepant responses would almost be inevitable, especially in light of some of the more accessible empirical work in this field pointing the finger at history and cultural heritage and their collective impact upon automatic stereotyping (e.g. Devine's, 1989 work on automatic vs. controlled components of stereotyping). Trainers may further allay test takers' fears by noting that social psychological evidence is so far mixed as to whether IAT scores actually predict biased behaviour, so a strong in-group preference will not inevitably result in biased out-group behaviour (Karpinski and Hilton, 2001; McConnell and Leibold, 2001). Having established these points, it is then possible to get test takers to think clearly about the genuine consequences of such a result.

Where positive reactions ensue and an increase in awareness of bias is met with a desire to do better in future, providing information about ways to combat stereotypes and prejudice, as well as giving IAT takers an opportunity to formulate some behavioural intentions, would be a step towards the goal of the IAT to reduce prejudice. For example, trained facilitators could make targeted suggestions for a given IAT taker about 'next steps' that may benefit them, and direct them toward literature or events that might help them to consider ways in which to change their feelings, beliefs and intentions to behave towards the IAT-targeted group (see Driscoll et al., 2004)." (p. 40)

"*Father–Son exercise*
It is not clear where the Father–Son exercise originated, but the present version was adapted from the more dramatic version by Hofstadter (1985, p. 136) (see http://www.infosys.tuwien.ac.at/Staff/q/Riddles.html#father_and_son). Participants in DTs were given the following version of the problem to solve:

A father and his son were involved in a car accident in which the father was killed and the son was seriously injured. The father was pronounced dead at the scene of the accident and his body taken to a local morgue. The son was taken by ambulance to a nearby hospital and was immediately wheeled into an emergency operating room. A surgeon was called. Upon arrival, and seeing the patient, the attending surgeon exclaimed, 'Oh my God, it's my son!' Can you explain this?

Based on data from hundreds of participants collected over several years in various DT sessions, we find that in about 40% of cases, people do not think of the most plausible solution to this question (the surgeon is the boy's mother; Driscoll, Pendry, Kelly, & Chapple, 2006). Instead, they are apt to generate a wide range of convoluted explanations. For example, in any given session, a diversity trainer is likely to hear answers, such as (1) the 'father' in the car must have been a Catholic priest – the father dying, then, was not the boy's parent, and (2) the surgeon is the real 'biological' father of the boy and so it was the boy's adopted father who died.

Why do participants have so much trouble and generate such complex explanations? Essentially, they find it hard to overcome the automatically activated stereotype (i.e. surgeons are generally men). In the ensuing training discussion, we use our knowledge of the social psychology literature to explain the cognitive underpinnings of this failure to spot the 'obvious' solution (e.g. Bargh, 1999; Devine, 1989; Devine & Monteith, 1999). Participants are not surprised to think of a surgeon being a woman, but rather, are shocked that they did not think of this answer, and instead, generated much more obscure solutions. They are generally impressed with the power of the unconsciously activated association between surgeon and maleness which, without their intent or awareness, directed the search process away from a simpler, more direct explanation." (p. 41)

"In training sessions, we find this type of exercise very powerful. It is simple to administer and to understand, but does not humiliate or upset participants. It generates discussion about all the other ways that occupational stereotypes may affect us and provides an appropriate lead-in to discussions of social role theory (Eagly & Steffen, 1984). The Father–Son exercise has the power to stun those individuals who do not consider themselves susceptible to the power of stereotypes. Those with supposed 'exempt status' catch a glimmer of the insidious nature of stereotypes, and how they can influence us without any consideration of what our wishes might be about their influence." (p. 41)

"It is also possible to broaden discussion to incorporate possible individual differences that may moderate the pattern of results. Some individuals 'get it' and are able to solve the problem, whereas others really do not. Why is this? Does stereotype activation inevitably lead to bias? Recent research within social psychology has generated a number of answers that can be readily translated for discussion purposes. Devine's research demonstrated that it is possible for stereotypes to be

automatically activated because 'the stereotype has been frequently activated in the past, it is a well learned set of associations that is automatically activated in the presence of a | member…of the target group … this unintentional activation is equally strong and equally inescapable for high- and low-prejudice persons' (Devine, 1989, p. 6). Her research goes on to demonstrate that although activation may be automatic, this does not necessarily play out in how a person behaves towards a member of the target group." (pp. 41-42)

"More recent research has built upon these findings and may also be used in discussions to reinforce the point that while stereotype activation is a trap we may all fall into at some point, sometimes we do not. Moskowitz, Gollwitzer, Wasel, and Schaal (1999), for example, suggest that individuals may differ in terms of the extent to which they may be 'chronic egalitarian' vs. 'non-chronic' (i.e. committed/not committed to being egalitarian, fair, tolerant and open minded). In their research, only non-chronics showed evidence of such stereotype activation. Participants with chronic goals failed to show this effect, leading Moskowitz et al. (1999) to conclude that stereotype activation is not inevitable. Thus, by reference to the relevant literature, trainers are able to reinforce the points made by the exercise and promote a deeper understanding of the processes involved." (p. 42)

"*Intergroup Attribution Exercise (IAE)*
Past research has highlighted that we explain ambiguous behaviours differently depending upon whether they are performed by in-group vs. out-group members (e.g. Duncan, 1976; Hewstone, 1989). In such studies, participants are asked to explain the behaviour of targets. One recurrent finding is that participants consistently favour the in-group, either using more positive language to describe ambiguous behaviour, or explaining unambiguously negative behaviour in situational terms (see Hewstone, 1989). It is possible to adapt such a paradigm for use in DT (Driscoll, 1999).
Once again, across hundreds of participants over the years, we were able routinely to demonstrate bias in DT sessions. Participants are given a list of slightly positive and negative behaviours they may routinely encounter in the workplace (i.e. walks by without saying hello; offers to help you on a project). We ask participants sitting on one side of the room to explain the behaviours imagining an in-group protagonist whereas those sitting on the other side were asked to imagine an out-group protagonist. This can be done covertly – not letting the one group know about the other group – by handing out an exercise manipulating the protagonist unbeknown to participants, or can be made explicit while encouraging the participants to help the diversity trainer demonstrate a point. The exercise has, almost without fail, shown the predicted bias Moreover, the effects are stronger for the out-group condition (i.e. ratings for this group are very negative, whereas for the in-group condition, ratings are slightly positive) and the group of trainees typically report feeling some moderate

discomfort at learning of their biased responding. Feelings of guilt at unwittingly falling into this attributional trap are often mentioned." (p. 42)

"This exercise demonstrates bias so clearly that afterwards, everyone in the room agrees how much better it is to be an in-group than an out-group member: a powerful point is made despite using fairly mundane behaviours. Such findings may then be discussed and related to the relevant social psychological literature on intergroup attributional biases (e.g. Hewstone & Klink, 1994; Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Maass, Salvi, Arcuri, & Semin, 1989; Taylor & Jaggi, 1974)." (p. 42)

"Aside from demonstrating bias of which trainees were hitherto unaware, what can this type of exercise offer DT? First, it can be used to reiterate and strengthen the basic point – made initially with the Father–Son exercise – that we are often not aware of the | influence that stereotypes have on our judgments of others. Second, and in line with some of the work reviewed earlier, it is possible that awareness of attributional biases, with the guilt that ensues, might ultimately lead to a more deliberative style of decision making which attenuates bias, or to an intention to monitor and regulate future output so that it at least appears less biased (e.g. Monteith, 1993; Monteith, Devine, & Zuwerink, 2000)." (pp. 42-43)

"Note that these latter two approaches (Father–Son exercise; Intergroup attribution exercise) have several advantages over many DT approaches. First, the exercises are simple in formulation and easy to explain. Second, when combined with appropriate discussion which explains how we are all potentially prey to such biases, they are popular with participants, who do not feel persecuted for their seemingly stereotypic reactions (as can be the case with some more confrontational exercises). Participants generally react in a positive fashion and report that they are now motivated to think twice in the future. We are not so naive as to argue that such insights alone will result in wholesale change; nonetheless, we believe exercises such as these – which derive from biases documented in the social psychological literature – have much to offer DT." (p. 43)

"Thus far, our discussion has targeted specific approaches that may be employed within DT programmes and has considered them in isolation from the organizational settings in which they take place. However, these approaches, whether alone or in combination, will only have a positive impact if they are incorporated in an organizational climate that both values and appropriately manages diversity." (p. 43)

"Managing diversity refers to a variety of interventions at the macro-level of organizations: the ways in which workforce policies, procedures and ethos serve to reinforce the values of encouraging and maintaining a diverse workforce. It is ill-advised to bolt on DT programmes in organizations where this macro-level is incompatible. Such programmes are likely to fail or even heighten existing intergroup tensions." (p. 43)

"Within social psychology, considerable efforts have been devoted to the topic of prejudice reduction (Allport, 1954; Amir, 1969; Dovidio et al., 2004; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Sherif et al., 1961). While different approaches will emphasize different methods for success, all generally agree upon principles that derive from the contact hypothesis (Amir, 1969; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). Regarding the topic of workplace ethos, the contact hypothesis states that prejudice reduction is most likely where there are social norms of equality. What this means in practice is that the organizational climate creates and reinforces a norm of acceptance and tolerance in the workplace. This is, of course, not always the reality.
For example, employees might undergo training that aims to improve gender relations and improve equal opportunities. In the context of training, a pro-diversity stance may make sense and trainees may leave with good intentions and a feeling of unity. However, should they step back into a working environment where, for example, there are subtle but institutionalized pressures dictating that women should place career before children, or the converse, then equal opportunities have not in truth been achieved and – taking our lead from the sizeable social psychological literature on the contact hypothesis – it seems justifiable to suggest that the DT may be less effective as a result. In sum, while it may be possible to improve some of the ways DT is delivered, effects may be hampered by an incompatible organizational ethos." (p. 44)

"In conclusion, we have set out what we consider to be some of the ways social psychological theory and research could be used to improve DT programmes. We have, further, alluded to how social psychology could be improved by paying more attention to DT programmes and outcomes. It is our hope that the suggestions laid out help to galvanize the respective fields into collective action." (p. 45)

Citation	**Conclusions**
Ragins, B. R., & Ehrhardt, K. (2020). Gaining perspective: The impact of close cross-race friendships on diversity training and education. *Journal of Applied*	"We develop and test a theoretical model of diversity education that can be used by researchers in academic and organizational settings. Leveraging theoretical perspectives from the social and educational psychology literatures, we integrate Pettigrew's (1997, 1998) intergroup contact theory with Gurin's (1999; Gurin et al., 2002) disequilibrium theory to offer a theoretical account of the role of cross-race friendships in diversity education. Although these theories emerge from different fields,

Abstract
Diversity education occurs in universities and workplaces, but research has progressed in disciplinary silos. Consequently, the field of diversity training has failed to utilize theoretical and practical advances from related fields. Our research addresses these limitations. Integrating educational and social psychology theories, we develop a relational model of training that offers perspective taking as an outcome of diversity training and cross-race friendships as a relational experience that spills over to the training environment. Our first 2 studies, conducted in organizational and academic settings, confirmed the model. Pre- and postcourse assessments revealed that while participants became more aware of the value of perspective taking and their need to improve this skill, only those with close cross-race friends improved their reported perspective taking abilities. Other forms of interracial contact and racial attitudes had no effect. Supporting theoretical predictions, belief in a just world mediated this friendship effect. Given the influence of cross-race friendships, we conclude with a third study that, using an experimental design, examined the effectiveness and underlying processes of

they complement one another. As described in the following text, Pettigrew's (1997, 1998) intergroup contact theory holds that close cross-race friendships elicit change but does not address perspective taking or the educational environment. Gurin's (1999; Gurin et al., 2002) disequilibrium theory, in contrast, focuses on perspective taking in educational environments, but does not unpack the role of close friendships as a pretraining condition. Integrating these theories, we test the proposition that diversity education increases perspective taking and that this effect is amplified for those who have the pretraining experience of close cross-race friendships (i.e., the friendship effect). Deepening our theoretical explanation, we also posit that belief in a just world is an underlying driver of the friendship effect." (p. 3)

"...We propose that those with close cross-race friends should be more motivated to develop their perspective-taking skills in diversity classes than those lacking such friendships. These friendships may help participants see the value of diversity training and make them more engaged in classroom experiences that facilitate the development of perspective-taking aptitudes and abilities. Taken together, this theorizing leads to the predictions that (1) diversity courses will increase perspective taking and (2) that this effect will be stronger for participants with close crossrace friendships." (p. 4)

"...We therefore predict that belief in a just world should mediate the relationship between close cross-race friends and changes in perspective taking. Belief in a just world is the belief that the world is a fair and just place and that people get what they deserve (Lerner & Miller, 1978). Although it has not been directly tested, related research supports this prediction (Bowman & Brandenberger, 2012). Close cross-race friendships affect people's perspectives and awareness of race-related advantages and disadvantages (Plummer et al., 2016) and change college students' beliefs about, and awareness of, racial inequality (Spanierman, Neville, Liao, Hammer, & Wang, 2008). Students with close cross-race friends may therefore enter a diversity class armed with a heightened awareness of inequality, which increases their motivation and their receptivity to classroom experiences and opportunities for improving their perspective-taking skills." (p. 5)

"We tested our theory using participants in diversity courses in organizational and academic settings. We designed our studies to build on one another. Our first study established a foundation by examining whether trainees in an organization's diversity course experienced an increase in perspective taking and whether this effect was amplified for those with close cross-race friends. Our second study replicated Study 1 results and extended our model in two ways. First, we deepened our theoretical understanding by examining whether belief in a just world explained the friendship effect.

a technique that increased participants' willingness to engage in cross-race friendships and other prosocial diversity and ally behaviors at work (e.g., diversity voice). Our findings illustrate the power of relationships and offer new theoretical directions and practical applications for diversity training and education. (PsycInfo Database Record (c) 2020 APA, all rights reserved)

Limitations
"...Although Study 3 used an experimental design with random assignment, we acknowledge the limitation in asserting strong causal claims about empathic concern as a mediating mechanism in this study." (p. 18)

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=pdh&AN=2020-52958-001&site=eds-live

Second, we extended the outcomes of our model to include perspective-taking mindsets, which are defined as individuals' attitudes and beliefs about the malleability and value of perspective taking. Because theories are strengthened by the empirical refutation of alternative explanations (Bacharach, 1989), we also addressed alternative explanations for the friendship effect. We examined and compared the impact of other forms of interracial contact, such as participants' reports of past positive interracial experiences and, using census data, their exposure to other races in their communities. We also examined whether our findings were explained by variables related to cross-race friendships and diversity education, such as racial attitudes and beliefs. These analyses affirmed the robustness of our theory and the uniqueness of the friendship effect.

Taken together, the findings from our first two studies illustrate the singular importance of close cross-race friendships in diversity education. Accordingly, our third study took a practical approach in examining whether diversity education can influence participants' motivation to develop cross-race friendships and other prosocial diversity behaviors. As noted earlier, perspective taking has not only been approached as an aptitude but also as a response evoked from a perspective-taking manipulation (Ku et al., 2015; Todd & Galinsky, 2014). In particular, perspective taking is elicited by asking participants to write essays about 'a day in the life' of another. This technique increases the willingness to engage in intergroup contact in laboratory settings through different mediating variables (Wang, Kenneth, Ku, & Galinsky, 2014). In our third study, we apply this technique to the field of diversity education. Specifically, we introduce a perspective-taking exercise at the beginning of the course and, using an experimental design, examine whether it influences participants' willingness to develop cross-race friendships and other prosocial diversity outcomes through different mediational processes. We also contribute to theory by comparing mediators that have been used to explain the technique's effectiveness. In sum, while our first two studies examine perspective taking as an outcome of diversity education, and our third study assesses whether an exercise designed to elicit perspective taking in laboratory settings increases the effectiveness of diversity education in the field. If so, this accessible and replicable exercise can be an effective tool for diversity trainers and educators." (p. 5)

"*Study 3: Field Study Using an Experimental Design*
This study builds a practical bridge between social psychology research and the field of diversity education. Using an experimental research design, we examine whether a 'day in the life' perspective-taking essay exercise given at the beginning of a course influences participants' willingness to develop cross-race friendships and other prosocial diversity outcomes by the end of the course. We also contribute to theory by comparing mediators that have been used to explain the exercise's effectiveness. The exercise typically involves presenting subjects with a photo of someone who is

demographically different from them and asking them to write a short narrative essay about a day in the life of the target (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Todd & Galinsky, 2014). The treatment (i.e., perspective-taking) group is instructed to adopt the perspective of the target when writing their essay while the control group does not consider the target's perspective. The groups are then compared on outcome measures typically captured immediately after the manipulation." (p. 13)

"Although the perspective-taking exercise has been used nearly exclusively in laboratory settings, we believe this technique can be used in educational contexts to affect what we call prosocial diversity behaviors. We define prosocial diversity behaviors as behaviors that achieve positive and beneficial outcomes with respect to diversity. Their overarching goal is to increase experiences of inclusion and decrease discrimination and marginalization in the workplace. Like other types of prosocial organizational behaviors (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), prosocial diversity behaviors include behavioral intentions and operate at the individual, dyadic, group and organizational levels. Examples include challenging discriminatory policies, practices, and behaviors; promoting inclusive organizational cultures; supporting disadvantaged and marginalized groups; as well as developing diverse friendships and mentoring relationships. Prosocial diversity behaviors therefore incorporate ally behaviors, but also include relational practices that extend beyond traditional conceptions of allyship.
We examine three prosocial diversity outcomes in this study: willingness to develop cross-race friendships, comfort confronting racist comments at work and diversity voice. Following Van Dyne and LePine (1998), we define diversity voice as promotive behaviors that involve the expression of constructive suggestions for improving diversity in the workplace. Despite their importance and relevance for diversity education and ally training, researchers have not examined these variables as course outcomes or whether a perspective-taking exercise can affect them. However, in support of these ideas, researchers have found that the exercise influences students' attitudes toward non-English speakers (Madera et al., 2011) and their self-reports of supportive behaviors toward sexual minorities (Lindsey et al., 2015). Building on this work, our study examines whether a perspective-taking exercise can influence participants' willingness to develop cross-race friendships and other prosocial diversity outcomes." (p. 14)

"Data were collected from students enrolled in three additional sections of the managing diversity course described in Study 2...The final sample consisted of 89 students: 28% were men, 82% were non-Hispanic White, 61% were 22 to 30 years old, 33% were 18 to 21 years old, and 7% were 31 or older." (p. 14)

"The exercise, which is reproduced in the online supplemental material, followed commonly used protocols (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Todd & Galinsky, 2014). Participants were presented with three photos and asked to select the photo of the person who was least like them in terms of race. The photos, which were created by a graphic designer, were similar on all aspects except for race. They depicted the head and upper torso of three smiling young men (Black, White, and Asian) in their late 20s, who were wearing identical business suits. Participants were randomly assigned to either the perspective-taking | or control group– objective condition. Following Batson, Polycarpou, et al. (1997; Batson, Sager, et al., 1997), those in the perspective-taking condition (n 46) were given the following instructions. Please write a one-page description about a typical day in the life of the person you have selected. Please adopt the perspective of the person in the photo when writing your description:
• Imagine a day in his life: what are his thoughts, feelings, and experiences?
• Try to look at the world through his eyes and walk the world in his shoes.
• Try to imagine how he feels and what he experiences over the course of a typical day." (pp. 14-15)

"Participants assigned to the objective condition (n 43) were instructed as follows. Please write a one-page description about a typical day in the life of the person you have selected. Please take an objective perspective when writing your description:
• Try to be as objective as possible when imagining what is happening to this person and what his day is like.
• Try not to let yourself get caught up in imagining what this person has been through or how this person feels.
• Just describe his day as objectively as possible.
Participants were told that the exercise should take 15 min to complete. The exercise was distributed the second day of class and was due the third day of class." (p. 15)

"This study illuminated the utility of applying a social psychology technique to diversity education and contributed to our theoretical understanding of the processes underlying the exercise's effectiveness in field settings...Participants who were randomly assigned to the perspective-taking condition experienced greater empathic concern, which in turn promoted a greater willingness to develop cross-race friendships and engage in diversity voice at the end of the course, compared with those in the control condition. The exercise was effective irrespective of participants' race, age, gender, or experiences with close cross-race friends. Study 3 therefore provides a useful tool that can be used by diversity trainers and educators in organizations and academic settings." (p. 16)

"This set of field studies affirms the importance of diversity education and illustrates the power of close cross-race friendships. Supporting our relational theory of diversity education, course participants became more aware of the value of perspective taking and their need to improve this skill, but only those with close cross-race friends improved their reported perspective-taking abilities by the end of the course. Supporting theoretical predictions, belief in a just world mediated this friendship effect. We found that [t]hose with close cross-race friends entered the course armed with a different set of beliefs than those lacking such friendships: those with close cross-race friends were less likely to believe that the world was just and were more likely to believe that diversity courses are important and could provide the skills they need for future positions. These precourse beliefs may have increased their motivation and engagement in classroom experiences that facilitate perspective-taking skills. Our tests for alternative explanations further affirmed the robustness of the friendship effect and provided additional support for our theory. We controlled for and examined the independent effects of a range of diversity-related attitudes and beliefs that underlie cross-race friendships and the motivation to engage in diversity education, such as participants' racial prejudice and need for social distance, their anxiety interacting with other races, their belief that racial bias can be changed, their motivation to respond without prejudice, as well as their demographic group (race, age, gender) and other forms of interracial contact (past positive interracial contact and residential diversity). None of these pretraining characteristics predicted a change in perspective taking, and the friendship effect held even when we controlled for them. These findings support our relational theory and suggest that close crossrace friendships are a unique form of social contact that can transform people's cognitive processes, beliefs, and world views in ways that increase their motivation to engage in diversity classes and harvest the skills these classes offer." (p. 16)

"This study also has policy implications for higher education and the workplace. Our research not only affirms the value of diversity courses in business schools (Bell et al., 2009), it also illustrates an important but unacknowledged opportunity for organizations and academic institutions. Given residential segregation (Charles, 2003), people may be more likely to develop interracial friendships in their universities and workplaces than in their communities. Organizations and universities need to recognize the importance of interracial relationships and foster their development. This involves more than just increasing racial diversity; these institutions need to provide opportunities for positive social interactions that can lead to friendships. For example, universities can help facilitate diverse friendships through integrated campus housing and social event programming; and organizations can encourage the development of cross-race relationships through diverse work teams and social events." (p. 18)

	"In conclusion, our future depends on our ability to understand each other's perspectives and develop positive relationships across differences. Diversity education can help achieve these goals and must be supported in both academic and organizational settings." (p. 18)
Citation Roberson, L., Kulik, C. T., & Pepper, M. B. (2003). Using needs assessment to resolve controversies in diversity training design. *Group & Organization Management, 28*(1), 148–174. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601102250028 **Abstract** Needs assessment is an important element in training design, and organizational diversity training programs are frequently criticized for their lack of attention to the needs assessment process. This paper explores the link between needs assessment and diversity training design. First, a review of the needs assessment literature reveals that an emphasis on organizational analysis has led to the neglect of other kinds of assessment data. Second, a review of the diversity training literature identifies five areas of controversy. We describe the needs assessment questions that organizations can ask to resolve each controversy and better tailor diversity training to their own needs. Finally, based on the design controversies and needs assessment questions, we provide an agenda for future	**Conclusions** "In this article, we explore how needs assessment can enhance the effectiveness of diversity training design. First, we describe the type of needs assessment that is typically advocated for diversity training: What do experts say are the kinds of information that should be collected, and how should that information be used? Second, we examine five controversies regarding diversity training design. We find that needs assessment, as usually conceptualized and promoted in the diversity training literature, does not address these controversies. Third, we explore how needs assessment could be used to address these issues. That is, what kinds of information should be gathered through a needs assessment to provide answers to common questions about training design?" (p. 149) "The instructional systems design model, which advocates a systematic approach to training design, implementation, and evaluation, views needs assessment as the critical first step in training design (I. L. Goldstein, 1991). Needs assessment addresses three interrelated components, or areas of analysis: organizational, operations, and person analyses (Ostroff & Ford, 1989). An organizational analysis involves a systemwide examination of organizational goals, resources, and constraints on training. This typically involves first the clarification of organizational goals and strategy and then the examination of a variety of variables (such as productivity or efficiency) to determine the extent to which organizational objectives are being met (Ostroff & Ford, 1989). Organizational analysis may also include investigation of the internal environment (e.g., structures, policies and procedures, climate) for | its congruence with organizational goals and the extent to which it facilitates goal attainment (Blanchard & Thacker, 1999). Operations analysis identifies tasks for particular jobs, and the associated knowledges, skills, and abilities (KSAs) needed to perform job tasks. Job analytic techniques are the major methods proposed for this analysis. Finally, person analysis determines how well individual employees are performing their tasks and the extent to which they possess needed KSAs and competencies. The major methods advocated for person analysis are performance appraisal techniques and self-assessments. In combination, a needs assessment focused on these three components can identify where in the organization training is needed, what training is needed, and who needs training. It also provides criteria and baseline measurements for evaluation of training outcomes (Thayer, 1997)." (pp. 149-150)

research on the effectiveness of various kinds of diversity training interventions. **Article Link** https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tfh&AN=9160811&site=eds-live	"TRAINING CONTROVERSY 1: AWARENESS TRAINING, SKILL TRAINING, OR BOTH Diversity trainers typically distinguish between two broad types of diversity training, which can be classified by their objectives for trainees (Ferdman & Brody, 1996). One type of training is awareness training. Awareness programs include heightening awareness of diversity issues and revealing unexamined assumptions, biases, and tendencies to stereotype (Kerka, 1998; Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1998). As a result, awareness training primarily targets trainee attitudes toward diversity. An alternative type of training seeks to develop skills. Skill-based training targets behaviors rather than attitudes, focusing on communication skills and conflict management or resolution strategies (Kerka, 1998) across diverse group identities." (p. 152) "...A controversy in the diversity training literature involves the usefulness of awareness training: Is it necessary? It would seem that a well designed needs assessment could answer the question of whether a focus on awareness or skill, or some combination of the two, would be most appropriate. However, our review found that writers in this literature rarely, if ever, invoke needs assessment as a basis for their recommendations regarding training type." (p. 153) "One question that should be asked and answered during the needs assessment phase to guide the skills versus awareness decision is the organization's motivation for initiating change efforts. Those organizations that initiate diversity training from a reactive standpoint (due to lawsuits or pressures from groups in or outside of the organization) may be most likely to benefit from an emphasis on skill training. Employees who lack the critical behavioral skills needed to avoid unlawful discrimination may learn little from a training program with an awareness focus. Those unhappy with the current organizational climate for diversity are likely to view awareness training as window dressing, for appearance's sake only, leading to resentment. Indeed, those writers who seem most disenchanted with awareness training assume a reactive stance on the part of the organization. Zhu and Kleiner (2000) criticize awareness training when used as the primary method to reduce discrimination and harassment. Lubove (1997) discusses the limitations of awareness training as a court-ordered remedy for discrimination." (p. 153) "A second question that can be asked during needs assessment to facilitate the awareness versus skill decision is What are employee attitudes toward diversity and how strongly are those attitudes held? Nemetz and Christensen (1996) used social judgment theory (Sherif & Hovland, 1961) and the elaboration likelihood model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) to predict that individuals' commitment to their diversity beliefs would determine reactions to diversity training and the amount of attitudinal and behavioral change that would result. Those who are weakly committed to their ideas are more likely to

elaborately process and learn from new information that can lead to attitude change. Such individuals may benefit most from awareness training. However, if individuals have negative attitudes along with a strong commitment | to those beliefs, they are likely to react negatively to awareness training. Instead, for such individuals, a focus on behaviors coupled with organizational rewards and sanctions may be the most productive approach for changing behavior. Thus, during needs assessment, organizations should measure not only the direction of attitudes (positive or negative) toward diversity but also their strength. Ford and Fisher (1996) suggest that attitude strength might be operationalized by asking individuals how concerned they are about the issues, how often they think about the issues, or how important their views on diversity are to their self-perception." (pp. 153-154)

"TRAINING CONTROVERSY 2: BROAD VERSUS NARROW DEFINITION OF DIVERSITY Organizational diversity training may be narrowly focused on a limited number of demographic dimensions (e.g., race and gender) or broadly focused on a range of demographic dimensions (e.g., age, sex, race, ethnicity, disability) as well as other individual differences (e.g., educational level, parental status, learning styles). One of the biggest challenges for human resource professionals is how to define diversity for the purposes of organizational training, and the advice they receive is contradictory at best. For example, under the heading 'What Companies Should Do,' *Business Week* recommended that organizations 'adopt a broad definition of diversity in the workplace covering all kinds of differences among employees, including | race, gender, age, work, and family issues' (Galen & Palmer, 1994, p. 54). In contrast, a publication targeted to human resource professionals described a broad diversity focus as the 'worst practice' that organizations should avoid (Frost, 1999)." (pp. 154-155)

"Our literature search identified only one study that provided an empirical contrast between broad and narrow approaches to diversity training. Kulik, Perry, and Bourhis (2000) compared the effects of participating in broad (age, sex, race, and ethnicity) and narrow (age only) diversity training programs on raters' interest in hiring an older job applicant. Results suggest that neither program enhanced participants' willingness to hire an older job applicant, but under some conditions, narrow training reduced participants' interest in the older job applicant. Specifically, decision makers who had participated in the narrow training program and were 'cognitively busy' (distracted by competing demands) during the hiring decision were less willing to hire the older job applicant. Kulik et al. (2000) explained this effect as resulting from 'ironic processes' (Wegner, 1994). Because the rater's attention is so narrowly focused on one demographic dimension, that dimension can influence decision-making processes—even in a direction opposite to the rater's conscious intention. These results suggest that organizations adopting a narrow diversity definition may need to guard against

ironic processes. This can | be done by providing trainees with additional practice time to develop skills during the training and by reducing distractions and allowing longer deadlines on decision tasks following the training. An organizational analysis can determine whether the organization has the resources available to provide these safeguards, and an operations analysis can identify the job tasks that require additional resources. Therefore, before adopting a narrow diversity definition, organizations need to engage in both an organizational analysis (to identify the primary outcomes of interest) and an operations analysis (to identify the jobholders most directly accountable for those outcomes and ensuring that they have sufficient resources to act on the diversity training they receive). If resources for reducing cognitive load (e.g., fewer competing tasks, longer deadlines) on relevant decision tasks are not available, the organization may be better off providing broad-focused training." (pp. 155-156)

"Other questions that organizations might consider when deciding between broad- versus narrow-focused training are Why is the organization initiating diversity training, and what does the organization hope to achieve? Organizations sometimes initiate diversity training in response to pressure from either internal (e.g., current employees) or external (e.g., customers, suppliers, or regulatory agencies) constituencies (Dass & Parker, 1999), and these constituency groups may be interested in very specific outcomes (e.g., increasing the hiring rate of women and racial minorities, improving the quality of customer service). In these reactive situations, a narrow definition may demonstrate to constituencies that their concerns are being addressed, and the diversity training can be linked to specific outcomes. In contrast, organizations adopting a proactive stance toward diversity are likely to view diversity issues as having long-term as well as short-term ramifications and be concerned about a broad range of training objectives (e.g., efficiency, innovation, and social responsibility) (Dass & Parker, 1999). These broad objectives are likely to be best addressed under a broad diversity umbrella." (p. 156)

"TRAINING CONTROVERSY 3: CONFRONTATION OR NOT?
Most authors agree that experiential learning, which occurs through active participation, is important in the context of diversity training (Ferdman & Brody, 1996; Mobley & Payne, 1992). As a result, many diversity training programs include simulation and role-play activities, as well as group discussions of individual and collective experiences. However, some trainers have adopted a fairly extreme position by advising that experiential diversity training incorporate a 'confrontational element.' For example, Lunt (1994) describes a diversity training program that encourages employees to directly confront one another on issues surrounding race, gender, and sexual orientation. Other programs deliberately create 'unsafe' situations in which trainees are 'picked on' because of their

gender, race, or religion; afterward, trainees explore their feelings and reactions (Lippman, 1999). Advocates argue that these confrontational techniques are needed because people are unaware of their own prejudices (Raths, 1999) and resistant to information that suggests their attitudes and beliefs are wrong (Hennessy, 1994). As a result, trainees need to be 'jolted' into changing their attitudes and subsequent behavior. Confrontational diversity training provides this jolt, provoking participants into examining the causes of their own behavior (Hennessy, 1994).

Of course, these confrontational approaches may backfire. Employees can become defensive or feel that they are being judged too quickly when they are challenged in a public setting (Raths, 1999), and some authors worry that confrontational techniques cause participants to leave with even stronger biases (Morrison, 1992). However, advocates of confrontational training techniques argue that confrontation is an essential part of the learning process and that some degree of conflict in the training process is inevitable (Lunt, 1994). Confrontational strategies permit the trainer to directly address employee resistance to the training; ignoring trainee resistance can sabotage training effectiveness (Mobley & Payne, 1992)." (p. 157)

"Our literature review did not identify any diversity training research that directly assessed the effectiveness of confrontational approaches. However, confrontational techniques are part of a long tradition in psychotherapy. When using a confrontation strategy, a therapist calls the client's attention to observed discrepancies among attitudes, thoughts, or behaviors to make the | client aware of his or her psychological defenses or resistance to the therapy (Klein, 1989). The therapist might accomplish this through silence (as a way of getting the client to accept responsibility for the therapeutic work) or through probing questions that encourage the client to engage in introspection of his or her own behavior (Klein, 1989)." (pp. 157-158)

"Orlinsky and Howard (1986) reviewed the research on confrontation in the clinical literature and concluded that the results were strikingly consistent in demonstrating that confrontation was positively associated with patient outcomes. The evidence suggests that confrontation is most effective when implemented in the context of a long-term therapeutic relationship (Kadushin & Kadushin, 1997), after the therapist has gathered sufficient data to make firm statements about inconsistencies in the client's thoughts, behaviors, or attitudes (Strean & Strean, 1998). In short-term relationships, confrontations elicit more defensive behavior from the client (Salerno, Farber, McCullough, Winston, & Trujillo, 1992). If confrontation is used prematurely, the end results may be wasted time, client anxiety, and intensified client resistance (Greenson, 1967)." (p. 158)

"These research results provide direction to human resource practitioners about the kind of needs assessment information needed to decide when confrontational techniques are best used in diversity training. First, the results suggest that the practitioner needs to consider the existing relationship between the trainees and the trainer and the resources that the organization is willing to devote to the training. Confrontational strategies are most effective in the context of long-term relationships (Kadushin & Kadushin, 1997). Confrontation may be most effectively applied by trusted insiders who are highly familiar with the trainees' attitudes and behavior and who will be able to conduct follow-up sessions with the same training group. If the organization is hiring an outside trainer to conduct a short-term, single-shot diversity training program, confrontation may be not only inappropriate but problematic.

Second, research suggests that confrontation in therapeutic contexts is most effective when the therapist can provide illustrative examples of inconsistencies from the client's life (Strean & Strean, 1998). In the training context, this may require a thorough pretraining person analysis to identify inconsistencies in the trainee's thoughts, behaviors, or attitudes. A person analysis might identify inconsistencies between the trainee's expressed attitudes (e.g., 'I am interested in hiring nontraditional job applicants') and his or her behavior (e.g., actual hiring record) that can be explored during the training process. An organizational-level analysis will not provide the kinds of specifics needed to support a confrontation strategy." (p. 158)

"TRAINING CONTROVERSY 4: HOMOGENEOUS VERSUS HETEROGENEOUS TRAINING GROUPS

Another commonly occurring question regarding the conduct of diversity training concerns the composition of training groups. The diversity literature frequently advises organizations to assemble groups of trainees who are demographically heterogeneous, particularly with respect to visible dimensions of diversity such as gender, racioethnicity, and age. For example, Ellis and Sonnenfeld (1994) recommend that organizations 'try to recruit a mix of participants that minimizes the likelihood that individual participants will be obligated to assume token roles as unwilling representatives of their racial, gender, or other such group' (p. 101). Kirkland and Regan (1997) and Baytos (1995) advocate the use of mixed groups for diversity training not to protect individuals with token status but for the educational benefits. The quality of discussion regarding diversity issues is believed to be enhanced by heterogeneity, and homogeneous groups may limit the value of learning. Such suggestions for diverse training groups have sometimes been taken quite seriously. In some organizations employing limited numbers of racioethnic minority employees, the few employees of color have been asked to attend multiple training sessions so that group heterogeneity could be achieved (Baytos, 1995; Caudron & Hayes, 1997)." (p. 159)

"There is another side to this debate, which advances the superiority of homogeneous training groups. Some diversity trainers argue that racially mixed groups are more likely to reinforce prejudiced attitudes among trainees (Gordon, 1995) and advocate racially homogeneous training groups instead. Groups homogeneous with respect to gender or racioethnicity may reduce complaints of White males who say that they sometimes feel threatened or attacked in diverse training groups (Galen & Palmer, 1993). Homogeneous groups may enable trainees to engage in frank discussions about the | training content, without feeling distracted by impression management concerns or pressures to behave in a 'politically correct' fashion (Kitfield, 1998). Additionally, the use of homogeneous groups avoids placing minority participants in the 'hot seat' of educating the majority group (Katz, 1978) and facilitates the process of learning about one's own group membership (Alderfer, Alderfer, Bell, & Jones, 1992; Kirkland & Regan, 1997). Although many writers addressing this issue have focused on racioethnicity, Burkart (1999) suggests that homogeneous training groups provide a safe setting in which members of any subordinated subgroup can better examine the within-group dynamics resulting from power differences." (pp. 159-160)

"Although both sides of the heterogeneous/homogeneous controversy have passionate supporters, there is little research that systematically evaluates the effect of training group composition on diversity training outcomes. Roberson, Kulik, and Pepper (2001) created diversity training groups homogeneous or heterogeneous in racioethnicity and nationality and found that the effects of training group composition on measures of knowledge and skill depended on the experience level of the trainee. Specifically, high-experience trainees (those with prior diversity training) were more knowledgeable about skills and strategies for dealing with diversity issues, generated more, and more specific, strategies for applying the training content to their work assignments, and demonstrated greater cultural competence in response to diversity incidents, when they had been trained in homogeneous groups. For low-experience trainees (those without prior diversity training), group composition had no significant impact on outcomes. Thus, greater experience with diversity issues resulted in greater sensitivity to group composition when learning skills and behavioral strategies. However, neither group composition nor trainee experience had a significant impact on attitudes toward diversity." (p. 160)

"These findings may be due to the different training needs of those with varying experience. As trainees gain experience with diversity issues through training, the learning of behavioral skills gains importance (Gudykunst, Guzley, & Hammer, 1996). Trainees may use each other as models, and behavioral modeling is more likely to occur if the model is perceived as similar to the trainee (Decker

& Nathan, 1985). Behavioral learning also causes anxiety (Landis & Bhagat, 1996), and a safe environment in which to rehearse new behaviors is needed. Feelings of safety are likely to be enhanced with similar others. Paige and Martin (1996) further suggest that trainees are likely to be resistant to behavioral learning unless they have formed relationships among themselves. Because of the greater attraction | and rapport among similar others (Millikin & Martins, 1996), relationships may form more quickly in a demographically homogeneous group, facilitating learning." (pp. 160-161)

"These findings suggest how needs assessment can be used to guide the decision regarding training group composition. If the organization wants to change employee attitudes, or if trainees have not previously been exposed to diversity training, then heterogeneous and homogeneous training groups are likely to be equally beneficial. Thus, the critical questions to include in the needs assessment are (a) Is the intention to change attitudes or behavior? This can be determined through organizational analysis. (b) If changing behavior is important, how can groups be formed to increase behavioral learning? A person analysis can identify the diversity training experience of each individual. If trainees have prior experience with diversity training, use existing work groups or homogeneous groups. If trainees have little experience with diversity training, group composition may not matter." (p. 161)

"TRAINING CONTROVERSY 5: TRAINER DEMOGRAPHICS
One of the biggest challenges for organizations conducting diversity training is deciding who the trainers should be. Organizations often struggle with the question of whether trainers' own demographics influence their training effectiveness. Karp and Sutton (1993) suggest that 'the current tendency is to avoid having white males do diversity training' (p. 30). Many human resource professionals believe that women or members of racial minority groups are particularly well suited to present diversity material (Flynn, 1999), even when the training group is composed primarily of Whites or men. Female and non-White trainers are likely to have firsthand experience with discrimination (Karp & Sutton, 1993) and may have a stronger stake in the issues (Mobley & Payne, 1992).
However, not everyone in the diversity literature agrees that female and non-White trainers are always the most desirable choices. Some authors suggest that the trainer's demographics should be matched to those of trainees so that trainees are able to 'see themselves' in the trainers (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1997). This suggestion is consistent with research findings in the relational demography literature suggesting that demographic similarity is often associated with positive outcomes. For example, Tsui and O'Reilly (1989) found that similarity within organizational dyads was associated with greater personal attraction between dyad members. Likewise, similarity between trainer and trainee on

demographic variables can enhance the trainer's credibility by suggesting that the trainer has experienced situations similar to the trainee's own reality (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1997).
As the controversy over trainer demographics has grown, recommendations in the business literature have grown more complex. Karp and Sutton (1993) describe the "ideal" diversity trainers as a two-person team, with one trainer presenting a minority point of view and the other reflecting the majority participant group. Diverse trainer teams can model interactions across different identity groups, providing an opportunity for participants to observe how differences can complement and benefit a team (Pollar, 1998). " (p. 162)

"Our review of the diversity training literature identified only one study that addressed the effects of trainer demographics. Hayles (1996) reports that in unpublished research conducted within the Department of Navy and the U.S. government, pairs of diversity trainers that were diverse in terms of ethnicity or gender produced significantly more learning among participants than homogeneous trainer pairs. This finding suggests that trainees may learn from the interactions modeled by diverse trainer teams. However, it is unclear whether the trainers were similar or dissimilar to the people they | were training. As a result, there is little guidance available in deciding whether a particular mix of trainer demographics will enhance or attenuate training effectiveness. In contrast to the diversity training literature, two other literatures (the counseling literature and the behavioral modeling literature) have addressed related questions." (pp. 162-163)

"In the counseling literature, researchers have wondered whether demographic similarity or dissimilarity between a counselor and a client will influence counseling effectiveness. The empirical research finds limited effects based on client-counselor gender similarity (e.g., Campbell & Johnson, 1991), but finds consistent effects based on racioethnic similarity (e.g., Ricker, Nystul, & Waldo, 1999; Terrell & Terrell, 1984; Watkins & Terrell, 1988). In general, racioethnic similarity between a counselor and a client is associated with positive outcomes such as greater symptom relief (Ricker et al., 1999), whereas racioethnic dissimilarity is associated with negative outcomes, especially in relationships characterized by distrust (Terrell & Terrell, 1984; Watkins & Terrell, 1988). Most frequently, this literature has examined the effects of Black clients' being assigned to either White or Black counselors. Black clients who are distrustful of Whites are less optimistic about the success of counseling received from White counselors (Watkins & Terrell, 1988; Watkins, Terrell, Miller, & Terrell, 1989), expect White counselors to be less accepting, less trustworthy, and have less expertise (Watkins & Terrell, 1988) and are less likely to return for subsequent counseling sessions when their intake interview is conducted by a White counselor (Terrell & Terrell, 1984)." (p. 163)

"In the behavioral modeling literature, empirical research has demonstrated the effectiveness of models in improving a variety of trainee skills including interpersonal skills, assertiveness skills, and communication skills (Burke & Day, 1986; Latham & Saari, 1979; Smith, 1976). These skills are similar to those addressed in diversity training, and the trainer may in effect be operating as a behavioral model. Research suggests that two factors are especially critical in determining whether trainees will adopt the modeled behavior. First, models who are demographically similar to trainees may be more effective in eliciting the desired behavior (Hornstein, Fisch, & Holmes, 1968), in part because trainees find it easier to visualize themselves engaging in the modeled behavior. Imitative behavior is more likely to occur if trainees judge the model to be an appropriate comparison other for their own behavior (Brockner et al., 1984), and social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954) posits that similar, rather than dissimilar, others are appropriate models. In fact, some authors suggest that optimal identification results when the behavioral model is of the same sex and race as the trainee (Goldstein & Sorcher, 1974)." (p. 163)

"Second, imitative behavior is more likely to occur when the model is perceived as credible and is rewarded for engaging in the desired behavior, especially if the trainees desire similar reinforcement (A. P. Goldstein & Sorcher, 1974). As a result, organizational training programs may be more successful when they involve models who have high organizational or social status (Manz & Sims, 1981).

The research results observed in the counseling and behavioral modeling literatures suggest that matching trainer and trainee demographics may be most critical when (a) the trainees are likely to be mistrustful of demographically dissimilar trainers or (b) the training focuses on behavioral skills. In both of these situations, demographic similarity between the trainer and the trainees may enhance training effectiveness. These results suggest that during needs assessment the human resource practitioner needs to collect person analysis information concerning the trainees' level of cultural mistrust. For example, the Cultural Mistrust Inventory (Terrell & Terrell, 1981) was developed in the counseling literature to assess the extent to which Blacks mistrust Whites and may be a useful pretraining assessment tool for diversity trainers. If the results indicate a high level of mistrust, demographic dissimilarity between the trainer and trainees may not evoke frank discussion or sufficient self-disclosure from the trainees." (p. 164)

"Additionally, the human resource practitioner should consider whether the training will primarily focus on raising awareness or developing behavioral skills. If the training is primarily intended to raise awareness, trainer trainee dissimilarity may be effective. However, if the training is designed to

develop behavioral skills, modeling may be facilitated by using trainers who are demographically similar to trainees." (p. 164)

"Finally, the human resource practitioner also needs to consider whether the trainer's demographics will enhance or detract from the trainer's credibility in the particular training environment. Female and racial minority trainers may have a great deal of expertise within the topic areas of diversity and discrimination (Flynn, 1999; Karp & Sutton, 1993). However, if the organizational context is one in which women and members of racial minorities primarily occupy low-level positions, group membership is negatively correlated with power and authority, which affects its organizational meaning. Work by D. A. Thomas (1999) and Ely (1995) has shown that under these conditions, societal stereotypes are more likely to go unexamined, affecting between and within group relations. In such contexts, female and minority trainers are more likely to lack credibility for trainees, and positive organizational consequences of modeling their behavior will be less apparent or believable. Instead, the audience may be more likely to view female or racial minority trainers as "having an ax to grind" (Flynn, 1999). In these | cases, more attention may need to be devoted to developing the trainer as an effective model (e.g., by emphasizing the trainers' credentials or identifying non-demographic dimensions on which trainer and trainee are similar) or by including trainers from the dominant powerful group." (pp. 164-165)

"We have identified five controversies regarding diversity training that organizations often wrestle with when designing training programs. As our review has shown, all sides of these controversies have strong proponents, and it is likely that each position has validity and is warranted under certain conditions. We discussed relevant research in psychology and management that would shed light on when each choice might be most appropriate. From this application of research, we were able to identify needs assessment information that would help human resource practitioners and trainers make design decisions for their organizations.... Needs assessment can indeed help trainers and human resource practitioners resolve common controversies in training design, but it must be more broadly conceived than in the past. Although needs assessment is generally viewed as having three interrelated components (organizational analysis, task/operations analysis, and person analysis), needs assessment in the diversity training context has traditionally been dominated by organizational analysis. In contrast, the questions in Table 1 cover all three facets of needs assessment." (p. 165)

"*Organizational analysis.* In the past, organizational analysis has been used primarily to identify broad issues with implications for training content and the criteria used to assess change. Table 1 shows additional questions to be addressed in an organizational analysis to answer design questions. These

questions cannot be answered via the typically recommended culture audit but can be addressed by top management (Ford & Fisher, 1996). This means that organizations have the knowledge and information to answer many | design controversies by themselves. They need not rely on consultant preferences or lists of 'best practices' for training design decisions. Using an internal organizational analysis rather than these outside sources to answer design questions will lead to more tailored training, which is likely to be more effective." (pp. 166-167)

"*Person analysis.* Our review identifies person analysis as another key area for addressing design controversies. Person analysis has been largely neglected by diversity trainers, even though attitude survey data, commonly advocated, could be used for this purpose. This neglect may be due to the traditional use of person analysis as a way to determine which individual employees are performing at acceptable levels (Blanchard & Thacker, 1999). In the diversity domain, the pinpointing of individuals who are "low performers" is likely to be a threatening assessment. Thus, people talk of using aggregate survey results. Two of our person analysis questions, regarding current attitudes toward diversity and inconsistencies in attitudes and behavior, might indeed be threatening to individuals. Although some organizations do use assessment tools to identify job applicants or employees with problematic attitudes (e.g., Rice, 1996), the fact that more and more organizations are evaluating managers on their effectiveness in managing diversity (Garcia, 2000; Rice, 2000) may motivate employees to voluntarily self-assess their skills and seek out resources appropriate to their needs. For example, Rossett and Bickham (1994) describe self-assessment tools that were used to encourage law enforcement officers to probe their attitudes toward diversity. The officers were motivated to develop their skills in dealing with a diverse community because those skills were directly related to their job performance. Other person analysis questions identified in Table 1 do not focus on singling out individuals whose attitudes need repair but identifying additional person-level variables that can influence the effectiveness of different training choices. Trust in the trainer, familiarity with other trainees, and previous diversity training experience can all be assessed at training group levels." (p. 167)

"*Operations analysis.* Operations analysis, the third facet of needs assessment, was not identified as critical for resolving most of the design controversies reviewed here. Yet this area may be very relevant for some other training decisions. For example, another decision faced by trainers and human resource professionals is whether diversity training should be conducted top down or bottom-up. In a top-down training strategy, top-level management and executives receive training first, followed by lower levels. This approach is endorsed by many experts as a way of demonstrating top management | support for the diversity initiative (Hayles, 1996; Lunt, 1994). However, a bottom-up strategy may be

appropriate in some situations. When Denny's embarked on a large-scale diversity initiative designed to change its public image as a racist organization, diversity training was initially directed toward employees in customer service positions and addressed the right and wrong ways to seat and serve customers (Rice, 1996). By focusing first on the employees with the most direct customer contact, Denny's hoped to make faster inroads in changing the public's perception of the organization. In this situation, operations or task analysis would be critical to determine which jobs to focus on and, within each job, to identify the particular behaviors that need immediate change. Similarly, as indicated in Table 1, operations analysis is useful in addressing the broad versus narrow training controversy by identifying tasks that may require additional resources. In general, when particular behaviors are targeted by diversity training, operations analysis is warranted." (pp. 167-168)

"Finally, our review points to the need to measure multiple dependent variables in training evaluations. In the diversity training literature, the recommendations of trainers and consultants on each side of the training controversies are often made based on trainee reactions. This reflects a focus on trainee reactions as the primary criterion of interest, and training has often been designed to influence this criterion alone. However, our recommendations regarding design choices have been made based on criteria of learning and behavioral or attitudinal change. Although trainee reactions are useful, they do not equal learning or change in behaviors and attitudes (Salas, CannonBowers, Rhodenizer, & Bowers, 1999). This points to the need to examine several levels of criteria and their relationships when evaluating diversity training." (p. 169)

Citation
Smith, N. L., & Percy, E. J. (2019). Diversity training methods, opinions of political correctness, and perceptions of microaggressions. Psi *Chi Journal of Psychological Research, 24*, 106–112. https://doi.org/10.24839/2325-7342.JN24.2.106

Abstract
This experiment studied the impact of diversity training methods and political correctness opinions on participants'

Conclusions
"To date, very few psychometric assessments measure individual opinions of politically correct speech, with the exception of Strauts and Blanton's (2015) Concern for Political Correctness (CPC). Using the CPC to assess baseline political correctness opinions, the present study aimed to compare the effectiveness of different diversity training programs and whether their efficacy was dependent on participants' opinions of political correctness." (p. 108)

"Sixty participants, all of whom were enrolled in an Introductory Psychology course at North Central College, were recruited through SONA. The sample consisted of 43 women and 17 men, with 29 in the prescriptive group and 31 in the perspective-taking group. Participants responded that they were White (85%, n = 51), Hispanic or Latino (15%, n = 9), Asian (6%, n = 4), Native American or Alaska Native (6%, n = 4), Middle Eastern or North African (2%, n = 1), and Jamaican (2%, n = 1). Each participant was compensated with 1 credit for their psychology class." (p. 108)

perception of microaggressions. It was hypothesized that (a) those with a positive political correctness opinion would be more aware of microaggressions after diversity training than those with a negative political correctness opinion, (b) the perspective-taking training group would be more effective than the prescriptive training group, and (c) those with a negative political correctness opinion in the prescriptive training condition would have a backfire response in which their awareness of microaggressions would decrease. Using a 2 x 2 design, participants completed a questionnaire assessing their opinion of political correctness and were then randomly assigned to 1 of the diversity training conditions. All participants analyzed a series of comics depicting microaggressions and ranked their offensiveness on a 5-point Likert scale, both before and after training, to measure their change in perception. No significant difference was found for opinion of political correctness, $F(2, 54) = 0.11$, $p = .900$, $\eta P^2 = .004$. A significant opposite result was found for diversity training method, $F(1, 54) = 10.03$, $p = .002$, ηP^2 with a greater change in perception for those in the prescriptive group as compared to those in the perspective-taking group. Additionally, no backfire response was detected among those with a negative political correctness opinion in

"A revised version of the CPC (Strauts & Blanton, 2015) was used to measure participants' opinions of political correctness. Criterion validation studies have confirmed that the CPC accurately predicts negative responses to politically incorrect speech (Strauts & Blanton, 2015). However, the original measure was left-leaning because all nine questions were indicative of a positive political correctness perspective. The revised version added three questions indicative of a negative political correctness opinion and altered the phrasing of three original questions, creating six questions leaning toward a positive political correctness opinion and six | leaning toward a negative political correctness opinion (see Appendix). Participants responded using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree)." (pp. 108-109)

"The POMS was created by the authors using Pixton, an online comic book creator. The 20-question measurement was developed by compiling examples of microaggressions, coding each example by theme, and creating comic strips to depict the scenarios. The POMS consisted of 16 comics depicting microinvalidations and microinsults, two comics depicting microassaults, and two control comics. The comics used in the present study can be accessed via Open Science Framework at https://osf.io/k3wz4. For each question, a comic strip was displayed on a Smart board for 15 seconds along with the question, 'Do you perceive anything about this situation to be harmful or offensive?' Participants answered using a 5-point Likert scale and were asked to remain silent so as not to influence other participants. Two versions of the POMS were created in order to measure microaggression perception before and after diversity training. It was randomly decided via a coin flip before each experimental session which version of the POMS would be taken first, to ensure reliability between the versions." (p. 109)

"Those in the prescriptive condition were given a condensed handout from the University of Southern California's academic affairs ("Recognizing Microaggressions," n.d.). The handout was adapted from Sue (2010) and gave information about the messages that microaggressions send. For the perspective-taking condition, participants were given a worksheet with a writing prompt and space to write. The prompt was modeled after Lindsey et al. (2015), where participants were asked to imagine themselves as a member of a marginalized ethnicity and write about the challenges that person might face." (p. 109)

"The North Central College institutional review board provided approval (#2017-60) for research with human subjects. Initially, participants were randomly assigned to one of the diversity training methods based on a coin flip. Upon arrival, participants were seated with at least one empty seat between each

the prescriptive condition. Findings suggest that exposure to diverse perspectives is important for changes in microaggression perception to occur.

Limitations
"These results indicate the impact of diversity training on primarily White students, and may not be representative of other communities. It would be beneficial for future studies to evaluate the efficacy of diversity training in communities with majority people of color. Another limitation of this study was the method of communicating microaggressions. Comic strips are two-dimensional, unable to fully depict something as nuanced and multifaceted as microaggressions. For example, it would be difficult to create a clear comic strip portraying a White person speaking extra slowly to a person with a Chinese accent. This occurrence is common yet tricky to accurately illustrate via this medium, thus limiting the types of microaggressions which could be included on the POMS." (p. 111)

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=136850078&site=eds-live

other. They were given an informed consent form and asked to carefully read through it before voluntarily signing. A manilla folder was placed in the center of the table and participants were told they would personally place their packets in that folder after the experiment. Each participant was then given a packet of materials for the experiment, faced down.

When prompted, participants flipped over their packets and had 2 minutes to complete the CPC (see Appendix). Next, they were given detailed instructions on how to take the POMS. Comic strips were projected onto a whiteboard, with a number in the lower right-hand corner indicating the question number. They were directed to observe each storyboard carefully and answer the question in their packets, "Do you perceive anything about this situation to be harmful or offensive?" Responses were recorded using a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (definitely not) to 5 (definitely yes) and each storyboard was displayed for 15 seconds. After completing the POMS pretest, participants underwent a diversity training session.

In the prescriptive condition, participants followed along in their packets as a handout was read aloud. Going through this handout took approximately 5 minutes. Participants in the perspective-taking condition were asked to imagine themselves as a member of a marginalized race, religion, or ethnicity. Then, they were given 5 minutes to write a short story about the challenges this person might experience in everyday life. After the training session, all participants took a posttest of the POMS and answered a brief demographic questionnaire. Once completed, participants placed their packets inside the manilla folder in the center of the table, given debriefing forms, thanked, and dismissed." (p. 109)

"The aim of this experiment was to evaluate the impact of various diversity training methods and political correctness opinions on perceptions of microaggressions. It was initially hypothesized that those with a positive political correctness opinion would experience a greater increase in awareness after diversity training than those with a negative political correctness opinion. Results failed to find a significant difference in awareness of microaggressions based on one's opinion of political correctness. It was also hypothesized that those with a negative political correctness opinion in the prescriptive group would be less aware of microaggressions after the training. This hypothesis was also rejected, as these participants experienced an increase in perception similar to that of the other conditions. These findings suggest that the efficacy of diversity training does not depend on political correctness opinion, but it is also possible that the prescriptive condition was not an exact representation of political correctness. The prescriptive handout did not explicitly tell participants that they could not say, or act upon, the listed microaggressions; rather, it explained the subliminal messages which they send to members of marginalized races and ethnicities. Political correctness implies some type of restraint on expression (Loury, 1994); the handout merely suggested the elimination of certain phrases, but did not require it. It is also possible that the statistical significance

was a fluke—a reflection of conformity in the social environment of the experimental session. Many of the examples listed in the handout were very similar to some of the comics on the POMS, so that by the posttest it was fairly clear to participants that the comics were portraying microaggressions. This, along with the knowledge that the trainer perceives microaggressions as detrimental, could lead participants to label situations as harmful or offensive even if they did not personally believe so. Indeed, political correctness can lead group members to self-censor if their beliefs differ from the majority, for fear of backlash or social ostracism (Loury, 1994)." (p. 110)

"It was also hypothesized that the perspective taking training group would be more effective than the prescriptive group. The opposite was found; participants in the prescriptive training condition experienced a significant increase in their perceptions of microaggressions, while those in the perspective-taking condition did not. Perhaps our initial categorization was inaccurate because the prescriptive group might be more adequately described as a perspective-taking group. For those in the prescriptive condition, becoming aware of the metacommunications of microaggressions was a driving force to push them outside of their own experiential thoughts. In a sense, they were taking on the perspective of those with different life experiences. Meanwhile, the initially named perspective- taking group might be more accurately | described as an introspection group. The logic behind this condition's diversity training method is that, by pondering the experiences of those with different life experiences, social comparison occurs, thereby reducing the confines dividing in-groups and out-groups (Lindsey et al., 2015). However, these participants only had access to their internal thoughts, rather than outside perspectives, leading to circular thinking, which was represented in many of the responses reinforcing stereotypes. One participant wrote that the most common challenges facing the African-American community were 'single parent homes...Black on Black crime...and gangs.' Another wrote, 'I have a heavy Indian accent because I only know life on the reservation.' These statements are as perplexing as they are problematic. They could easily be perceived as microaggressions, but may also reflect the miseducation that led to these conclusions in the first place. Regardless, the attitudes of these participants will not alter if they do not travel outside their own sphere of thinking." (pp. 110-111)

"Regardless of political correctness opinion, all people carry conscious and unconscious internal biases. These findings suggest that in order for perceptions of subtle bias to change, individuals must be exposed to differing perspectives. This line of thinking is consistent with intergroup contact theory, or the idea that forming positive, interdependent relationships with multiple members of an out-group leads to more positive attitudes of that community. It is one of the most effective and applicable methods of improving cross-cultural relations; for example, Bohmert and DeMaris (2015) found that

	having more interracial friendships is strongly associated with more positive racial attitudes. Then, in order to reduce internal racial biases, cooperative bonds must be formed with many people of various different backgrounds. The changes in perception detected in this study are a step in the right direction but should not be confused with altered internal biases. Future studies should examine whether changes in perceptions of microaggressions actually lead to fewer microaggression occurrences. Although it is unlikely that a one-time diversity training class will truly change deeply rooted racial schemas, exposing students and employees to the underlying messages that microaggressions send lays the groundwork for understanding. Because culture shapes reality, authentic intercultural relations will inevitably lead to misunderstandings. These differences in perception can be uncomfortable, but should be embraced and worked through in order to facilitate a better understanding of those	with different life experiences. Perhaps then the veil will be recognized and, eventually, begin to lift." (pp. 111-112)
Citation Wilson, H. F. (2013). Learning to think differently: Diversity training and the 'good encounter.' *Geoforum, 45*, 73–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2012.10.001 **Abstract** At a time of ongoing economic and social insecurity the capacity to live with difference is under renewed strain. In this context, community outreach organisations and projects of intervention that deal with diversity-related tensions are essential. This paper provides an empirical account of a diversity workshop run by an international organisation that aims to cultivate more peaceful modes of coexistence through attention to the everyday formation of prejudice. The paper has two key concerns. The first is to attend to the techniques employed to	**Conclusions** "This paper examines a series of training exercises that aim to promote new 'knowledge practices' (Adam and Groves, 2007) that alter how individuals see their role in effecting social change at an everyday level. In so doing, it details the varied techniques and exercises utilised by The Group in order to address and further unpack the organisation of prejudice, its everyday occurrence, and the normalising tendencies of state regulation (Brown, 2006)." (p. 74) "There are an abundance of programmes that utilise intervention strategies to facilitate transformations in behaviour, reduce conflict and foster more 'peaceful' and socially inclusive communities. Diversity training took off in the 1970s in response to changing workplace demographics and has since proliferated to encompass a variety of activities (Paluck, 2006). These include instructional approaches that provide information on legislation, diversity policies, demographic changes and cultural styles of communication through to experiential methods that are more participatory in nature and utilise role-plays and story-telling to encourage people to talk about their backgrounds, experiences and personal prejudices (Paluck, 2006, p. 580–581). A wealth of books provide a catalogue of advice and techniques on how to understand and manage difference – a concern that was heavily underlined by the last government (DCLG, 2009; SHM, 2007) – outlining 'the essential steps' (Weeks, 1994), 'breakthrough strategies' (Liberman, 2003), 'mediation tools' (Dana, 2000) and 'essential dynamics' (Mayer, 2000) that produce the best results." (p. 76) "The Group has its own handbook which offers practical guidance and outlines the 'conceptual tools' needed to 'embrace' diversity and resolve tensions. These are outlined alongside a series of tips or

facilitate encounters with difference and to unpack the constructions of prejudiced thought. In the context of growing debates around the possibilities and challenges of coordinated contact, the paper engages with work that has articulated alternative ways of responding to difference through an attention to practices of embodied thought. The second concern focuses upon the conditions that make new ways of thinking possible and argues that in order to understand how such organisations might affect positive change, it is vital to understand how such workshops take place. The paper therefore attends to the role of memory, habit and the working of particular affects such as shame, to open up a discussion about the ways in which workshop exercises might resonate beyond training events. The paper concludes with some reflections upon the implications for policies concerned with behavioural change in the context of developing relations across difference.

Limitations
"Thus, the paper does not address how such training and the manipulation of emotional registers might work with individuals who are not ashamed of their prejudices or who are not sympathetic to the organisation's aims." (p. 80)

Article Link

contingency plans for those instances when things fail to go according to plan and participants respond in an unanticipated manner. Crucially, such guidance goes beyond an account of what exercises should be delivered and in what order, to encompass detailed accounts of the ways in which the workshop should be set up and delivered, from the 'crucial' and 'proper' arrangement of chairs and flowers, to the points at which a supportive hand might be needed or information should be delivered 'gently' or said 'lightly'. The programme is thus designed with a concern for producing the right spatial environment or 'atmosphere' in which to foster diversity and animate particular forms of attachment, encounter and intensity (Anderson, 2009; Stewart, 2011). This included the disruption of 'habitual impulses' and comfort zones (Lambert, 2011) through regularly moving chairs, well-timed frisby-games to ease the tensions of particularly emotional sessions and icebreaker strategies, which included throwing a soft toy between participants as they repeated their names. Such strategies worked to shift the 'emotional tonality' of the space (Conradson, 2003, p. 1986) and to build a sense of connection, as did the bringing in and sharing of personal objects. For some exercises groups were broken up into smaller numbers and sent to smaller rooms to enable more intimate discussion and reflection, whilst the 'affective intensities' brought into being by the telling of often painful personal experiences were sustained through obligatory moments of silent reflection. To borrow Conradson's phrase, atmospheres were performatively 'brought into being' (p. 1985)." (p. 76)

"This particular 'thinking space' is thus without doubt as much a question of the specific relations between a diversity of objects, movements and forces as it is a programme of well-tailored exercises and critical thought (McCormack, 2010). Indeed it would be difficult to attend to the various conditions that inflect encounters with others, without attending to the very things that make the workshop productive and without asking how the space is designed or how participants might become 'attuned' to it (Stewart, 2011). As Stewart (p. 451) notes, the 'viscerality of being in whatever is happening renders choices already weighty' and this is precisely why I was advised to take part in the workshop myself – to better understand how the desire for personal change was effected through a combination of visceral productions and embodied comprehensions that were often difficult to articulate. Crucially, if such productions are vital to facilitate action, we might ask how and to what extent the exercises might work beyond the workshop." (p. 76)

"Whilst there has been a growing focus upon the affective and experiential learning processes of conflict management (Tromski and Doston, 2003) – although more could be said about the affective dimensions of their politics as demonstrated by Pratt and Johnston (2007) – little is said about the specific relations that make workshop spaces productive. Furthermore, given the centrality of bodily comprehensions to an individual's capacity to act, it is perhaps unsurprising that there is much

criticism about the perceived gap between conceptual understandings of diversity – its requirements and responsibilities – and the ability to respond to challenging moments of encounter in everyday life, which clearly demands a very different set of skills and attunements. Practices and programmes of diversity management, including online diversity training and diversity documentation (Ahmed, 2007a) commonly focus upon the rational or deliberative elements of negotiation or have a tendency to address issues of diversity in terms of their economic or legal outcome (Hostager and De Meuse, 2008; Ogilvie and Carsky, 2002). Yet encounters with difference are emergent, often outside expectation and complicate any neat accounts of agency, causality or moral cultivation. Attending to the enactment of difference in everyday life thus demands a more experimental ethic of cultivation than more traditional forms of diversity training might perhaps allow.

With this in mind, the following sections attend to a number of workshop exercises and it is worth providing a few words on my choice of presentation here. I present a series of workshop accounts that in some way depict a moment in which habits of thought are challenged and the micropolitics of perception are laid bare." (p. 76)

"*Exercise 1*
Participants attend the workshops for a variety of reasons and either sign up individually or are sent by organisations, including local councils, retailers, the police and the NHS. The workshops are run both as a means to train people in prejudice reduction and as a means to address prejudice in particular organisations or communities. The workshops described in this paper were predominantly for the purpose of leadership-training. Some participants were thus responsible for diversity issues at their place of work, others were training as volunteers for The Group, whilst others were simply there because they had an interest in diversity work and wanted to improve their skills. This meant that for the most part participants were relatively open to The Group's objectives and were willing to learn. The Group has set rules of engagement. Participants are expected to welcome the 'mistakes' of others, which are described as anything that may cause offense as the result of either misinformation or ignorance. In this respect the regulation of discussion is similar to that seen in relation to various forms of hate speech, ruling out any behaviour that offends with intent or malice, whilst potentially making participants vulnerable at the same time. If participants are unwilling to adhere to this one key rule, they are asked to step outside of the workshop where the conditions of their return are negotiated." (p. 77)

"At the beginning of my first workshop participants were asked to stand up when they identified with something that was called out. The facilitator began with the easier categories of 'recognition'; age, gender and nationality. When we stood we were reminded to take note of whom we might be standing

with and to note what we had in common. The questions continued; Are we religious? Are we Hindi? Christian? What denomination? This particular question embarrassed me and caught me between a desire to remain seated and a desire to be open with the remainder of the group; conscious that I didn't want people to judge me. I stood. So did half of the room.

The question of religion was followed by place of birth, family order, class, parents, appearances, language, schooling, nationality, heritage, disabilities, sexuality and what might perhaps be considered to be more private identities – experiences of criminal records, abuse, drugs, bereavement and so on. By the end of the exercise it is more than likely that each of the participants will have stood side-by-side with every other participant at least once. It thus acts as a disruption or a small shock to tendencies of classification and recognition, which are developed through 'repetition, synthesis, and schemetization' (Grosz, 2004, p. 169). It serves to remind people that social space is constantly divided by habits of categorisation that not only place importance upon singular identity traits to create 'false antimonies between groups', but are further in danger of doing so at the expense of recognising other commonalities (Parekh, 2008, p. 48)." (p. 77)

"Such tendencies not only form an initial impulse, but further provide a degree of consistency that maintains one's sense of self and thus, it is perhaps only when habits are interrupted that they become visible and an explanation is demanded (Harrison, 2000). As Grosz (2004) argues, ruptures or nicks can bring us face to face with contingency." (p. 77)

"Such possibility was noted by Jayna, a health worker responsible for diversity training in her workplace, who made reference to the workshop's disruption of 'false antinomies' (Parekh, 2008): '[Y]ou do discover things that you don't necessarily think you're going to find out, I'm referring to that sort of stereotype as well, that sort of perception as to what a person is or isn't. I thought actually, I don't know if other people felt this as well, but I thought actually it did highlight some of the similarities as well, rather than just how different we are…' (Jayna, 2009, focus group).

Jayna hints at the emergence of new terms of similarity that challenge the construction of identity/difference and alter the possibility for recognition. She later described the exercise as 'people standing together with people they didn't expect to be standing with...'. Of course, this is not to suggest that standing together in such exercises necessarily leads to a shared understanding or experience and it also fails to acknowledge the varying importance that individuals ascribe to particular aspects of their identity, sometimes giving identities an ontological significance that was not always felt. Individuals were thus variously expressed as cultural, sexual or racialised beings and whilst there was room for acknowledging the plurality of identities held by any one individual, there was less room for acknowledging the plurality of identity practices, how they might be subjected to

influences of experience, past encounters or wellbeing, or how they might carry often false expectations (Boler, 1999)." (p. 77)

"The value of such an exercise thus lies in the questions that it might open up through its facilitation of small ruptures in one's sense of perception, which was summed up in a conversation between two participants that had just completed their first day of training:
Saqiba. Did you not think that the [exercise] made you attach labels to yourself?
Ellen. Yeah (.) But then did you not find it really difficult to do?
Saqiba. Hmm...[I]
Ellen. I found it difficult, but I do it to other people all the time... (Focus group, 2009)
For Ellen, the discomfort of being labelled forced a reflection upon her own habit of labelling others. There is no indication as to whether this might encourage her to think differently, but rather an appreciation of her tendency to do it on a routine basis." (p. 77)

"*Exercise 2*
In a second exercise, participants are asked to work in pairs and to each choose an 'identity' mentioned in the previous exercise – or one that they feel they might hold prejudices against, however small. One person in every pair repeats out loud the identity selected by their partner, and each time they repeat it, the other is to respond with the first thought that comes into their head – working on the basis that individuals make audible those initial thoughts that arise instantaneously." (p. 77)

"*My partner turns to me and shouts the selected identity. I respond with little hesitation; 'ARROGANT'! Whilst I am more hesitant to voice some of the initial thoughts that come to mind, as the exercise develops, they come out so quickly | that my instinct is to clap my hand over my mouth... As the pace of the exercise quickens, it becomes more and more difficult to check what I say and my face burns with embarrassment. (Workshop diary, 2009)*" (pp. 77-78)

"Whilst this undoubtedly relies upon the honesty of participants, the exercise often revealed unsettling assumptions. Yet while embarrassing and sometimes shameful, the exercises were always completed with relative ease. A more open group discussion often followed, asking participants to reflect upon the origin of their stereotypes. Participants were asked to think about the role of the media in generating particular affects; to question how government policies produce (un)desirable subjects; to examine how conversations in the workplace or with the next door neighbour might shape them; and to ask how the multiple subjectivities discussed in the first exercise might inform their thinking – whether it be their economic circumstance, education, religion, family history and so on. As such, they

demand that the origins of assumptions are further scrutinised, to ask, for example, why certain bodily characteristics are taken to signify a person's character without having had prior contact with them." (p. 78)

"As one participant stated, the exercise serves as a reminder 'that our prejudices are always lurking around in the undergrowth' (2009). It highlights how, in everyday encounters, stereotypes can 'click in at the possibility of intimacy' without prior warning (Connolly, 2002, p. 35), to perhaps inform your choice of seat on a bus (Wilson, 2011) or allow a racist comment to slip out when somebody cuts you up in a car (Swanton, 2010; Katz, 2002). This lack of prior warning is evidenced in the above account by the immediate instinct to clap hand over mouth seconds after the offending words had already escaped. This presents the chance to reflect upon those instances when undesirable thoughts are brought forth in the most public of ways – a reflection that was further facilitated by the workshop facilitators and a well-placed question:
'You know what happens when someone cuts in front of you when you're waiting for the bus? You know in that moment, words do come out, you know? And because it's coming out attached to rage, you might not notice what's come out? Yeah? But when you do it when there is no rage attached, you think 'oh my goodness! I did not know that was there!'' (Clifton, 2009)." (p. 78)

"As Probyn (2005, p. 35) argues, the very expression of shame can produce exactly the 'alternative ethos of engagement' that Connolly advocates. It is an 'acute sensitivity' (p. 2) to something that demands acknowledgement through an 'involuntary reassessment: Why am I ashamed?'' (p. xii). It can thus challenge participants to learn about themselves which, for a number of feminist writers, makes it politically valuable to such pedagogical endeavours (Pereira, 2012). In this instance, long term beliefs and assumptions are not just subjected to the critical gaze of others, but are subjected to personal assessment...Crucially, as Zembylas and McGlynn (2012) note, discomforting emotions also have the ability to linger days, weeks or even years after the event to continue to produce reactions and sustain self-reflection." (p. 79)

"Given how central the experience of shame is to confronting manifestations of power and unsettling conventional ways of thinking (Pereira, 2012), it is vital to question the ethical implications of such discomfort, particularly when it is used as a pedagogical tool (Boler, 1999; Cobb, 2007). Whilst The Group claim that they do not wish to purposefully shame people, it would be difficult to deny its significance to the workshop exercises. For Pereira (2012) such a situation can be justified so long as two key conditions are in place; time and trust. Participants have the right to opt out at any given point, yet whilst much work goes into ensuring that participants feel safe in being uncomfortable, the

resonances and temporalities of discomforting emotions make it very difficult to predict what kind of effects the workshop might have beyond the event. Thus, whilst it might be the case that more needs to be done to investigate the lasting benefits of such workshops, perhaps more also needs to be done to understand the long-term consequences of staging such discomforting exercises. This is particularly pertinent given that the exercises are at times reliant upon the suffering of another participant and the (re)production of their vulnerability. Whilst participants are made aware of this from the outset, it is very difficult to fully prepare for what may be the re-opening of particularly painful wounds." (p. 79)

"The significance of such a shared sense to the learning experience was perhaps most apparent in the next and final exercise, when a participant was encouraged to recount or share an experience of prejudice before taking the opportunity to 'vent'. Here, they are given the chance to say what they would have liked to have said at the time and to tell their perpetrators how it made them feel. As Sandercock (2003, p. 162) has argued, telling personal stories can be a 'vital vehicle' for dealing with history. In this respect it can perform a transformative or 'cathartic function' whilst also making it possible for accounts to be heard in all of their anxious, joyful, sorrowful, angry or hateful states (Sandercock, 2003). Participants variously expressed anger at how they had been treated in the past, shame when they recounted their own prejudices or grief at the loss of a loved one as a means to encourage a collective commitment from participants for change." (p. 79)

"The presence of the audience, the anxiety of exposure and the close proximity of the facilitator, combine to affectively energise and intensify the encounter to unknowable effects. Embodied comprehensions and the structural conditions of address within which this encounter took place were undeniably crucial to the exercise (Butler, 2005). As Connolly (2002, p. 76) argues, 'thought-imbued energies find symptomatic expression in the timbre of our voice, the calmness or intensity of our gestures [...] the receptivity, tightness, or sweatiness of our skin' and are clearly central to the ways in which encounters and experiences of prejudice are understood, made sense of and further relayed. The discomfort of the heavy silence and the quiet but uncontrollable tears that shook the participant and further crumpled the composure of those watching made this a particularly intense and indeed memorable encounter. It is one I have been unable to forget and one that was mentioned in several participant diaries after the event. Again, it is perhaps the memory of such encounters that is most productive in maintaining The Group's desire for change beyond the workshop, for this is the point at which the forces of prejudice come into sharp focus and the full impact of small acts, utterances and indirect discriminations are made clear. If not already felt, this is certainly realised through a well-timed question from the facilitator; who here has been responsible for making any of these comments

in the past or for failing to challenge another that has? A silent room is normally enough to make the point and to allow the implications of the question to settle upon the audience." (p. 79)

"Despite the deeply personal nature of this account and the reference to the small acts and utterances of prejudice, there is a notable commitment to better understanding the form of discrimination outlined, rather than the personal experience alone. Whether it be racism, sexism, homophobia or any other form of discrimination, the call for action at the end of the exercise is aimed more specifically at challenging the configurations of hegemonic social relations that variously perpetuate injustice or normalise particular ways of living. Of course, the prejudices discussed across the workshops were very different and it would be difficult to consider each and every one to be somehow comparable or equally affecting. Indeed The Group asked participants not to pass comment on the personal experiences discussed – or what they thought of them – but to recognise that each and every one of them had damaging effects – regardless of how big or small they might be. As such, we might see what Ruitenberg (2009) has described as the education of political emotions – or the opportunity to place personal | accounts within the context of wider societal relations so as to develop the ability to 'feel anger on behalf of injustices committed against those in less powerful positions' in a variety of very different contexts (p. 277). The exercises are thus regularly followed by statistics of inequality – the high representation of minority women in mental health establishments, the over-representation of young black men in stop and search statistics, the lack of women in senior political positions or the growing percentage of people with eating disorders. Such reminders of the political, economic and socio-cultural contexts in which prejudiced encounters take place highlight the historical-material circumstances of particular bodies. The exercises are thus not only about the micro- contexts in which people act, but are about situating them within a wider concern for collective responsibility (Popke, 2009)." (pp. 79-80)

"In this respect attention to the connection between forms of discrimination and the micropolitics of perception alters the ways in which participants see their role and implication in forms of injustice (Adam and Groves, 2007, p. 161). This not only makes it difficult for participants to deny or ignore the repercussions of their everyday actions, but endeavours to change the way in which participants understand processes of othering and their moral responsibility to others in the future. By transforming taken-for-granted habits of thought and social relations into subjects of reflection, the injustices produced – whether unintended or not – are made irreversibly present. In enabling participants to better understand the taking-place of discrimination, its material reality and the 'spreading of effects across time and space' (p. 172), the new knowledge practices that are advocated across the workshop are given a greater sense of urgency." (p. 80)

"As I indicated at the start of this paper, attending to the micro contexts and techniques of such a workshop is vital at a time when behaviour-changing interventions are not only on the rise but are increasingly the responsibility of voluntary organisations – particularly in relation to matters of 'diversity management'. As I have argued, the workshop offers a useful case through which to examine how new forms of engagement and responsibility might be engendered - with particular attention to bodily encounter - and further highlights how Connolly's (2002) writing on self modification and techniques of thought might be practically utilised. Through attention to the organisation of perception and the taking-place of prejudice, the exercises aim to open up the ways in which prejudice and its effects are understood, turning attention to the complicated relationship between thought, will and responsibility (Bissell, 2012) and forcing individuals to rethink how they are variously implicated in prejudice. Crucially, whilst elements of the workshop clearly target the affective subject, the training does not prioritise an attention to pre-cognitive registers. Through attention to the organisation of perception, the force of heated moments of exchange or the endurance of past encounters, the workshop certainly attends to more than deliberative thought and moral cultivation and further troubles accounts of agency through a reflection upon the variety of different actors and influences that regulate behaviour. This does not however, reduce human action to 'mute attunements' (see Barnett, 2008 for a discussion), but rather opens up the politics of difference to alter the way in which it is understood, not only in everyday encounters but within policy discourses, culture, the media, state practices and institutions." (p. 80)

"As I have argued to this point, much of the emphasis is placed upon exposing habit to scrutiny through enabling encounters that 'jar' thinking 'into motion' (Connolly, 2002, p. 113). The exercises are positioned as tactical interventions in processes of thought in order to gradually affect the 'sensibility from which one acts' (Connolly, 2002). However, given the relatively small achievements of such work, it is important that such personal work and 'self-recomposition' occurs alongside continued public negotiation that aims to change the way in which responsibility to others – and their suffering – is defined (Connolly, 1996). Indeed it is vital, as Popke (2009) argues, that such a focus on enhancing new forms of engagement does not come at the cost of overlooking 'a more extensive vision of collective responsibility' (p. 84). Beyond encouraging a change in constellations of identity/ difference at an individual level, it might be argued that such workshops are limited in their capacity to demand justice on a larger scale. Indeed, the endeavour to completely rework the conditions through which encounters with difference take place is an enormous project. It is not surprising then, that a common question asked of work concerned with such micro-encounters is how such action might be scaled-up. This is an important question given that the organisation's mission statement calls

for systemic change and given that the techniques explored here are learnt and utilised across a trans-national network to tackle a variety of social problems and conflicts. In this instance however, it would perhaps be more appropriate to ask how such encounters might be multiplied. The aim of this work is to encourage participants to share their experiences and techniques with their own organisations, groups and communities in the hope that this in turn will lead to the formation of further groups focused on the work of prejudice-reduction. The workshops are thus better understood as a first step to changing how individuals see their role in effecting change and to enriching a sense of 'responsibility for the common' (Popke, 2009) – although the extent to which this is actually realised is a focus for future research." (p. 81)

"Moving beyond these ongoing challenges I want to conclude by returning to recent concerns with behaviour-change and the current debates on the theories and possibilities of contact. Here I want to echo the arguments of Pykett (2012, p. 226) that government policies have been neglectful of the contextual factors that shape conduct and thus provide 'inadequate accounts of human subjectivity'. Through attending to the micro-contexts in which people act and make decisions, we might raise some valuable questions about the ways in which narratives of subjectivity, and their multiple performances and representations, interact with bodily encounters. This is a question that is paramount to work concerned with cultivating shared belongings and multicultural dialogue through a variety of means. Questions of prejudice clearly concern pre-cognition, but prejudice is also shaped by belief or background. The point is that neither takes precedence here. Through studying moments and spaces of encounter, it is possible to better consider how belief is more or less important in different situations, how subjectivities are differently performed and how different normative modalities of action shape spatial configurations of practice (Barnett, 2012). Thus, whilst there is much attempt here to work on habits of thought and processes of othering, the indeterminacy of action cannot be ignored. Yet, whilst addressing the taking-place of prejudice can only ever be a partial project, this paper argues that it is only through projects that are both attentive to, and critical of, the multiple positions, subjectivities and spacings that go into producing modes of encountering difference that the challenges of facing prejudice might be met." (p. 81)

Trade Publication Articles

Citation	Conclusions
Citation Best practices for diversity training. (2011). *Workforce Management, 90*(8), 14. **Abstract** The article offers suggestions on best practices for diversity training of employees. Professor Quinetta Roberson says that organizations must motivate employees by explaining them how diversity training would help them. Michael Hyter, president of the company Global Novations suggests use of experiential training focused on behavior. Shilpa Pherwani, partner at Ibis Consulting Group Inc. suggests that action plans to evaluate the effectiveness of diversity training must be created. **Article Link** https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=b9h&AN=64895601&site=eds-live	"Here are five of the best practices based on research and companies' experiences * Communicate an individual business case. During the past decade, developing a business case for diversity has become a standard practice within companies. However, organizations also should communicate what Villanova University management professor Quinetta Roberson calls an individual business case. 'People want to know, 'What's in it for me?'' says Roberson, who studies strategic diversity management. 'Is this going to increase my skill set where I'm more likely to be identified as a high-potential or future leader? They need to be given some kind of motivation to learn.' That way, they're more engaged when they attend training." (para. 1) "* Use experiential training focused on behaviors. 'Generic and theoretical learning doesn't have the same stickiness as experiential learning,' says Michael Hyter, president of diversity consultant Global Novations. Leading-edge practices incorporate experiential learning that develops skills rather than simulates discrimination. 'We don't teach people how to manage black people,' Hyter says. 'We teach people how to teach people who are different than them.'" (para. 2) "* Adopt clear metrics. Determine the goals of diversity training and evaluate its effectiveness, says Shilpa Pherwani, a managing partner with diversity consultant Ibis Consulting Group. Pherwani's firm tracks effectiveness by creating action plans for participants, tying the actions to organizational competencies. Steps may include setting specific recruiting and hiring goals for people of color and providing equitable opportunities to members of underrepresented groups." (para. 3) "* Encourage employees to practice what they learned. Managers need to provide opportunities for subordinates to apply their diversity training, Roberson says. 'We saw examples where employees would go back to their job excited about what they learned, but their managers would say, 'I don't care about all that diversity stuff. You've been gone for a day or two. I need you to do X, Y and Z.'' But

when managers share the newly trained subordinate's enthusiasm, they're reinforcing the message that the company values diversity and inclusion programs." (para. 4)

"* Don't expect training to be a panacea. 'Diversity training just in and of itself doesn't change the culture,' Pherwani says. It should be part of a comprehensive strategy that includes recruitment, mentoring and talent management. The diversity training helps explain the business rationale and provide skills to engage in difficult diversity conversations. Combining that training with a systemic approach provides a road map to organizations that want to build an inclusive culture, she says." (para. 5)

Citation

Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). Why diversity programs fail: and what works better. *Harvard Business Review, 94*(7–8), 52-60.

Abstract

The authors draw on three decades of research which demonstrates that conventional methods for promoting diversity, in place since the 1960s, have not been effective in increasing the presence and status of women and minorities in the workplace. Compulsory diversity training may be met with resistance, and hiring tests have been found to be used selectively. Instead, the most effective programs are those that engage individuals. Invitations to join diversity recruitment activities often receive positive responses because they are voluntary; mentoring is another method. Increasing manager contact with women and minority employees has also

Conclusions

"In analyzing three decades' worth of data from more than 800 U.S. firms and interviewing hundreds of line managers and executives at length, we've seen that companies get better results when they ease up on the control tactics. It's more effective to engage managers in solving the problem, increase their on the-job contact with female and minority workers, and promote social accountability— the desire to look fair-minded. That's why interventions such as targeted college recruitment, mentoring programs, self-managed teams, and task forces have boosted diversity in businesses. Some of the most effective solutions aren't even designed with diversity in mind. Here, we dig into the data, the interviews, and company examples to shed light on what doesn't work and what does." (p. 54)

"Do people who undergo training usually shed their biases? Researchers have been examining that question since before World War II, in nearly a thousand studies. It turns out that while people are easily taught to respond correctly to a questionnaire about bias, they soon forget the right answers. The positive effects of diversity training rarely last beyond a day or two, and a number of studies suggest that it can activate bias or spark a backlash. Nonetheless, nearly half of midsize companies use it, as do nearly all the Fortune 500. Many firms see adverse effects. One reason is that three-quarters use negative messages in their training. By headlining the legal case for diversity and trotting out stories of huge settlements, they issue an implied threat: 'Discriminate, and the company will pay the price.' We understand the temptation—that's how we got your attention in the first paragraph—but threats, or 'negative incentives,' don't win converts." (p. 54)

"Another reason is that about three-quarters of firms with training still follow the dated advice of the late diversity guru R. Roosevelt Thomas Jr. 'If diversity management is strategic to the organization,' he used to say, diversity training must be mandatory, and management has to make it clear that 'if you can't deal with that, then we have to ask you to leave.' But five years after instituting required training

been found to help eliminate bias, as does the influence of social accountability.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsbro&AN=edsbro.A457128267&site=eds-live

for managers, companies saw no improvement in the proportion of white women, black men, and Hispanics in management, and the share of | black women actually decreased by 9%, on average, while the ranks of Asian-American men and women shrank by 4% to 5%. Trainers tell us that people often respond to compulsory courses with anger and resistance—and many participants actually report more animosity toward other groups afterward." (pp. 54-55)

"But voluntary training evokes the opposite response ("I chose to show up, so I must be prodiversity"), leading to better results: increases of 9% to 13% in black men, Hispanic men, and Asian American men and women in management five years out (with no decline in white or black women). Research from the University of Toronto reinforces our findings: In one study white subjects read a brochure critiquing prejudice toward blacks. When people felt pressure to agree with it, the reading strengthened their bias against blacks. When they felt the choice was theirs, the reading reduced bias." (p. 55)

"Some 40% of companies now try to fight bias with mandatory hiring tests assessing the skills of candidates for frontline jobs. But managers don't like being told that they can't hire whomever they please, and our research suggests that they often use the tests selectively...When we interviewed the new HR director at a West Coast food company, he said he found that white managers were making only strangers—most of them minorities—take supervisor tests and hiring white friends without testing them...But even managers who test everyone applying for a position may ignore the results. Investment banks and consulting firms build tests into their job interviews, asking people to solve math and scenario-based problems on the spot. While studying this practice, Kellogg professor Lauren Rivera played a fly on the wall during hiring meetings at one firm. She found that the team paid little attention when white men blew the math test but close attention when women and blacks did. Because decision makers (deliberately or not) cherry-picked results, the testing amplified bias rather than quashed it." (p. 55)

"Companies that institute written job tests for managers—about 10% have them today—see decreases of 4% to 10% in the share of managerial jobs held by white women, African-American men and women, Hispanic men and women, and Asian American women over the next five years. There are significant declines among white and Asian American women—groups with high levels of education, which typically score well on standard | managerial tests. So group differences in test-taking skills don't explain the pattern." (pp. 55-56)

"More than 90% of midsize and large companies use annual performance ratings to ensure that managers make fair pay and promotion decisions. Identifying and rewarding the best workers isn't the only goal—the ratings also provide a litigation shield. Companies sued for discrimination often claim that their performance rating systems prevent biased treatment. But studies show that raters tend to lowball women and minorities in performance reviews. And some managers give everyone high marks to avoid hassles with employees or to keep their options open when handing out promotions. However managers work around performance systems, the bottom line is that ratings don't boost diversity. When companies introduce them, there's no effect on minority managers over the next five years, and the share of white women in management drops by 4%, on average." (p. 56)

"This last tactic is meant to identify and rehabilitate biased managers. About half of midsize and large firms have systems through which employees can challenge pay, promotion, and termination decisions. But many managers—rather than change their own behavior or address discrimination by others—try to get even with or belittle employees who complain. Among the nearly 90,000 discrimination complaints made to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 2015, 45% included a charge of retaliation—which suggests that the original report was met with ridicule, demotion, or worse. Once people see that a grievance system isn't warding off bad behavior in their organization, they may become less likely to speak up. Indeed, employee surveys show that most people don't report discrimination. This leads to another unintended consequence: Managers who receive few complaints conclude that their firms don't have a problem." (p. 56)

"Things don't get better when firms put in formal grievance systems; they get worse. Our quantitative analyses show that the managerial ranks of white women and all minority groups except Hispanic men decline—by 3% to 11%—in the five years after companies adopt them. Still, most employers feel they need some sort of system to intercept complaints, if only because judges like them. One strategy that is gaining ground is the "flexible" complaint system, which offers not only a formal hearing process but also informal mediation. Since an informal resolution doesn't involve hauling the manager before a disciplinary body, it may reduce retaliation. As we'll show, making managers feel accountable without subjecting them to public rebuke tends to help." (p. 56)

"If these popular solutions backfire, then what can employers do instead to promote diversity? A number of companies have gotten consistently positive results with tactics that don't focus on | control. They apply three basic principles: engage managers in solving the problem, expose them to people from different groups, and encourage social accountability for change." (pp. 56-57)

"When someone's beliefs and behavior are out of sync, that person experiences what psychologists call 'cognitive dissonance.' Experiments show that people have a strong tendency to 'correct' dissonance by changing either the beliefs or the behavior. So, if you prompt them to act in ways that support a particular view, their opinions shift toward that view. Ask them to write an essay defending the death penalty, and even the penalty's staunch opponents will come to see some merits. When managers actively help boost diversity in their companies, something similar happens: They begin to think of themselves as diversity champions. Take college recruitment programs targeting women and minorities. Our interviews suggest that managers willingly participate when invited. That's partly because the message is positive: 'Help us find a greater variety of promising employees!' And involvement is voluntary: Executives sometimes single out managers they think would be good recruiters, but they don't drag anyone along at gunpoint." (p. 57)

"Managers who make college visits say they take their charge seriously. They are determined to come back with strong candidates from underrepresented groups—female engineers, for instance, or African American management trainees. Cognitive dissonance soon kicks in—and managers who were wishy washy about diversity become converts. The effects are striking. Five years after a company implements a college recruitment program targeting female employees, the share of white women, black women, Hispanic women, and Asian American women in its management rises by about 10%, on average. A program focused on minority recruitment increases the proportion of black male managers by 8% and black female managers by 9%. Mentoring is another way to engage managers and chip away at their biases. In teaching their protégés the ropes and sponsoring them for key training and assignments, mentors help give their charges the breaks they need to develop and advance. The mentors then come to believe that their protégés merit these opportunities—whether they're white men, women, or minorities. That is cognitive dissonance—'Anyone I sponsor must be deserving'— at work again." (p. 57)

"Mentoring programs make companies' managerial echelons significantly more diverse: On average they boost the representation of black, Hispanic, and Asian-American women, and Hispanic and Asian-American men, by 9% to 24%. In industries where plenty of college-educated non managers are eligible to move up, like chemicals and electronics, mentoring programs also increase the ranks of white women and black men by 10% or more. Only about 15% of firms have special college recruitment programs for women and minorities, and only 10% have mentoring programs. Once organizations try them out, though, the upside becomes clear. Consider how these programs helped Coca-Cola in the wake of a race discrimination suit settled in 2000 for a record $193 million. With guidance from a court-appointed external task force, executives in the North America group got

involved in recruitment and mentoring initiatives for professionals and middle managers, working specifically toward measurable goals for minorities. Even top leaders helped to recruit and mentor, and talent-sourcing partners were required to broaden their recruitment efforts. After five years, according to former CEO and chairman Neville Isdell, 80% of all mentees had climbed at least one rung in management. Both individual and group mentoring were open to all races but attracted large numbers of African-Americans (who accounted for 36% of protégés). These changes brought important gains. From 2000 to 2006, African-Americans' representation among salaried employees grew from 19.7% to 23%, and Hispanics' from 5.5% to 6.4%. And while African-Americans and Hispanics respectively made up 12% and 4.9% of professionals and middle managers in 2002, just four years later those figures had risen to 15.5% and 5.9%. This began a virtuous cycle. Today, Coke looks like a different company. This February, Atlanta Tribune magazine profiled 17 African-American women in VP roles and above at Coke, including CFO Kathy Waller." (p. 57)

"Take self-managed teams, which allow people in different roles and functions to work together on projects as equals. Such teams increase contact among diverse types of people, because specialties within firms are still largely divided along racial, ethnic, and gender lines. For example, women are more likely than men to work in sales, whereas white men are more likely to be in tech jobs and management, and black and Hispanic men are more likely to be in production...Working side-by-side breaks down stereotypes, which leads to more equitable hiring and promotion. At firms that create self-managed work teams, the share of white women, black men and women, and Asian-American women in management rises by 3% to 6% over five years." (p. 58)

"Rotating management trainees through departments is another way to increase contact. Typically, this kind of cross-training allows people to try their hand at various jobs and deepen their understanding of the whole organization. But it also has a positive impact on diversity, because it exposes both department heads and trainees to a wider variety of people. The result, we've seen, is a bump of 3% to 7% in white women, black men and women, and Asian-American men and women in management. About a third of U.S. firms have self-managed teams for core operations, and nearly four-fifths use cross-training, so these tools are already available in many organizations. Though college recruitment and mentoring have a bigger impact on diversity—perhaps because they activate engagement in the diversity mission and create intergroup contact—every bit helps. Self-managed teams and cross-training have had more positive effects than mandatory diversity training, performance evaluations, job testing, or grievance procedures, which are supposed to promote diversity." (p. 58)

"The third tactic, encouraging social accountability, plays on our need to look good in the eyes of those around us. It is nicely illustrated by an experiment conducted in Israel. Teachers in training graded identical compositions attributed to Jewish students with Ashkenazic names (European heritage) or with Sephardic names (African or Asian heritage). Sephardic students typically come from poorer families and do worse in school. On average, the teacher trainees gave the Ashkenazic essays Bs and the Sephardic essays Ds. The difference evaporated, however, when trainees were told that they would discuss their grades with peers. The idea that they might have to explain their decisions led them to judge the work by its quality. In the workplace you'll see a similar effect. Consider this field study conducted by Emilio Castilla of MIT's Sloan School of Management: A firm found it consistently gave African-Americans smaller raises than whites, even when they had identical job titles and performance ratings. So Castilla suggested transparency to activate social accountability. The firm posted each unit's average performance rating and pay raise by race and gender. Once managers realized that employees, peers, and superiors would know which parts of the company favored whites, the gap in raises all but disappeared." (p. 58)

"Corporate diversity task forces help promote social accountability. CEOs usually assemble these teams, inviting department heads to volunteer and including members of underrepresented groups. Every quarter or two, task forces look at diversity numbers for the whole company, for business units, and for departments to figure out what needs attention. After investigating where the problems are—recruitment, career bottlenecks, and so on—task force members come up with solutions, which they then take back to their departments. They notice if their colleagues aren't volunteering to mentor or showing up at recruitment events. Accountability | theory suggests that having a task force member in a department will cause managers in it to ask themselves, 'Will this look right?' when making hiring and promotion decisions." (pp. 58-59)

"Deloitte has seen how powerful social accountability can be. In 1992, Mike Cook, who was then the CEO, decided to try to stanch the hemorrhaging of female associates. Half the company's hires were women, but nearly all of them left before they were anywhere near making partner. As Douglas McCracken, CEO of Deloitte's consulting unit at the time, later recounted in HBR, Cook assembled a high-profile task force that 'didn't immediately launch a slew of new organizational policies aimed at outlawing bad behavior' but, rather, relied on transparency to get results." (p. 59)

"The task force got each office to monitor the career progress of its women and set its own goals to address local problems. When it became clear that the CEO and other managing partners were closely watching, McCracken wrote, "women started getting their share of premier client assignments and

informal mentoring." And unit heads all over the country began getting questions from partners and associates about why things weren't changing faster. An external advisory council issued annual progress reports, and individual managers chose change metrics to add to their own performance ratings. In eight years turnover among women dropped to the same level as turnover among men, and the proportion of female partners increased from 5% to 14%— the highest percentage among the big accounting firms. By 2015, 21% of Deloitte's global partners were women, and in March of that year, Deloitte LLP appointed Cathy Engelbert as its CEO—making her the first woman to head a major accountancy. Task forces are the trifecta of diversity programs. In addition to promoting accountability, they engage members who might have previously been cool to diversity projects and increase contact among the women, minorities, and white men who participate. They pay off, too: On average, companies that put in diversity task forces see 9% to 30% increases in the representation of white women and of each minority group in management over the next five years." (p. 60)

"Diversity managers, too, boost inclusion by creating social accountability. To see why, let's go back to the finding of the teacher-in-training experiment, which is supported by many studies: When people know they might have to explain their decisions, they are less likely to act on bias. So simply having a diversity manager who could ask them questions prompts managers to step back and consider everyone who is qualified instead of hiring or promoting the first people who come to mind. Companies that appoint diversity managers see 7% to 18% increases in all underrepresented groups — except Hispanic men—in management in the following five years. Those are the gains after accounting for both effective and ineffective programs they put in place." (p. 60)

"Strategies for controlling bias—which drive most diversity efforts—have failed spectacularly since they were introduced to promote equal opportunity. Black men have barely gained ground in corporate management since 1985. White women haven't progressed since 2000. It isn't that there aren't enough educated women and minorities out there—both groups have made huge educational gains over the past two generations. The problem is that we can't motivate people by forcing them to get with the program and punishing them if they don't. The numbers sum it up. Your organization will become less diverse, not more, if you require managers to go to diversity training, try to regulate their hiring and promotion decisions, and put in a legalistic grievance system. The very good news is that we know what does work—we just need to do more of it." (p. 60)

Citation	Conclusions
Goodman, N. (2019, January 1). Proving the critics wrong on the impact of	"To counter attacks on the beneficial impacts of diversity training, this article highlights the results of an in-person program on unconscious bias taken by a CEO and his executive cabinet of 12 men who

diversity training: Highlighting the results of an in-person program on unconscious bias taken by a CEO and his executive cabinet of 12 men who work at a billion-dollar industrial manufacturing company. *Training, 56*(1), 42-43.

Abstract

Can diversity and unconscious bias training have an impact on an organization's policies, procedures, and practices, and result in changes in participants' awareness, perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors? Based on more than 25 years of practice in the field and the demonstrated results below, the answer is a resounding "Yes!"

Article Link

https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsgac&AN=edsgac.A571977437&site=eds-live

work at a billion-dollar industrial manufacturing company. These executives were reluctant to take the time for this workshop, and some saw it as 'irrelevant,' which makes the results below and their transformation even more significant. These executives have the authority to implement the '20 Commitments' they created individually and collectively across the organization. Here are those commitments, followed by the individual actions six of the executives committed to enact personally and across the organization." (p. 42)

"THE 20 COMMITMENTS
1. Be more consistent when asking for information during an informal meeting—ask everyone for their input to allow everyone an opportunity to share information.
2. Communicate and have empathy.
3. Let each person on the team present their work.
4. Incorporate a 'show and tell'/sharing of information—even on the personal level— to foster trust and commitment.
5. Challenge people to drive diversity when considering candidates for succession planning purposes and to build/foster those relationships.
6. Reach beyond staff for committee work.
7. Capture information that is 'going up' the communication/leadership chain in addition to disseminating information coming down from the top.
8. Change system bias—listen to new ideas and step back from thinking, 'Just do it—that is the way we've always done it and the way that works for us.'
9. Encourage department members to generate and bring one new idea to team meetings.
10. Look beyond the usual people for assignments.
11. Identify 'devil's advocates' to review ideas.
12. Identify patterns of biases in others' behaviors.
13. Set an agenda for inclusion.
14. Speak up when people interrupt and don't interrupt others.
15. Become aware of biases, especially when viewing resumes.
16. Share articles regarding core values, micro-inequities, bias, etc.
17. Be aware of micro-inequities and negative micro-messaging.
18. Challenge first thoughts.
19. Sustain and support the women's initiative.
20. Be mindful of feeling stressed and hurried." (p. 42)

"SAMPLE OF INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE COMMITMENTS AND ACTION PLANS:
EXECUTIVE #1: |
1. Look for opportunities to create a diverse candidate pool.
2. Challenge what kinds of opportunities exist for females to rise to the director level.
3. Women occupy HR, but there aren't a tremendous number in the field—we need to change that.
4. Remove names from resumes.
5. Include a women's committee for campus recruiting or career fairs.
6. Recruit from diverse tech colleges.
7. Send messages to internal recruiters to recruit more diverse candidates." (pp. 42-43)

"EXECUTIVE #2:
1. Rotate people into leadership roles.
2. Identify service areas that lack diversity and develop a plan.
3. Acknowledge comments that foster diversity.
4. Look at teams: Rank their level of diversity; call it out and develop within those who have low diversity. Watch out for 'group think.' Participate in hiring and reviews." (p. 43)

"EXECUTIVE #3:
1. Ensure we have an inclusive process, from recruiting for those plum jobs to obtaining perspectives at exit interviews.
2. Model the behavior.
3. Review job announcements and specifications, and redo them to see if they are biased.
4. Make sure there are stretch assignments.
5. Partner with the Society of Latino Engineers and other similar groups." (p. 43)

"EXECUTIVE #4:
1. Attend HR meetings—lots of Millennials are present.
2. Bring the group together—listen to what they have to say. They love to be involved in special assignments.
3. At the four senior HR meetings per year, pair executives up and see what they have achieved over the last 90 days.
4. Identify jobs that can be two-year assignments and initiate those rotations, if possible.
5. Share the dialog regarding Millennials with the leadership team." (p. 44)

"EXECUTIVE #5:

	1. Get more involved in the hiring process. 2. 'CYA' (facilitators' term for 'check your assumptions'); make sure I have the right assumptions. 3. Create processes for diversity and succession planning—make sure we ask, 'What are your career aspirations?' Mentor those you want to keep. Make this a fundamental process. 4. Be consciously competent. We run hard and fast. Let's pause to see the not so obvious: Sit in the customer or internal employee's seat. 5. Determine and identify why we are not the 'employer of choice.' Interview peer groups, and get information from existing employees." (p. 43) "CEO: 1. Make sure my son sees his mom as a valuable working person. 2. Move toward more of a sponsorship than a mentorship for women eligible for promotion. 3. Consciously interact with more people not in my image or likeness. 4. Use the weekly checklist at the end of the week—asking myself, 'Am I staying consciously inclusive?' 5. Expand the internal understanding of unconscious bias across the broader constituency. 6. Figure out how we can we more consistently keep unconscious bias at the forefront of our thoughts. Determine how we can challenge our processes—to help us get over the thoughts of where we are, and focus on the future (where we can be)—creating that vision of inclusivity." (p. 43) "The executive cabinet agreed to meet two months after the program to further refine their goals and form teams to tackle specific areas of interest they have in common with other members of the cabinet. Time will tell how much change takes place. It would be naïve to expect every action to be implemented, but it is clear from these results the cabinet now is committed to lead the mission to move their organization toward conscious inclusion." (p. 43) "Their increased sensitivity to this topic also will lead to changes in their interpersonal relations at work, their communities, and at home. The benefits of diversity training depend much on the culture and commitment of the organization, the dedication of the CEO, and the degree to which leaders are convinced the future success or failure of the organization is based on their need to change." (p. 43)
Citation Guy, S. (2019). What research tells us about diversity training: New research shows diversity training can change	**Conclusions** "Researchers are just beginning to unravel the science behind successful diversity training — and, in the process, gaining respect for the rigorous analysis they have brought to the way such training should be conducted. '[Diversity training] is not just something that should be done because it's the

people's ways of thinking and behaving, but only if done with finesse, expertise, and over a sustained period. *SWE Magazine, 65*(2), 52-58.

Abstract
The article offers the result of new research related to diversity training. It talks about the science behind successful diversity training; and also highlights the effects of diversity training on four training outcomes and across characteristics of training context, design, and participants along with the facilitating positive intergroup interactions, reducing prejudice and discrimination.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sch&AN=141872120&site=eds-live

right thing to do,' said Katerina Bezrukova, Ph.D., associate professor of organization and human resources at the University of Buffalo's School of Management and one of four co-authors of a seminal analysis assessing the effects of diversity training. 'If you don't do it right, you can get a lot of horrible and tragic outcomes.'" (p. 52)

"The researchers' analysis examined more than 40 years of studies, fusing data from 260 studies and more than 29,000 participants from a variety | of fields. The 260 independent samples assessed the effects of diversity training on four training outcomes over time and across characteristics of training context, design, and participants, according to the report, titled 'A Meta-Analytical Integration of Over 40 Years of Research on Diversity Training Evaluation' (Bezrukova, Spell, Perry, and Jehn, 2016). The analysis used models from diversity training literature and psychological theory to generate theory-driven predictions." (pp. 52-53)

"Due to the complexity of the topic and the strong emotional responses it can bring, diversity training is a branch of its own in the study of training methods. Dr. Bezrukova notes that the research team conducted its analysis within the established framework of diversity training and philosophy. Citing earlier work, the authors write, 'We define diversity training as a distinct set of instructional programs aimed at facilitating positive intergroup interactions, reducing prejudice and discrimination, and enhancing the skills, knowledge, and motivation of participants to interact with diverse others (Pendry et al., 2007).'
The study found training is most effective when it is delivered over an extended period, integrated with other initiatives, and designed to increase both awareness and skills. The setting, whether it consisted of young people on college campuses or corporate employees of varying ages at their job sites, made no difference. Based on a review of the overall research, neither voluntary nor mandatory training was clearly superior, though some researchers assert that mandatory training frequently backfires.
Among the positive indicators: People can learn about other cultures by working with those of different and diverse backgrounds. The long-term aim of effective diversity training could be what diversity trainers Thomas Kochman, Ph.D., and Jean Mavrelis, co-authors of Corporate Tribalism: White Men/White Women and Cultural Diversity at Work, call cultural pluralism, or an environment in which people appreciate and value one another's norms, behaviors, and attitudes." (p. 53)

"Dr. Kochman and Mavrelis, a husband-and-wife team whose firm, Kochman Mavrelis Associates, is based in the Chicago suburb of Oak Park, lead diversity training sessions in which employees' differences are openly discussed. 'Ours is not an assimilationist model,' Mavrelis said. 'It's where

there is no 'one way.' … If we take things that aren't in the rulebook and make them explicit, we could say, 'A lot of people [who work together] could be great leaders.' We make the implicit explicit.'" (p. 54)

"'Building trust is the key,' Dr. Kochman said. 'With cultural pluralism, there's a greater social equity. People want to be respected for their differences. That sets a dynamic into motion where, if you want to be treated as you see yourself, others have to know how you see yourself. That's where the learning comes in, the educational aspect. In our training, we don't make it accusatory. We make it educational, and minimize the defensiveness.'" (p. 54)

"'Cognitive learning tends to increase over time,' said Dr. Bezrukova, who grew up in Crimea and became interested in diversity when she attended The Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania as a postdoctoral researcher and social psychologist. Coming from a decidedly different culture, she has had little in common with everyone she has worked with. 'The attitudes this [diversity] training attempts to change are generally strong, emotion driven, and tied to our personal identities, and we found little evidence that long-term effects to them are sustainable,' Dr. Bezrukova said. 'However, when people are reminded by their colleagues or even by the media of scenarios covered in training, they are able to retain or expand on the information they've learned,' she said." (p. 54)

"It's the kind of learning that needs constant reinforcement. 'It's critical to offer diversity programs as part of a series of related efforts, such as mentoring or networking groups for minority professionals,' Dr. Bezrukova said. 'When organizations demonstrate a commitment to diversity, employees are more motivated to learn about and understand these societal issues and to apply that in their daily interactions.
'If there is good support — through hiring practices, promotions, and clear goals — anything in support of diversity, the coordinated efforts help,' she said. People who become more attuned to diverse cultures tend to seek out information verifying their new insights on TV and social media, for example. 'I was happy to see people [involved in the studies] increase their cognitive knowledge,' Dr. Bezrukova said. 'Just knowing about something provides better understanding and leads to better relationships with people who are different. That's a positive trend.'" (p. 54)

"For diversity training to have staying power, a simple lecture won't cut it, the research found. Diversity training participants responded more favorably to programs that used several instruction

methods, including lectures, discussions, and exercises. 'If it's just a one-click response setup, it's not going to work that well,' Dr. Bezrukova said." (p. 54)

"Seeking insight and possible solutions, some scholars have examined the effectiveness of awareness-based and behavioral approaches to diversity training. Margo Monteith, Ph.D., professor of psychological sciences at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, said, 'Stereotypes are so ingrained in our culture, they become a habitual way of responding. The role of motivated self regulation really is about breaking a bad habit.' Practicing self-regulation requires effort and practice, she said. 'It requires continual efforts and vigilance toward understanding the nature of one's biases and working on regulating them. It's across time where people become better at generating alternative types of responses (other than the stereotypical knee-jerk responses).'" (p. 55)

"So, how do people see that they are biased? Confrontation can be an effective tool in diversity training, but, in dealing with sexism, confrontation must be paired with evidence that people | participating in the training exhibit bias — and that the results have repercussions, said Dr. Monteith, who is co-editing a new book, *Confronting Prejudice and Discrimination: The Science of Changing Minds and Behaviors*, with Robyn Mallett, Ph.D., an associate professor of psychology at the Loyola University Chicago. That's because, as Dr. Monteith described it, 'Sexism is a unique kind of 'ism. Women and men have communal relationships. Women often are viewed very positively in terms of attitudes. In the president's words, 'I have respect for women,'' she said.
Logically, it follows that diversity training should include hands-on activities. That might include showing participants identical resumes — one from a man and one from a woman. When the diversity trainee decides to 'hire' the man, the response would be to present the evidence of the identical applications. 'Presenting that evidence has clear implications for the well-being of women versus men,' Dr. Monteith said. 'People with (higher internal motivation) will then experience this negative self-directed affect and become more concerned about their biases.'" (p. 56)

"'Encouraging reductions of sexist biases often requires that people have experiences where their own biases come to light,' Dr. Monteith said. For those who are less motivated to see their own biases, the appropriate motivation can spring from showing that they are violating society's or their employer's norms and values, rather than browbeating them or failing to offer them choices, she said. The idea is to create clear norms of behavior. 'Any time an authority figure models a certain behavior, people are more likely to go along with it,' Dr. Monteith said. 'And grassroots movements, even the #MeToo movement, people coming together who aren't in positions of power but gathering in solidarity and presenting their common experiences, can have a positive effect.'" (p. 57)

"Alexandra Kalev, Ph.D., professor of sociology at Tel Aviv University and co-author with Frank Dobbin, Ph.D., professor of sociology at Harvard University, of the *Harvard Business Review* article 'Why Diversity Programs Fail' (Dobbin and Kalev, 2016), said diversity training should never be a requirement. 'There is no in-and-out, quick solution for diversity,' Dr. Kalev said. 'The actual experience of training often creates more antagonism than buy-in and motivation.
'Most training is mandatory. People have to sit in a room instead of doing what they are busy with and listen to how bad and biased they are,' she said, as this can be the case particularly when evidence based confrontation methods are not handled with the necessary sensitivity and thoughtfulness. While diversity training has become 'a huge industry, run by well-meaning people,' Dr. Kalev posits it can be done correctly at a much lower cost and in a much less flashy way than many companies implement it. 'It's not going to go away, so we need to make sure to do it right,' she said." (p. 57)

"From Dr. Kalev's perspective, doing it right would mean:
• Implementing diversity training on a | voluntary basis — and only after employees understand the business case for diversity, and as part of a larger organizational project. 'Diversity training should be held only when it's relevant,' Dr. Kalev said, echoing the point that training needs to be part of a larger effort that includes examining and instituting new company policies and processes. 'Sometimes it's not even about biases. Sometimes women must attend meetings from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m., and if not, they're left out. Yet they may have to pick up their children from school. In cases where we're talking about arrangements that aren't family friendly, move the meetings to no later than 3 p.m.' She emphasized that, 'When managers understand the business case for their department, their company — that it's not about replacing white men; just getting the best workers, it works,' she said. 'When managers get to devise the plans — when they are engaged — this is when it works.'
• Using contact theory. Let employees from different backgrounds, roles, and ethnicities work together. For example, a cross-functional project team comprising employees from various departments, a mix of salaried and hourly workers from a research and development department, along with those who work in assembly, and from customer service, can weaken the participants' biases by learning more about one another.
• Engaging mentors. 'Once senior executives do one mentoring assignment, they start recruiting other managers and take it on as their own,' Dr. Kalev said. 'This kind of engagement creates a buy-in. That's one of the mechanisms we see works — creating buy-in of the idea that diversity is important, not threatening, and a goal that the leaders can help achieve.'
• Implementing targeted recruitment. Seek diverse job candidates and have line managers interview them. 'It creates commitment, engagement, contact. We see the numbers add up.'" (pp. 57, 58)

"Dr. Kalev notes that the above approaches are 'not as costly as training, and even small organizations can adopt them.'" (p. 58)

"The work of inclusiveness — making space for everyone and everyone's culture, experience, and personality — is as difficult and complicated as people themselves. We all have biases, yet the search continues for the best way to open everyone, including the most resistant people, to change. The effort will require that mentors, colleagues, executives, managers, and hourly workers take on one another's struggles with a buy-in deep enough to help each other, honor each other, and hear each other out." (p. 58)

Citation

Morse, G. (2016). Designing a bias-free organization. *Harvard Business Review, 94*(7/8), 63-67.

Abstract

Most diversity training programs are a waste of money, says Iris Bohnet. Companies often conduct programs without ever measuring their impact. And unfortunately, research on their effectiveness shows they seldom change attitudes, let alone behavior. The solution? Focus on processes, not people. Behavioral science tells us that it's very hard to eliminate our biases, but we can redesign organizations to circumvent them. Behavioral design makes it easier to do the unbiased thing by either preventing biased choices or changing people's beliefs. Companies can start by collecting data on their current diversity training. Then they must bring the same rigor to people management that they apply to

Conclusions

"Ris Bohnet thinks firms are wasting their money on diversity training. The problem is, most programs just don't work. Rather than run more workshops or try to eradicate the biases that cause discrimination, she says, companies need to redesign their processes to prevent biased choices in the first place. Bohnet directs the Women and Public Policy Program at the Harvard Kennedy School and cochairs its Behavioral Insights Group. Her new book, *What Works*, describes how simple changes—from eliminating the practice of sharing self-evaluations to rewarding office volunteerism—can reduce the biased behaviors that undermine organizational performance. In this edited interview with HBR senior editor Gardiner Morse, Bohnet describes how behavioral design can neutralize our biases and unleash untapped talent." (p. 63)

"HBR: Organizations put a huge amount of effort into improving diversity and equality but are still falling short. Are they doing the wrong things, not trying hard enough, or both?
Bohnet: There is some of each going on. Frankly, right now I am most concerned with companies that want to do the right thing but don't know how to get there, or worse, throw money at the problem without its making much of a difference. Many U.S. corporations, for example, conduct diversity training programs without ever measuring whether they work. My colleague Frank Dobbin at Harvard and many others have done excellent research on the effectiveness of these programs, and unfortunately it looks like they largely don't change attitudes, let alone behavior. [See 'Why Diversity Programs Fail,' by Frank Dobbin, in this issue.] I encourage anyone who thinks they have a program that works to actually evaluate and document its impact. This would be a huge service. I'm a bit on a mission to convince corporations, NGOs, and government agencies to bring the same rigor they apply to their financial decision making and marketing strategies to their people management. Marketers

financial and marketing decisions. This means defining the desired change, implementing new programs, collecting hard data, and evaluating the results. Even simple changes can be effective. For example, hiring managers can use software that allows them to strip age, gender, socioeconomic background, and similar information out of résumés so that they focus only on talent. Bias affects everyone, despite efforts at awareness and the best of intentions. The good news, says Bohnet, is that behavioral design can break the link between our gut reactions and our actions, and allow our biased minds to get things right.

Article Link

https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=116330326&site=eds-live

have been running A/B tests for a long time, measuring what works and what doesn't. HR departments should be doing the same." (p. 64)

"What would a diversity evaluation look like?
There's a great classroom experiment that's a good model. John Dovidio and his colleagues at Yale evaluated the effect of an antibias training program on first and second graders in 61 classrooms. About half the classrooms were randomly assigned to get four weeks of sessions on gender, race, and body type with the goal of making the children more accepting of others who were different from them. The other half didn't get the training. The program had virtually no impact on the children's willingness to share or play with others. This doesn't mean you can't ever teach kids to be more accepting—just that improving people's inclination to be inclusive is incredibly hard. We need to keep collecting data to learn what works best. So the point for corporations is to adopt this same methodology for any program they try. Offer the training to a randomly selected group of employees and compare their behaviors afterward with a control group. Of course, this would also mean defining success beforehand. For diversity training programs to go beyond just checking the box, organizations have to be serious about what they want to change and how they plan to evaluate whether their change program worked." (p. 64)

"What does behavioral science tell us about what to do, aside from measuring success?
Start by accepting that our minds are stubborn beasts. It's very hard to eliminate our biases, but we can design organizations to make it easier for our biased minds to get things right. HBR readers may know the story about how orchestras began using blind auditions in the 1970s. It's a great example of behavioral design that makes it easier to do the unbiased thing. The issue was that fewer than 10% of players in major U.S. orchestras were women. Why was that? Not because women are worse musicians than men but because they were perceived that way by auditioners. So orchestras started having musicians audition behind a curtain, making gender invisible. My Harvard colleague Claudia Goldin and Cecilia Rouse of Princeton showed that this simple change played an important role in increasing the fraction of women in orchestras to almost 40% today. Note that | this didn't result from changing mindsets. In fact, some of the most famous orchestra directors at the time were convinced that they didn't need curtains because they, of all people, certainly focused on the quality of the music and not whether somebody looked the part. The evidence told a different story." (pp. 64-65)

"What are examples of good behavioral design in organizations?
Well, let's look at recruitment and talent management, where biases are rampant. You can't easily put job candidates behind a curtain, but you can do a version of that with software. I am a big fan of tools

such as Applied, GapJumpers, and Unitive that allow employers to blind themselves to applicants' demographic characteristics. The software allows hiring managers to strip age, gender, educational and socioeconomic background, and other information out of résumés so they can focus on talent only.

There's also a robust literature on how to take bias out of the interview process, which boils down to this: Stop going with your gut. Those unstructured interviews where managers think they're getting a feel for a candidate's fit or potential are basically a waste of time. Use structured interviews where every candidate gets the same questions in the same order, and score their answers in order in real time.

You should also be thinking about how your recruitment approach can skew who even applies. For instance, you should scrutinize your job ads for language that unconsciously discourages either men or women from applying. A school interested in attracting the best teachers, for instance, should avoid characterizing the ideal candidate as 'nurturing' or 'supportive' in the ad copy, because research shows that can discourage men from applying. Likewise, a firm that wants to attract men and women equally should avoid describing the preferred candidate as 'competitive' or 'assertive,' as research finds that those characterizations can discourage female applicants. The point is that if you want to attract the best candidates and access 100% of the talent pool, start by being conscious about the recruitment language you use." (p. 65)

"What about once you've hired someone? How do you design around managers' biases then? The same principle applies: Do whatever you can to take instinct out of consideration and rely on hard data. That means, for instance, basing promotions on someone's objectively measured performance rather than the boss's feeling about them. That seems obvious, but it's still surprisingly rare.

Be careful about the data you use, however. Using the wrong data can be as bad as using no data. Let me give you an example. Many managers ask their reports to do self-evaluations, which they then use as part of their performance appraisal. But if employees differ in how self-confident they are—in how comfortable they are with bragging—this will bias the manager's evaluations. The more self-promoting ones will give themselves better ratings. There's a lot of research on the anchoring effect, which shows that we can't help but be influenced by numbers thrown at us, whether in negotiations or performance appraisals. So if managers see inflated ratings on a self-evaluation, they tend to unconsciously adjust their appraisal up a bit. Likewise, poorer self appraisals, even if they're inaccurate, skew managers' ratings downward." (p. 65)

"This is a real problem, because there are clear gender (and also cross-cultural) differences in self confidence. To put it bluntly, men tend to be more | overconfident than women—more likely to sing

their own praises. One meta-analysis involving nearly 100 independent samples found that men perceived themselves as significantly more effective leaders than women did when, actually, they were rated by others as significantly less effective. Women, on the other hand, are more likely to underestimate their capabilities. For example, in studies, they underestimate how good they are at math and think they need to be better than they are to succeed in higher-level math courses. And female students are more likely than male students to drop courses in which their grades don't meet their own expectations. The point is, do not share self-evaluations with managers before they have made up their minds. They're likely to be skewed, and I don't know of any evidence that having people share self-ratings yields any benefits for employees or their organizations." (pp. 65-66)

"How can firms get started?
Begin by collecting data. When I was academic dean at the Harvard Kennedy School, one day I came to the office to find a group of students camped out in front of my door. They were concerned about the lack of women on the faculty. Or so I thought. Much to my surprise, I realized that it was not primarily the number of female faculty that concerned them but the lack of role models for female students. They wanted to see more female leaders—in the classroom, on panels, behind the podium, teaching, researching, and advising. It turns out we had never paid attention to—or measured—the gender breakdown of the people visiting the Kennedy School.
So we did. And our findings resembled those of most organizations that collect such data for the first time: The numbers weren't pretty.
Here's the good news. Once you collect and study the data, you can make changes and measure progress. In 1999, MIT acknowledged that it had been unintentionally discriminating against female faculty. An examination of data had revealed gender differences in salary, space, resources, awards, and responses to outside offers. The data had real consequences. A follow-up study, published in 2011, showed that the number of female faculty in science and engineering had almost doubled, and several women held senior leadership positions.
Companies can do their own research or turn to consultants for help. EDGE, where I serve as a scientific adviser, is a Swiss foundation and private company that helps organizations across the sectors measure how well they do in terms of gender equality. A firm named Paradigm is another. I came across it when I was speaking with tech firms in Silicon Valley and San Francisco. It helps companies diagnose where the problems are, starting by collecting data, and then come up with possible solutions, often based on behavioral designs." (p. 66)

"Men may resist organizational changes favoring women because they view gender equality as zero sum—if women win, men lose. How then do you enlist men as agents of change?

	Few men oppose the idea of benefiting from the entire talent pool—at least in theory. But some are concerned about actually leveling the playing field. In practice, of course, the blind auditions in orchestras have increased competition for male musicians. And the inclusion of women affects competition for men in all jobs. I understand that increased competition can be painful, but I am too much of an economist to not believe in the value of competition. There is no evidence that protectionism has served the world well.
	Enlisting men is partly about helping them to see the benefits of equality. Fathers of daughters are some of the strongest proponents of gender equality, for obvious reasons, so they can be particularly powerful voices when it comes to bringing other men along. Research on male CEOs, politicians, and judges shows that fathers of daughters care more about gender equality than men without children or with only sons. I would urge fathers of daughters to be outspoken in their own organizations and to advocate for equality not just as a broad goal, but to actively help drive the changes I describe here—collecting baseline organizational data, promoting experiments, measuring what works, changing processes to limit the impact of our biased minds and level the playing field, and so on.
	A big part is, simply, continued awareness building—not just of the problem but also of the solutions available to organizations. I recently gave a talk on Wall Street to an audience that was male. I started by inviting people with children to raise their hands. Then I asked those with daughters to raise their hands. Many hands were up. I told them that this made my job easy as some of my biggest allies were in the room. It broke the ice, especially when I told the audience that my husband and I only have sons—who are great feminists, I might add, and in small ways have already brought behavioral insights to their school by reminding the principal to refer to teachers in general as both 'he' and 'she.'" (p. 67)
Citation Orenstein, E. G. (2005). The business case for diversity. *Financial Executive, 21*(4), 22-25. Retrieved from https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/trade-journals/business-case-diversity/docview/208904426/se-2?accountid=14779 **Abstract**	**Conclusions** "Based on interviews with executives at public and private companies and others in the human resources field, Financial Executives Research Foundation (FERF) found the business case for diversity consists of diversity's contribution to one or more of four factors. The four are: increasing revenue or gross margin; enhancing compliance or reducing litigation risk; enhancing corporate goodwill (to become the 'employer of choice);' and as part of tone at the top, when corporate leadership believes diversity is 'the right thing to do.'" (p. 22) "One of the first things a company will try to do in making a business case for any initiative is to assess the impact on the bottom line. A study in 2001 by Roy Adier, *Women in the Executive Suite Correlate to High Profits*, published by the Glass Ceiling Research Center, found that the 25 Fortune 500 firms with the best record of promoting women to high positions are between 18 and 69 percent

The business case for diversity in the workplace - of race, gender, age, ethnicity and more - has been examined and debated over the years. Despite its promotion by governments and social engineers, the benefits aren't always readily apparent or directly measurable. Based on interviews with executives at public and private companies and others in the human resources field, Financial Executives Research Foundation (FERF) found the business case for diversity consists of diversity's contribution to one or more of four factors. The four are: 1. increasing revenue or gross margin, 2. enhancing compliance or reducing litigation risk, 3. enhancing corporate goodwill (to become the "employer of choice)," and 4. as part of tone at the top, when corporate leadership believes diversity is "the right thing to do." Executives were also found to take a holistic approach to diversity, making it part of their extended role in leading professional and community organizations.

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=16927307&site=eds-live

more profitable than the median Fortune 500 firms in their industries…Such statistics will not necessarily convince a company that diversity will boost profits, but there are other compelling reasons to engage in diversity initiatives. SHRM's Taylor notes, 'Bottom line, there are times when you design a diversity initiative to implement and supplement your compliance function. It may be purely from an Equal Employment Office (EEO) perspective, such as to reduce the amount of EEO activity in a particular area, or to reduce exposure to the risk of potential litigation.' However, he cautions, diversity initiatives must also be thoughtfully planned, so as not to backfire." (p. 23)

"Lehman Brothers entered into diversity initiatives mainly for talent, says Suzanne Richards, its senior vice president. Diversity. She notes that as a financial services company, Lehman is a firm without a product in terms of the classic consumer definition of the word. 'What we have is the quality of our ideas and service, which reflects the quality of our people.' To bring the broadest possible benefit to its clients, Richards says, the firm needs the broadest ideas from a diverse and talented pool. 'It's hard to place a price on talent,' she adds; but making the workplace more inviting can be one way to help attract and retain talent, to become the 'employer of choice.' She notes demographics show the world is becoming more diverse, and 'we want to make sure we have the best of the best.'" (pp. 23-24)

"Private companies, such as Cargill Inc. — an international provider of food, agricultural and risk management products and services — also see value in diversity initiatives. Cargill's program started 'gelling' around 1997 when the leadership team developed a 'Statement on Diversity,' explains Jody Horner, vice president of Corporate Diversity, and Karen Sachs, a consultant on Cargill's diversity team. At the time, says Sachs, 'who were undergoing organizational changes, and decided diversity would be a key component to fuel growth. The program took on a global nature, setting the stage for how we look at it today: to be very inclusive, and recognize differences exist in people.' Cargill's diversity initiatives dovetail with its four key measures for company performance: how engaged its employees are, how satisfied its customers are, how much it has enriched the communities it works in and profitable growth. Horner says, 'The link to the business case is the key to ultimate success.'" (p. 24)

"Richards says Lehman conducted a basecase employee satisfaction survey last summer, and has five employee networks in New York — one for women, Hispanics and Asians, as well as employees of African descent and a gay and lesbian network. It also has a women's network in London and three new networks in Tokyo. Each network has a mission statement and subcommittees devoted to employee development (including mentoring), commercialization (reaching out to potential clients) and philanthropy, which is viewed as a way to connect with employees and the community." (p. 24)

"Cargill has 'employee councils,' which Horner describes as being 'the eyes and ears at the local level on the ground [since meaningful actions occur with the input of those closest.' | For example, its meat-business diversity team has led wide-ranging programs from recruiting to mentoring, offering English as a second language and Spanish for others who work with employees whose first language is Spanish." (pp. 24-25)

"On the training front, Richards has found great success using an interactive theatre approach, which has trained 5,000 Lehman employees so far in Tokyo, London and New York, and will be rolled out to other locations. She says the two-hour interactive program 'sensitizes employees to the need for an inclusive environment to consider all opinions and the broadest possible thoughts and perspectives." Cargill also extends its 'Valuing Differences' programs through its training programs. 'We have tried to integrate diversity training into other training programs, so that if you are going to general leadership training, there is a diversity component all the way from first-level supervisors to senior management,' says Horner." (p. 25)

"The other side of best practices is avoiding potential pitfalls, SHRM's Taylor cautions that diversity initiatives are not one-year initiatives and that you will not see immediate results. 'Companies that expect otherwise are destined to create more dissatisfaction than satisfaction,' he warns. The key, however, he says, is to appreciate diversity as a long-term strategic initiative. Cargill's Horner echoes the sentiment, 'Cargill and other companies have learned that diversity is a complex topic, with no easy answers and a variety of expectations.' Taylor emphasizes the importance of planning, with special advice about mentoring programs, 'The worst thing to happen is to have a halfhearted, not well-thought-out diversity strategy,' he says, adding that it's almost worse to have a poorly conceived and implemented strategy than none at all." (p. 25)

"Perhaps James A, Beil, president and CEO and CEO of The Boeing Co., sums it up best: 'At Boeing, diversity isn't an afterthought or corollary of our business strategy. Diversity is, in fact, one of our critical business strategies.'" (p. 25)

| **Citation**
Pan, J. C. (2020). Minding the gap. *New Republic, 251*(1/2), 60–63.

Abstract | **Conclusions**
"How, exactly, should we reconcile the vast sum of money and energy poured into diversity training with its lackluster results? Two recent books argue that a more thoroughgoing accounting of racism is needed to correct our society's deficiencies. In *Diversity, Inc: The Failed Promise of a Billion-Dollar Business*, NYU journalism Professor Pamela Newkirk argues that diversity is likely to remain elusive |

Although Newkirk is critical of the diversity industry, whereas DiAngelo works squarely within it, both authors view altering white consciousness as the key to social transformation. In fact, the work of facilitating the broad "paradigm shift" Newkirk wants to see in lieu of the diversity industry's empty "pledges, slogans, or well-compensated czars" is increasingly a central part of that very industry. As it happens, DiAngelo has been a longtime facilitator within the diversity training apparatus that Newkirk critiques, and her analysis of white fragility is drawn largely from personal observations gathered during the workshops and seminars she's run. [Extracted from the article]

Article Link
https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=pwh&AN=140326834&site=eds-live

until we address the larger context of our nation's history of racial segregation and violence. This kind of reckoning is also the subject of *White Fragility*, a runaway hit that has spent over a year on the New York Times bestseller list and amassed an array of favorable reviews since its 2018 release. In the book, author Robin DiAngelo—a sought-after speaker and former professor who's worked for decades as an anti-bias consultant—describes the phenomenon of 'white fragility,' a condition that renders white Americans unable to discuss race and racism without succumbing to defensiveness and emotional distress, and that thereby perpetuates our racial hierarchy. Overcoming this hostility, DiAngelo argues, requires sustained self-reflection, humility, and vigilance from white people." (p. 60)

"According to Newkirk, for-profit companies, higher education, and cultural institutions alike will only achieve true and sustained racial diversity following a broader cultural shift in which Americans, particularly white Americans, come to terms with the nation's history of white domination, which began with the enslavement of Africans and the displacement and mass murder of Native Americans, and continued through the twentieth and twenty-first centuries via exclusionary immigration laws and imperial excursions abroad. In Newkirk's view, even most of the scholarly research on the shortcomings of diversity training fails to capture the way the diversity industry has come untethered from a larger project of accounting for this ugly history. 'While many recent studies raise legitimate concerns about diversity practices,' she writes, 'most have overshadowed the extent to which these initiatives ceased to be seen as a moral imperative linked to centuries of systemic racial oppression.'" (p. 61)

"Encouraging white Americans to come to terms with both the country's history and their own complicity in perpetuating | present-day injustice is precisely the goal of Robin DiAngelo's book White Fragility, which was released to much discussion and acclaim last year. As it happens, DiAngelo has been a longtime facilitator within the diversity training apparatus that Newkirk critiques, and her analysis of white fragility is drawn largely from personal observations gathered during the workshops and seminars she's run." (pp. 61-62)

"Over her years of conducting trainings on race, DiAngelo has observed that white people reliably (and usually immediately) erupt into defensiveness and discomfort when asked to consider the persistence of racism—a response that she calls white fragility. White fragility is itself a product of racism, namely a national history of segregation that has kept whites comfortably protected from the reality of the nation's racial hierarchy; as a result, DiAngelo argues, most white people find it extremely difficult to talk about race. Examples of white fragility in action include workshop

attendees who insist on their color blindness, bring up their own hardships, and even women who cry during discussions of racism. 'These responses work to reinstate white equilibrium,' writes DiAngelo, 'as they repel the challenge, return our racial comfort, and maintain our dominance within the racial hierarchy.'" (p. 62)

"Indeed, the major shortcoming of *White Fragility* is that it offers almost nothing in the way of concrete political action. Though solving society wide inequality isn't the goal of her book, DiAngelo notes—and, of course, it would be unrealistic to expect her to single-handedly accomplish such a thing—even her practical suggestions for what white people might do to combat racism amount to little more than personal introspection and self-improvement. That includes learning to cultivate feelings of gratitude and humility (even excitement) upon learning that one has done something racist, listening and 'processing' in the aftermath of such an event, and a variety of other vague endeavors, such as challenging 'our own socialization and investments in racism.'

This style of whiteness training, Johnson writes, 'encourages sharing one's origin story, failings and sense of torment, but beyond charitable giving, it does not necessitate sharing resources at the level of redistributive public policy.' It is therapeutic rather than policy-based. In this sense, DiAngelo writes from the same lineage as other white anti-racist educators, including *White Like Me* author Tim Wise (who blurbed her book) and Peggy McIntosh, writer of the widely shared 'Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack' pamphlet on white privilege. While ruminating on one's internalized prejudices may require some psychological heavy lifting, there's little evidence that it helps produce or sustain material change. And though whiteness educators like DiAngelo may employ the radical-sounding language of critical race theory, self-reflection is ultimately a much easier undertaking than working to build a durable political coalition that actually has the leverage to remake society." (p. 62)

"For all their emphasis on discomfort, the kind of racial reckoning advocated by both Newkirk and DiAngelo today exists without much difficulty under capitalism. That is to say, it's entirely possible—even easy—to advocate for racial diversity and white self-examination while simultaneously endorsing (or at least ignoring) economic inequality. This conundrum was most famously articulated by the professor and critic Walter Benn Michaels in his controversial 2006 book, *The Trouble With Diversity*. 'The commitment to diversity is at best a distraction and at worst an essentially reactionary position,' he wrote, to the horror of many on the left at the time. What he meant wasn't that diversity in and of itself was bad or undesirable, but that the preoccupation with achieving it usually came at the expense of attacking | economic inequality. For quite a few (if not most) people whose primary commitment is championing diversity, the underlying assumption is that our current lopsided distribution of wealth and resources would be justified so long as racial (and gender) disparities were

eliminated. That is, it would be acceptable if the top 1 percent of the population reaped the majority share of economic gains and exerted undue influence on the political system so long as that 1 percent was 50 percent female, 14 percent black, 18 percent Latino, and so on." (pp. 62-63)

"This is the metric that allows Newkirk to praise Coca-Cola's diversity programs—which managed to increase the number of African Americans at the senior executive level from one to 49 people over the course of a few years—as the 'gold standard' for corporations, while CEO James Quincey earns nearly $17 million annually, or over 1,000 times what the average employee makes. It's what allows Coca-Cola to proudly advertise its strides in 'representation' while also backing Trump's 2017 tax cuts, including publishing an interview in which chief financial officer Kathy Waller (an African American woman) praised the bill's 'potential to reinvigorate job growth and help U.S. companies be more competitive.'" (p. 63)

"Even more insidiously, the vocabulary of inclusion has lately been wielded to undermine or dismiss broad-based universal policies that would, ironically, disproportionately help people who aren't white. 'If we broke up the big banks tomorrow,' Hillary Clinton asked on her doomed campaign trail, 'would that end racism? Would that end sexism? Would that end discrimination against the lgbt community?' Strictly speaking, probably not. But as Michaels has written, 'A serious and entirely race-blind transfer of wealth to poor people (even just the $15 dollar an hour minimum wage and even though the majority of people working for minimum wage are white) would do more to benefit poor black people than would the most rigorous and effective enactment and enforcement of every possible antidiscrimination law.'" (p. 63)

"Overturning our existing hierarchy—rather than just playing musical chairs with its demographics— depends on ending exploitation. The good news is that the kind of universal programs that Michaels and others advocate would go a long way toward doing just that, particularly for black Americans and other historically marginalized groups (recall Newkirk's own assessment of Great Society initiatives), and they also happen to be relatively popular. The bad news is that powerful political actors— including the Democratic Party elite that just so happens to be quite well-versed in the rhetoric of diversity—are fighting such reforms tooth and nail." (p. 63)

"The question, then, is whether you believe that people's attitudes can be transformed through common struggle or you think that psychological transformation needs to happen before that struggle can take place. There are arguments for and against each possibility. But you can see why those who

	earn a paycheck informing people of their latent biases might feel compelled to insist upon the latter." (p. 63)
Citation Weissmark, M. S. (2020). Do diversity training programs work? Creating a culture of inclusion through scientific reasoning. *Skeptic, 25*(4), 41-43. **Article Link** https://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsggo&AN=edsgcl.646530062&site=eds-live	**Conclusions** "A review of the research on diversity and racial sensitivity programs shows that thousands of diversity intervention programs over so years have been ineffectual in removing bias and prejudice from people that they are biased and need to attend a mandatory anti bias training, or a racial sensitivity program can activate bias rather than stamp it out. If people feel forced to accept an authority's agenda, they | may do the opposite to assert their autonomy." (pp. 41-42) "In order to comprehend the complexities of our biases, it is necessary to understand their bio-logical, neurological and psychological underpinnings. Commanding people to get rid of biases that are deeply rooted in their personal memories and histories is akin to asking them to shed their very legacies and identities. Moreover, telling people to get rid of their biases is apt to fail when there are strong feelings on both sides of a historically sensitive issue. Evidence for this phenomenon was apparent in the multiple studies I conducted at Harvard on the aforementioned children of Holocaust survivors and children of Nazis, along with the great-grandchildren of enslaved African Americans with the descendants of slave owners. Both sets reported that they felt they had inherited a legacy that consumed large parts of their lives and identities." (p. 42) "In a time of pandemic and racial reckoning, and with our civil discourse at a standstill, conversations on polarizing topics have an urgency as never before. Many people are walking on eggshells wondering what to say and how to say it. Worse, some people don't feel safe to share their viewpoint out of fear of reprisal. This reflects the discomfort many have with the current widespread cancel culture. 'It no longer feels safe to have conversations with people who have a different viewpoint' they say. Diversity and racial sensitivity programs aimed at exposing and curing biases and prejudices are unlikely to succeed at creating a culture of inclusion where everyone feels heard, and where nuanced meaningful conversations take place. Given these constraints, it is natizedural to ask, 'Is there anything we can do? Are there any solutions we can live with?'" The quick answer is 'yes.' The solution requires a fair process of facilitated conversations in which people learn how to reason together scientifically about difficult questions, even when in stark disagreement. Over the years, thousands of students have joined me to reason scientifically about some of the most important polarizing questions we face as a society and in our everyday lives,

including questions on racial justice, slavery, police racial bias, white privilege, immigration, BLM, and reparations." (p. 42)

"People do not always think of scientific reasoning as a path to understanding in emotionally charged conflicts. However, the nature of scientific reasoning causes one to pause, reflect, look to data for insight, and reach scientific consensus.
When I was teaching the Psychology of Diversity course at Harvard recently, one of my students expressed the view that racism has long been the cause of rampant police brutality. In response, another student suggested that police brutality, regardless of race, may be a more pressing issue and noted a recent news article supporting the same.
We can imagine how an exchange beginning in this manner might unravel into an emotional debate and end in a deadlock. Especially in our current politically polarized environment, we can also see how little progress would be made had another student expressed the view that police brutality was not an issue at all. However, as a facilitator of the conversation, I encouraged them to ask 'What do the data say about the relation between race and | police brutality? Which other factors contribute to the nexus between the two?'" (pp. 42-43)

"The class was then tasked with finding peer-reviewed scientific journal articles on the issue that have conflicting findings. When people are encouraged to seek out information in support of both sides, they are encouraged to seek out information without an agenda. This allowed us to problem solve together by asking, 'Why do these studies come to opposite conclusions? What data collection and analytic methods were used? What other factors could play a role in the discrepancy?'
From there, the conversation was able to open up and move forward. We could then ask more difficult questions such as, 'What effect does taking race out of the conversation on police brutality have on a person who has experienced racism? What effect does placing race as the central cause of police brutality have on a person who has experienced such brutality without race being a factor?'" (p. 43)

"Scientific reasoning does not take emotion out of the conversation. Instead, it allows us to pause and reflect on what effect our emotions have on the progression of our dialogue. This is what tends to go missing in conversations about polarizing diversity topics, but it is also what I have found to be imperative to include. It is the only way to recognize our blind spots and transform them into facilitators rather than obstacles.
This is the method used in science and problem-solving education. It is dialectic between persons holding different hypotheses about a topic but wishing to understand one another and test their views. One does not judge the other for their view. One does not try to win a debate. One does not expect the

other to change or think differently. Rather, the expectation is that one will learn to reason scientifically about the topic." (p. 43)

"Many great scientists, including Nobel Prize winners Marie Curie, Albert Einstein, and Richard Feynman, have stressed that scientific reasoning is the key to developing peoples' moral and intellectual strengths, and that this would lead to a better society. According to Feynman, the scientific worldview is a habit of mind, and once acquired one cannot retreat from it. I would underscore, as Feynman did, that scientific reasoning contains within itself a system of logic and standards of evidence that can be used for building a culture of inclusion. This method has the potential to create an environment where everyone feels safe to express a hypothetical viewpoint and open to understanding that more than one view can be hypothetically true at once." (p. 43)

"Scientific reasoning does not rely on armchair theorizing, political conviction, or personal opinion, but instead on methods of empirical research independently available to anyone as a means of opening the world to scrutiny. All opinions are viewed as hypotheses to be tested, rather than as appeals to emotion. When conversations on polarizing topics get bogged down by passionate opinions, scientific reasoning lifts us up so we can consider the alternative hypothesis." (p. 43)

"It is a universal fact that diversity is a feature of nature. This is true of individuals, families, social classes, religious groups, ethnic groups, and nations. There will always be diverse polarized views with which people passionately identify. Scientific reasoning is a fair two-sided method for evaluating polarized views, fake news, misinformation, and disinformation.
Embracing scientific reasoning and using logic and standards of evidence can bolster American education and heal our riven society. While agenda driven diversity training programs are divisive, the scientific reasoning method is connective. Agenda driven diversity training programs try to resolve differences by methods of shame and pressure that seek to win and control the debate and by cherry picking evidence in support of an idea, action, or theory, typically with the aim of persuading others to share one's 'right' view.
By contrast, the scientific reasoning method dissolves differences by asking people to consider all the data, ask each other questions about what the data mean, and reach a consensus about what is and is not agreed on. They then have a foundation on which to collaborate and explore how to test the questions about the points on which they disagree. The process of scientific reasoning is based on finding out what is true, and not, 'What can I prove and convince you of?'

	Scientifically reasoning together shifts the dynamics of the culture from one of divisiveness to one of connectedness, thereby making it possible to have a truly inclusive culture that includes different perspectives. That is why it is so vital." (p. 43)