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ABSTRACT

An Evaluation of Diversity Training:
Effects of Trainer Characteristics and Training Focus

by

Courtney Holladay

Reports of discrimination in employment practices are filed with the courts on a frequent basis (e.g., Labor Law Reports, 2004). Organizations manage the benefits and costs of diversity by implementing diversity training for employee participation. The present study takes a step toward building the area of diversity training research to support the practices in place within organizations. An integrated model for training evaluation was used based upon work by Kirkpatrick (1976), Alliger and colleagues (1997), and Kraiger and colleagues (1993). The results of the evaluation showed that trainees attending diversity training reacted with less backlash toward the training, exhibited greater behavioral and cognitive learning, and used race and gender to a lesser degree in a hiring decision task than trainees in a control training condition. There was no difference between these individuals in terms of their self-efficacy, attitudes toward diversity, perceptions of team processes, or conflict situational judgment test (SJT) scores. In addition to the training evaluation, design features (trainer race and gender, focus of training) were examined. The results showed that reactions toward the trainer were dependent on the trainer’s race and gender as well as the content of the training course. Furthermore, those trainees attending diversity training who reacted more favorably
toward the trainer exhibited greater affective and cognitive learning. These trainees also perceived more favorable group processes in a simulated diverse team and relied on qualifications in addition to race and sex of the applicant in a hiring task. There was no difference between trainees with low and high reactions toward their trainer in terms of conflict SJT scores. Finally, trainees who focused on similarities scored higher on a conflict SJT than trainees who focused on differences. The use of applicants’ race or gender in the hiring task was dependent on the trainees’ focus during training; however, there was no difference between these trainees in their perceptions of a simulated team’s processes. This study shows that diversity training can be effective in terms of modifying trainees’ reactions, learning, and transfer outcomes and can be further enhanced by the design features, such as trainer characteristics and the training focus.
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An Evaluation of Diversity Training:

Effects of Trainer Characteristics and Training Focus

The diversity of the workforce in the 21st century has become readily apparent as the number of women and minorities entering the labor pool continues to grow while that of White men consistently diminishes. Projections suggest that this pattern will continue well into the near future (Pyle & Bond, 1997; U.S. Department of Labor, 2001). While diversity has been touted as a competitive advantage (Hollister, Day, & Jesaitis, 1993; Rynes, & Rosen, 1995), research has shown that diversity may not materialize into the expected benefits and may even become detrimental (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Bantel & Jackson, 1989; Elsass & Graves, 1997). The most prevalent method that organizations have chosen for managing diversity is diversity training (Burkart, 1999; Cox, & Blake, 1991). In a survey of Fortune 500 companies, 75% of these companies reported using diversity training (Gilbert & Ivancevich, 2000). Despite the growing reliance on diversity training, there is surprisingly little empirical data documenting its effectiveness (Ivancevich, & Gilbert, 2000; Noe & Ford, 1992, Overmeyer Day, 1995; Roberson, Kulik, & Pepper 2001; Robinson & Dechant, 1997). In addition, the criteria needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs and the mechanisms by which diversity training is hypothesized to influence organizational outcomes have not been clearly delineated. Furthermore, design features that influence the effectiveness of diversity training have not been empirically examined.

The present study takes a step toward developing this area of research by conducting a systematic evaluation of diversity training as well as investigating characteristics relevant to the design of these programs. To begin with, a more detailed examination of the research to date that has been conducted on diversity training is presented, revealing the need for an
empirical evaluation. Next, the rationale behind diversity initiatives (i.e., the objectives of diversity training) is reviewed in an effort to help establish the criteria for an effective evaluation. The current models for evaluating training programs will be used as a basis in determining whether the expectations of diversity training are accomplished. Some theoretical background is offered as a means to identify the mechanisms linking diversity training with organizational outcomes. In addition to the evaluation of diversity training, two aspects of the training design will be explored. More specifically, characteristics of the trainer and the focus of the training will be taken into consideration by relying on past research in the areas of race and gender effects, trainer and trainee interaction, and ingroup and outgroup interactions.

*Understanding the Need for Diversity Training*

The definition of diversity has expanded from focusing solely on differences among protected groups (Bond & Pyle, 1998) to encompassing differences in education, personality, and time within the organization (Miller, 1994; Pfeffer, 1983). As a consequence, diversity in some form is present in most teams, departments, and organizations. While some studies have shown that diversity leads to better team outcomes, other studies have found diversity to actually inhibit creativity and overall performance (for reviews see, Milliken & Martins, 1996; Williams, & O’Reilly, 1998). The process loss occurring within the team is ultimately responsible for the negative organizational outcomes. Furthermore, Copeland (1988) suggested that individuals participating within diverse groups will increase their reliance on stereotypes through unmanaged interactions. The composition of the group renders the members ineffective and makes them unable to realize the benefits inherent in the diverse team (Guzzo & Dickson, 1996).
With the possibility that diversity may lead to detrimental processes and/or outcomes (Cox, 1991; Thomas & Ely, 1996), the need for management to capitalize on the gains achieved in similar efforts is evident. For example, an award winning affirmative action (AA) plan has been shown to positively impact an organization’s performance (Wright, Ferris, Hiller, & Kroll, 1995). Similarly, a diversity training initiative could affect an organization’s performance (Allen, 1995; Robinson & Dechant, 1997). However, performance can only become a concern after an effective tool for managing the diversity within an organization is established.

Past Research on Diversity Training

For diversity training to continue to be implemented in organizations, it is essential that the effectiveness of the training be realized (Jensen, 1996; Weaver & Dixon-Kheir, 2002). Such research could be instrumental in avoiding the discontinuation of diversity initiatives, a decision that could imply that organizations do not value diversity (Hollister et al., 1993). Further, this research could aid organizations in attracting and retaining the best employees, a suggested consequence of diversity training programs (Geber, 1990; Miller, 1994). While diversity training has been advocated by researchers and the popular press (Hanover & Cellar, 1998), there have only been a few studies that have tried to examine the impact of diversity training in organizations.

For instance, Kossek and Zonia (1993) assessed university employees’ attitudes toward their employer’s efforts at promoting diversity. They found, as expected, that minorities and women responded more favorably than Whites and men to their institution’s emphasis on diversity efforts. In a similar survey study, Ellis and Sonnefield (1994) assessed reactions of four types of employees: 1) employees who had attended a diversity workshop
and had familiarity with managing diversity from some other source, 2) employees that had only attended a diversity workshop, 3) employees that had only been exposed to the idea of managing diversity, and 4) employees who were completely unfamiliar with the topic of managing diversity. They found no differences between the first three groups. However, they did find that attitudes toward diversity management were more favorable among employees who had some exposure to the topic compared to employees who had no previous exposure. More specific to diversity training, Ellis and Sonnefield (1994) found that employees who attended the workshop perceived it to be a valuable experience and relevant to enhancing work relationships with individuals different from themselves.

Rynes and Rosen (1995) surveyed human resource professionals from a number of organizations on the implementation and perceived success of diversity programs. Factors related to the adoption of a diversity training program were size of the organization, priority given to diversity, presence of a diversity manager, the number of policies relating to diversity (e.g., mentor programs for minorities), and beliefs held by top management. These relationships were positive in nature. For example, the larger the organization, the more likely it was to adopt a diversity training program. These professionals further indicated that the success of a program was dependent upon mandatory management attendance, the percentage of the training budget allotted to diversity training, the breadth of the definition of diversity, both top and general support from management, and rewards for increasing diversity. While respondents did indicate initial success for their diversity initiatives, only 33% actually believed the program was successful in the long-term.

A well-known diversity training exercise used to reduce stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination is Jane Elliot’s “blue-eyes/brown-eyes” prejudice simulation exercise.
Stewart, LaDuke, Bracht, Sweet, and Gamarel (2003) undertook an evaluation of this exercise. They assessed students’ attitudes regarding their willingness to engage in relationships with diverse others, their degree of modern racism, and their motivation to control the expression of prejudice. They found that those students who participated in the exercise perceived greater comfort in interacting with others of different races from themselves than did those who did not participate. However, they did not find that participation in the exercise led to a reduction in the degree of modern racism or to an increase in the motivation to control prejudice reactions as measured against those students in a comparison group. Although these results are important in furthering the direction of diversity training research, an important qualification on these findings should be made. Students reported an intensely aversive experience to participation in this exercise as a result of being subjected to activities that involved criticism and group humiliation (Stewart et al., 2003). Thus, concern for students’ and employees’ well-being arises during the consideration of implementing such programs in organizations.

Hanover and Cellar’s (1998) study makes an important shift toward an assessment of self-perceptions on the utility of diversity training. The participants in this study were managers who were responsible for effectively managing members of a diverse workforce. Hanover and Cellar measured trainees’ self-perceptions of the importance of behaviors and the extent to which they performed behaviors related to diversity management practices. They found that managers who received training perceived the diversity-related practices as more important and perceived themselves to engage in more of these practices than managers who had not received training. They also found that reactions toward the training course were related to their self-perceptions of the importance and occurrence of the behaviors.
To further understand the state of diversity training, Wentling and Palma-Rivas (1998, 2000a, 2000b) conducted a number of interviews with diversity experts probing their perceptions about the barriers to diversity initiatives (e.g., stereotyping and lack of comfort with different others), factors that influence diversity programs (e.g., demographic changes), reasons for the management of diversity (e.g., competitive advantage), and future trends (e.g., diverse work teams will increasingly become a reality for organizations). Of particular relevance to the present research, experts mentioned the importance of using a qualified trainer to lead these courses and using evaluations to assess the effectiveness of diversity training. These two practices were noted as essential components of successful diversity initiatives. The experts also indicated that training was the best strategy for managing diversity because of its capacity for building skills and understanding in employees.

While most research has focused on the reactions to diversity training in measuring effectiveness, the design of these initiatives also has been investigated (Roberson et al., 2001). Roberson et al. were interested in the effects of trainee characteristics on the outcomes of diversity training. In accordance with the model presented by Kraiger, Ford and Salas (1993), they investigated the effects of training group composition and trainee experience on a cognitive learning measure, attitudes toward cultural diversity, and behavioral intentions. Training group composition by itself had no impact on any of the outcomes. They did find some evidence for the interaction between group composition and prior experience, as trainees with prior experience responded better in homogeneous than in heterogeneous groups. However, trainees with no prior experience were unaffected by group composition for some of the cognitive skills and behavioral intentions measured.
A Systematic Evaluation of Diversity Training

Though previous research has made an initial attempt at understanding the impact of diversity initiatives, a systematic evaluation of diversity training is still lacking (Chrobot-Mason & Quiñones, 2002). An evaluation needs to consider not only the reactions of the trainees like most of the previous research has done, but it also needs to consider affective, cognitive and behavioral learning outcomes to these initiatives. Furthermore, the use of a trained and untrained group is needed to determine the change experienced strictly due to the training program (Arvey & Cole, 1989). Finally, while self-reports have been extensively used, controlled observation of transfer behaviors resulting from training would considerably extend previous research.

Objectives of Diversity Training

In an effort to systematically evaluate the effects of diversity training, the first step is to clearly identify the objectives that the training sets forth. To date, objectives of diversity training programs have not been well established (Ferdman & Brody, 1996; Overmeyer Day, 1995). The end goal of diversity training should be to minimize the negative effects of diversity while maximizing the associated positive outcomes. The method for accomplishing this end-state is still under debate, and there is still disagreement over whether awareness must be the first step of an initiative (Morrison, Ruderman, & Hughes-James, 1993). Nonetheless, both awareness and modification of behaviors are agreed to be important components of a training program (Loden, 1996), with a recommendation for the central objective to focus on changing tangible behaviors (Chrobot-Mason & Quiñones, 2002). Whether awareness- or behavioral-based in nature, the components of a successful initiative should be built upon the objectives of the training course.
Chrobot-Mason and Quiñones (2002) suggest three broad themes for the objectives of diversity training initiatives: 1) improve the work environment for all employees, 2) improve work relationships, and 3) improve the quality and efficiency of work being conducted. To organize the more micro-level objectives stated in other work (Bhawuk & Triandis, 1996; Hayles & Russell, 1997; Ivancevich & Gilbert, 2000; Kirkland & Regan, 1997; Linnehan & Konrad, 1999; Loden, 1996; Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1998; Wheeler, 1994), the categories of Chrobot-Mason and Quiñones (2002) are used in the current research as an overarching framework. To supplement this framework, affective, cognitive, and behavioral outcomes are considered, as diversity has been identified as influencing these particular processes (Milliken & Martins, 1996). Generally, diversity training should lead to an understanding of diversity (cognitive), build skills on how to utilize diversity and work with diverse others (behavioral), and positively influence attitudes toward diversity (affective).

Table 1 represents an integration of the framework of Chrobot-Mason and Quiñones (2002), micro-level objectives identified by diversity researchers, and processes highlighted by Milliken and Martins (1996). The following serves as an illustration of the current framework presented in Table 1: providing a definition of the term diversity during diversity training falls under the objective of education, which falls under the broader theme of improving the work environment for all employees. The education objective should be evaluated from a cognitive outcome dimension perspective by use of a recall or recognition test (see Table 1). In another example from Table 1, an organization could have the objective of increasing organizational effectiveness and productivity. In order to determine whether this objective of diversity training is met, targeted behavioral observation of individual and/or team performance should be undertaken. If the performance objective is met, then the
Table 1

*A Framework for Diversity Training Objectives, Their Outcome Dimensions, and Potential Criteria for Evaluation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Objectives</th>
<th>Training Evaluation Outcome Dimensions</th>
<th>Potential Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve Work Environment for All Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved awareness (e.g., knowledge of business case for diversity)</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Recognition/recall tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communication of policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Preventing and resolving litigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Provides statistical information (i.e., changing demographics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Provide appropriate use of terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Provide purpose of such initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cultural change/improving climate</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Self-report measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Creating an environment of fairness and equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Fostering a positive climate for attitudes toward diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Work Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase personal effectiveness:</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Self-report measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Interaction comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Role conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Objectives</td>
<td>Training Evaluation Outcome Dimensions</td>
<td>Potential Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing specific skills:</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Targeted behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Conflict mediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Attitude change:</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Self-report measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improve the Quality and Efficiency of Work Being Conducted**

- Increase organizational effectiveness and productivity:
  - Performance                                          | Behavioral                            | Targeted behavioral         |
  - Grievance rates                                      |                                        | observation                |
  - Turnover                                             |                                        |                             |
  - Absenteeism                                          | Cognitive                              | Task performance            |
  - Creativity                                           | Affective                              | Self-report measure         |
  - Innovation                                           |                                        |                             |
  - Satisfaction                                         |                                        |                             |
organization is able to achieve the overall theme of improving the quality and efficiency of
the work being conducted.

*Models of Training Evaluation*

Once the objectives of the diversity training program have been determined, the
criteria for measuring effectiveness must be decided upon. In the past, most studies
investigating the effectiveness of diversity training have been qualitative in nature (Bhawuk
& Triandis, 1996), have only been able to assess self-reported behaviors (Wentling & Palma-
Rivas, 1998), or have been unable to assess the impact of the training itself (Roberson et al.,
2001). However, given the large percentage of organizations implementing such programs,
the need for systematic evaluations of diversity training is critical.

*Kirkpatrick’s evaluation model.* Kirkpatrick’s (1976) four level evaluation model has
remained the most frequently used framework for the evaluation of training programs
(Alliger, Tannenbaum, Bennet, & Shotland, 1997). His model is causal in nature, and the
levels have been thought of as a hierarchy of steps so that accomplishing each prior step
becomes necessary in order to reach subsequent steps in the model (Kirkpatrick, 1976). To
detail each step more fully, *reactions* is the first step in evaluating a training program and
consists of those measurements assessing trainees’ liking of the program. *Learning*, the
second step in the model, evaluates the principles, facts, and skills that were part of the
instructed material. The *behaviors* demonstrated on-the-job as a result of training is
examined in the third step. Finally, the impact (*results*) of the training (e.g., increase in
quality and quantity of production) on the organization is analyzed in the fourth step to
determine the improvement due to training.
A recent review of work in this area has suggested "augmenting" Kirkpatrick's framework (Haccoun, & Saks, 1998), as shown in the work and models of Kraiger, Ford and Salas (1993) and Alliger, Tannenbaum, Bennet, and Shotland (1997). Alliger et al. (1997) made an effort to supplement Kirkpatrick's original taxonomy. They proposed separating out affective reactions (liking) from utility judgments (i.e., perceptions of the training program's usefulness). They further expanded the learning component to include not only tests of knowledge, but also a behavioral/skill demonstration. Kirkpatrick's third step is renamed to the more general category of "transfer," to emphasize that it contains a "measurable aspect" of the job. Training results remain the same as in Kirkpatrick's original definition.

A meta-analytic test of this model found evidence for relationships among different levels of the framework (Alliger et al., 1997). Some of the notable findings were that utility reactions were related to job performance and that learning was related to results. All of the criteria demonstrated higher correlations with different criteria in the same level, a necessary component of convergent validity. In addition, the criteria had seemingly high reliabilities, lending support to their use in evaluations.

Kraiger, Ford, and Salas evaluation model. Kraiger et al. (1993) referred to training evaluation as "a system for measuring whether trainees have achieved learning outcomes" (p. 312). As such, they delve into Kirkpatrick's second evaluation step by concentrating their efforts on the type of criteria that could indicate learning has occurred during training. They highlight three outcomes as relevant to learning: affective, cognitive, and behavioral.

Affective outcomes refer both to attitudes resulting from training as well as motivational components (e.g., self-efficacy). While Kraiger et al. (1993) do not feel that reactions are a direct assessment of learning as in Kirkpatrick's model, they do believe
attitudes can be an indicator of learning. To illustrate the difference between reactions and attitudes, the liking of a training course can be seen as a reaction. An attitude, though, represents such outcomes as commitment or change in values. Further, Kraiger et al. believe that changes in motivational states could be taken as evidence of learning.

As another indicator of learning, the more traditional component assessing cognitive skills is included in their method of training evaluation. The most common technique used to determine whether a trainee has gained knowledge (declarative, procedural, or tacit) is through the administration of a test (e.g., a multiple choice or true/false exam). A behavioral component of learning is the last category in their model. This component appears to be congruent with Kirkpatrick’s third step, which recommends the examination of the trainees’ behaviors. That is, this category “concerns the development of [trainees’] technical or motor skills” (Kraiger et al., 1993, p. 316). However, Kraiger et al.’s category for skill-based outcomes could be extended from technical and motor skills to encompass interpersonal skills, which can also be demonstrated through behaviors.

*An integrated model.* The present study incorporates components from the previously described frameworks in order to conduct an evaluation of diversity training. The four levels corresponding to Kirkpatrick’s and Alliger and colleagues’ models are illustrated in Figure 1. In the present study, only the first three levels will be focused on in the evaluation. Each level of the model in Figure 1 provides evidence for meeting the objectives stated in Table 1. For example, the *reactions* that are examined after training will be reactions toward the trainer and toward the usefulness of the training course (see Figure 1). The perceived utility
Figure 1

An Integrated Model of Diversity Training Evaluation

- Reactions
  - Evaluation of trainer
  - Usefulness of training

- Learning
  - Affective
    - self-efficacy
    - attitudes toward diversity
  - Cognitive
    - knowledge
  - Behavioral
    - skill demonstration

- Transfer
  - Group Processes
    - Attraction
    - Cohesion
    - Communication
    - Conflict
    - Decision-making
    - Heterogeneity
    - Participation
    - Workload sharing
  - Skill Demonstration
    - Conflict resolution
    - Criteria used

- Results
  - Group Productivity
    - subjective performance ratings
    - objective performance ratings
  - Satisfaction
  - Reports of Incidents
    - sexual harassment charges
  - Climate
of diversity training should meet the objective of improving work relationships by increasing trainees’ interaction comfort with different others (outlined in Table 1).

**Hypothesis 1.** Individuals who participate in diversity training will perceive greater usefulness, as measured by utility reactions toward training, than individuals who do not participate in diversity training.

In a more exhaustive assessment of learning (suggested by the Kraiger et al. model), affective, cognitive, and behavioral components will be assessed. These learning components achieve two broader objectives of improving the work environment for all employees and improving work relationships. They further provide evidence for the more narrow objectives of attitude change, education, and providing specific skills (Table 1). Self-efficacy and attitudes toward diversity will be used as criteria in measuring trainee’s affective learning. In this context, self-efficacy refers to an individual’s perceptions of his/her confidence in interacting with diverse others. The trainees’ knowledge and skills will be tested to fulfill the cognitive and behavioral components, respectively (see Figure 1). More specifically, topics covered in training, such as the business case for diversity and conflict resolution skills, will be tested through a recognition/recall test and a self-report measure.

**Hypothesis 2a.** Individuals who participate in diversity training will demonstrate higher levels of affective learning, as measured by self-efficacy for interacting with diverse others and attitudes toward diversity, than individuals who do not participate in diversity training.

**Hypothesis 2b.** Individuals who participate in diversity training will demonstrate higher levels of cognitive learning, as measured by knowledge tests, than individuals who do not participate in diversity training.
Hypothesis 2c. Individuals who participate in diversity training will demonstrate higher levels of behavioral learning, as measured by a skill demonstration exercise, than individuals who did not participate in diversity training.

To investigate the transfer of knowledge and skills, the current study will examine the group processes perceived to be exhibited within teams. Diversity has been investigated in relation to affective, behavioral and cognitive group processes (Milliken & Martins, 1996). Diversity can either facilitate or inhibit these group processes. For example, enhanced quality in creativity and decision-making ability can be the positive by-products expected to result from diversity due to the exposure to alternative views. However, conflict and reduced cohesion are potential problems that can result from increasing diversity in work groups.

By providing specific skills targeting group processes, diversity training can improve the work environment and relationships. Specifically, training can improve affective processes, such as level of attraction to members of the group and cohesion (Cox & Blake, 1991). In addition, training can improve cognitive consequences of diversity, such as decision-making/problem solving and creativity (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Bantel & Jackson, 1989; Chatman, Polzer, Barsade, & Neale, 1998; Nemeth & Kwan, 1987; Wanous & Youtz, 1986; Watson, Kumar, & Michaelsen, 1993). And lastly, training can enhance an interpersonal component (behavioral) as evidenced through interactions demonstrating communication and conflict behaviors (Chatman et al., 1998; Cox & Blake, 1991; DiTomaso, Cordero, & Farris, 1996; Jackson, Stone, & Alvarez, 1993). Participation in a diversity training program should provide trainees with knowledge and awareness of the capacity for teams to capitalize on the benefits of their diverse workgroup. Thus, trainees should perceive diverse work groups as capable of performing effectively or productively.
That is, the transfer of training should result in a positive view of the group processes existing within diverse teams.

Diversity training could also decrease individuals' tendency to use discrimination in human resources practices, such as selection and hiring. Minorities have difficulties overcoming stereotypical perceptions that others hold of their capabilities (Tomkiewicz, Brenner, & Adeyemi-Bello, 1998). For example, individuals may believe that minorities have characteristics unsuitable for management positions, preventing minorities from proving their capabilities. Those individuals who have attended diversity training are exposed to a tool highlighting the value inherent in all individuals. As a consequence, they may be less likely to rely on stereotypes related to race and gender, reducing discriminatory practices in the workplace.

As discussed previously, an associated cost of diversity is the conflict that results from diverse individuals working together. Diversity training may provide trainees with the capability to reflectively resolve conflicts between employees. The interpersonal skills learned during training may empower trainees by supplying them with practices to rely on in conflict-laden situations. It is expected that the interpersonal skills learned during training should leave trainees with a better understanding of communicative behaviors that will allow for a smooth and effective interaction between employees.

Hypothesis 3a. Individuals who participate in diversity training will demonstrate greater ability to transfer trained skills, as measured by demonstration in hiring task and a conflict situational judgment test, than individuals who do not participate in diversity training.
Hypothesis 3b. Individuals who participate in diversity training will demonstrate greater ability to transfer group processes, as measured by subjective ratings of simulated teams, than individuals who do not participate in diversity training.

Mechanisms for influencing change. The proposed model offers hard criteria for the evaluation of diversity training. To supplement this model, it becomes necessary to consider the mechanisms that will allow for the criteria of an effective diversity training program to be met. In the work environment, employees encounter situations leading to increased cognitive loads. People are restricted in the amount of information that they can process. In order to overcome these limits, individuals use heuristics, such as stereotypes, to decrease their information-processing load (Bodenhausen, 1990; 1993; Hamilton, Sherman, & Ruvolo, 1990). Literature examining the impact of diversity in work groups lays bare situational constraints that hinder the members from fully realizing the uniqueness of each team member (Quattrone, 1986). A solution for this has been put forth in the theory of increased “contact,” in which it has been hypothesized that intergroup contact can reduce the boundaries (i.e., bias) between groups, leading to a more inclusive group identity (Gaertner, Dovidio, Rust, Nier, Banker, Ward, Mottola, & Houlette, 1999; Stroessner & Mackie, 1993).

The contact situation must contain certain conditions in order for a reduction in bias to occur, including the features: equal status in the setting; cooperative interactions, especially in pursuit of a common goal; personalized interactions at an individual level; and support from an authority figure (Fiske, 2002; Gaertner, Dovidio, & Bachman, 1996). If these conditions are achieved, then a common ingroup identity can be shared among individuals originally conceptualized as belonging to different groups (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Validzic, 1998). Under these conditions, individuals can start processing different others into
a “we” vs. an “us” categorical representation. In other words, they are able to recategorize members from an outgroup into a superordinate ingroup representation (Dovidio, Gaertner, Validzic, Matoka, Johnson, & Frazier, 1997). For example, if these conditions were met for individuals interacting within an organization, those individuals belonging to two separate departments could recategorize themselves as members of one organization (i.e., the superordinate representation), allowing for a common group identity.

While the potential exists for contact to result in more favorable reactions toward outgroup members, the conditions discussed previously are required for the successful interaction to take place. These conditions can often be absent from interactions, in which case the likely result is a more favorable reaction on an interpersonal/individual level leaving negative appraisals of the outgroup intact (Smith, 1993; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1999). If contact were an adequate mechanism for reducing barriers, then diverse work groups should not be encountering process loss. In fact, “if stereotypes are conceived of as probabilistic predictions, then it is not difficult to understand why personal experience [contact] has little effect on stereotypes” (McCauley, Stitt, & Segal, 1980, p. 202). Intergroup contact is dynamic and may result in individuals confirming or disconfirming their previously held stereotypes (Rothbart & John, 1985). It is therefore unlikely that interactions between groups, especially groups in conflict, will allow for disconfirmations to occur in naturalistic settings (Rothbart & John, 1985).

Individuals are more likely to experience discomfort and anxiety in their interactions with people who are different from themselves (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Existing stereotypes can either intensify or ameliorate the anxiety. In fact, a reciprocal relationship exists. That is, the danger of anxiety is that it causes information to be “minimally processed”
(Bodenhausen, 1993), increasing the likelihood of undesirable affective, behavioral, and cognitive responses (e.g., biases, stereotypes; Stephan & Stephan, 1985). As a consequence, any counterstereotypic information that a person holds is likely to be lost or less accessible during an anxiety-provoking situation (Wilder, 1993). The insufficient time often present for completion of a team’s projects can create such an anxiety-provoking situation. This reaction can be compounded further by the constrained roles in work groups (Quattrone, 1986). That is, members of a team or an organization are confined to certain roles, whereby the role potentially evokes its own associated stereotypes.

As posited by the model presented in Figure 1, key individual processes and outcomes are expected to be influenced by participation in diversity training. These changes in processes and outcomes should help to meet the objectives of diversity initiatives. That is, by accomplishing these objectives organizational barriers, such as “negative attitudes to and discomfort around people who are different” and stereotyping (Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1998, p. 239), are believed to be eliminated. In the controlled setting of diversity training, individuals are given time to attend to information that allows them to differentiate among others and process information that is inconsistent with their previous stereotypes (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). As Fiske (2002) notes, category membership “may not always activate associated stereotypes,” but it becomes critical to provide individuals with means, such as education, that allow for the deactivation of these stereotypes (p. 124).

Strengthening the value of training is its capacity for effectiveness, without a reliance on the conditions for successful contact. This environment goes beyond the mere exposure or contact they encounter in group settings (Brewer & Miller, 1988). As Fiske and Neuberg (1990) have advocated, stereotypes can be controlled when people are able to attend to and
invoke intentional control in their processing. The point is to undermine the tendencies that individuals have for stereotyping others and allow them to create or provide them with strategies to do so (Hamilton et al., 1990; Kawakami, Dovidio, Moll, Hermsen, & Russin, 2000). Gilbert and Hixon (1991) have noted the necessity of increasing the accuracy of the information on which people rely. In a controlled situation, a reduction in anxiety will likely result in an increased ability to make accurate assessments of outgroup members (Wilder, 1993).

In addition to allotting time and providing a controlled environment to trainees, training allows for the targeting of stereotypes at the group level, possibly eliminating the tendency to make allowances for only one member of an outgroup. Specifically, people may be more likely to modify their stereotype for all members of an outgroup as a result of the knowledge gained during training. The training initiative also makes known the importance of diversity to the organization and upper management. Upper management in this case serves as an authority figure to trainees. In situations where individuals are accountable to an authority, they are more likely to engage in more careful processing in forming their judgments of others (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). That is, people may rely less on stereotypes during training given the implementation of the course by management. Consequently, the four conditions (i.e., the provision of a controlled environment, time, knowledge/skills, and an authority figure) intrinsic to diversity training may lead to successful interactions among diverse individuals as a result of a) reduced anxiety and b) increased accuracy in judgments.

Training Design

Conducting an empirical evaluation of diversity training is a foremost concern for its continued prominence as a management tool. In addition to the evaluation, design features of
an effective program should be investigated. There has been a great deal of speculation surrounding the most effective way to design a diversity training program (cf. Von Bergen, Soper, & Foster, 2002). For example, it has been assumed and advocated by the popular press that a minority trainer would be most effective in this type of training (Karp & Sutton, 1993; Wheeler, 1994). However, despite the preponderance of these recommendations, there is no empirical research demonstrating the effect of these design considerations on training evaluation. Furthermore, with the ever-expanding definition of diversity, the validity of this belief becomes debatable (Kirkland & Regan, 1997). Diversity is said to encompass all those characteristics that make one individual different from another. But it is those features that are visible that are most often thought to represent diversity. The race and gender of the trainer are visible to the trainees, and as a result, may be the most salient features representing inherent diversity. Thus, even with the inclusive definition of diversity, the race and gender of the trainer may remain relevant and important factors in trainees’ reactions to the training.

*Trainer Characteristics*

To the author’s knowledge, past research on the interaction between trainer and trainee characteristics has been limited to one study (Steiner, Dobbins, Trahan, 1991). Steiner et al. proposed a model in which they predicted that trainers were likely to make attributions about their trainees’ performance. In fact, they stipulated that trainers would be more likely to make internal attributions for their trainees’ behavior. These attributions are likely to be influenced by characteristics specific to the trainee, such as race and gender. For example, a trainer is more likely to attribute a male trainee’s good performance to ability. However, the model was limited in scope in that its focus was on the trainer’s attributions of the trainee.
In a similar manner, Steiner et al.'s reasoning could be applied to understanding the processes that lead trainees' to make attributions about their trainer's performance. That is, trainees also have limited information about their trainers, may expect future interactions with their trainers, and may be dependent on their trainer for performance outcomes (Steiner et al., 1991). Their model indicates that a trainer's characteristics are likely to influence trainees' reactions toward their trainer. The consequence of these circumstances is that trainees could be led to spontaneously evaluate their trainer, making attributions based on the race and/or sex of their trainer.

*Trainer race.* Though the basis for the evaluation of trainers has rarely been explored, the joint effects of rater and ratee, leader and subordinate, and professor and student have been more thoroughly investigated. Past findings from these research areas may have particular applicability to the effect of trainer characteristics on trainees' ratings of their trainer. Of relevance to the question in the present study, the race of ratees and professors is one characteristic that has been commonly examined. In a meta-analysis by Kraiger and Ford (1985), the effects of race on the rater's evaluation of the ratee were clear: White raters assigned higher ratings to White ratees, and similarly, Black raters assigned higher ratings to Black ratees.

Results from subsequent studies have not been as clear-cut as the Kraiger and Ford meta-analysis. For example, Sacket and Dubois (1991) found that Black ratees were consistently rated lower than White ratees by both White and Black raters, although Black ratees did receive higher ratings from Black raters than White raters. In another study by Sacket and colleagues (Sacket, Dubois, & Noe, 1991), they found again that Blacks received lower ratings than Whites. However, in a study by Pulakos, White, Oppler, and Borman
(1989), the group (Black vs. White) receiving higher ratings was dependent on the dimension being rated (technical skill factor vs. military bearing factor). In the case of the technical skill factor (i.e., proficiency in job tasks, demonstrating leadership), White ratees were evaluated more favorably, whereas for the military bearing factor (i.e., maintaining appropriate military appearance and physical condition), Black ratees were evaluated more favorably.

The more analogous relationship to that of the trainer and trainee may be the relationship between professor/teacher and student. Researchers have focused on the credibility of professors, defining credibility as the extent to which a person is perceived as trustworthy, likable, competent, and physically attractive (Jones, Moore, Stanaland, & Wyatt, 1998). Research has shown that Black professors are held up to higher standards in evaluative situations than their White counterparts (Hendrix, 1997). However, Hendrix (1998) in a follow-up study found that ratings of the professor depended on the class that he or she was teaching. When the course was deemed to have an ethnic component, Black professors were seen as more credible. White professors, however, had to prove that they had some relevant experience in order to be viewed as credible in this context (Hendrix, 1998).

**Trainer gender.** Similar to research on the effect of ratee race in performance evaluations, another line of research has focused on the role of gender in the leader-subordinate relationship. In general, women tend to be devalued as leaders, particularly by male subordinates (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Conversely, male leaders are evaluated more favorably than female leaders. In fact, the preference for male leaders is stronger for both male and female subordinates (Forsythe, Heiney, & Wright, 1997), and men tend to be more readily perceived as the leader in a group context (Porter, Geis, & Walstedt, 1983).
In educational settings, the effect of the professor’s gender also has been previously investigated. With respect to gender, male teachers have been evaluated more favorably (i.e., more effective) than female teachers (Kierstead, Agostino, & Dill, 1988). However, similar to the relationship existing between race and content of the class, the evaluation of the instructors was influenced by both their gender and the particular course they were teaching. For example, male instructors were rated higher in teaching behaviors (e.g., explains material clearly) than female instructors in natural sciences courses, while the female instructors were rated at least as high if not higher than the males in humanities courses (Basow, 1995).

Typically, stereotyping has been offered as an explanation for these results. It is generally supported in the literature that men are attributed a greater level of competence than women (Heilman, 1983; McKillip, DiMiceli, & Luebke, 1977) and that White individuals are attributed more competence than Black individuals (Copeland, 1988), which is surprisingly subscribed to by both sexes and races respectively. The combination of racial and gender stereotypes results in White men being perceived as competent, while women and minorities are forced to prove their competence (Copeland, 1988). By calling into question an individual’s competence, the stereotypes can cause people to view the individual as a less credible source of information (Jones et al., 1998). The overt characteristics coupled with any impressions that trainees hold for the role of a trainer may cause trainees to evaluate these individuals, who do not conform to them (e.g., women in the leader/trainer role), more harshly (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

These impressions may consist of the appropriateness of certain characteristics for the trainer role. Because trainees are likely to have little previous contact with their trainer, the salience of the trainers’ overt characteristics may be heightened. Thus, trainees may be more
likely to rely on these characteristics when making attributions and judgments about the
trainer and his or her appropriateness for the role. Although trainees bring their stereotypes to
the training situation with them, the content of the training may cause their stereotypes to be
somewhat different than would be expected in other situations. In fact, due to the content of
the training course (i.e., diversity), women, men, Whites and Blacks may all be credible
sources of training. That is, women and men regardless of race may be evaluated similarly
when a course covers content highlighting an appreciation of individual differences.
Conversely, male and White trainers, respectively, may appear more credible or competent
than female or Black trainers, when content of training lacks a focus that may mitigate the
influence of race and gender.

*Hypothesis 4a.* The content of the training course will interact with the race of the
trainer to influence trainees’ reactions toward the trainer in terms of competence,
credibility, experience, knowledge, and preference. Specifically, trainees in the
control condition will rate trainers of different races differentially while trainees in
diversity training will respond equally favorably to both trainers regardless of race.

*Hypothesis 4b.* The content of the training course will interact with the gender of the
trainer to influence trainees’ reactions toward the trainer in terms of competence,
credibility, experience, knowledge, and preference. Specifically, trainees in the
control condition will rate trainers of different genders differentially while trainees in
diversity training will respond equally favorably to both trainers regardless of gender.

*Hypothesis 4c.* The content of the training course will interact with the race and
gender of the trainer to influence trainees’ reactions toward the trainer in terms of
competence, credibility, experience, knowledge, and preference. Specifically, trainees
in the control condition will rate trainers differently depending on race and gender, while trainees in diversity training will respond equally favorably to trainers regardless of race and gender.

*Trainer by trainee interaction.* The race and gender of the trainer should influence all trainees in this setting. Given limited research in the area of the trainer's influence on training outcomes, this research focuses on identifying its consequences. As such, the primary goal of the present research is to examine reactions toward the trainer regardless of the trainees’ individual characteristics (e.g., trainee race, trainee gender).

However, it should be noted that the effect of the trainer’s characteristics may depend on characteristics of the trainee. That is, the race and gender of the trainee may determine the influence that the trainer’s characteristics have on their reactions. To acknowledge this possible interaction between the trainer and trainee, these relationships will be examined in a more exploratory manner.

Although theoretical explanations beyond stereotyping are not often offered for the findings regarding sex and gender (Cox & Nkomo, 1990), there are a number of theories that could be drawn upon to support the relationships. Specifically, the perceived similarity to the trainer could influence trainees’ perceptions. Similarity can relate to more visible characteristics, such as dress and appearance, but can also extend to non-visible traits, such as personalities, background, and religion (Cialdini, 2001). The finding that people tend to like or respond more favorably to others that are similar to themselves is well established in the literature. This liking even extends to persuasion, in which people are also more likely to be persuaded by others who are similar to themselves (Cialdini, 2001).
In a typical training situation, the trainer serves as a model by demonstrating the requisite knowledge and skills (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). According to Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory, individuals tend to model similar others. In fact, model similarity has been shown to influence trainee motivation and attention (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). In turn, motivation and attention have been shown to be related to learning and performance in training (Goldstein, 1993).

Bussey and Bandura (1984) found that children were more likely to reproduce the behavior of a person judged to be similar in gender than someone who was not. Since “liking” of similar others and the continued learning through modeling extends into adulthood (Bandura, 1977), it would be expected that individuals in a training setting may be more inclined to attend to those trainers who are more similar to themselves. As a consequence of the unfamiliarity with the trainer, trainees may rely on more obvious characteristics (e.g., race) to assess similarity. It would then be expected that trainees would attend to trainers who are similar to themselves in terms of race and/or gender.

An alternative explanation seems more appropriate, given the results of Basow’s study (1995), in which she found that the male professors were rated similarly by both male and female students, while female professors were rated lower by male students. The similar ratings of male professors could also be explained by social learning theory. While individuals are more receptive to models like themselves, they may also be more receptive to models that are more familiar. As in the case of a male professor or trainer, this may be the norm or the more familiar case for men. Alternatively, male and female trainers (models) may be equally familiar to women. This pattern for men’s ratings could be further explained by the more subtle form of racism termed aversive racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). In
aversive racism, an individual does not rate the other group less favorably, but rates his or her own group more favorably. That is, a man does not rate female trainers lower, but rates male trainers even higher than would be expected. Thus, though men may react more favorably toward male trainers, women may react equally favorably toward male and female trainers.

*Hypothesis 5a.* The gender of the trainer and trainee will interact to influence the reactions toward the trainer. Specifically, reactions toward male trainers will be favorable from both male and female trainees. Reactions toward female trainers will be more favorable from female trainees than male trainees.

An analogous relationship may occur for White and Black trainers. White trainers may receive more favorable reactions from White trainees, whereas White and Black trainers may be equally well received by minority trainees in a preference for the similarity and the familiarity of the model. This argument is bolstered by research showing Black respondents rated White newscasters’ performance favorably (Johnson, 1984), which may reflect the fact that Black respondents are regularly exposed to such newscasters.

*Hypothesis 5b.* The race of the trainer and trainee will interact to influence the reactions toward the trainer. Specifically, reactions toward White trainers will be favorable from both White and minority trainees. Reactions toward Black trainers will be more favorable from minority trainees than White trainees.

The joint effect of the trainer’s race and gender on trainees’ reactions becomes particularly important given the presence of recommendations for the most effective combination. For example, some researchers have advocated White men as diversity trainers (Mobley & Payne, 1992). Given the research demonstrating that women and minorities recognize the belief in the competency of the “White man,” it could be the case that female
and minority trainees respond similarly toward a White male trainer and a trainer similar to themselves (i.e., White female trainer, Black male trainer, Black female trainer).

Alternatively, it could be the case that White male trainees would only respond favorably toward White male trainers. As a possible consequence of unfamiliarity and aversive racism, the White male trainees may respond comparatively less favorable toward trainers who are different from themselves.

*Hypothesis 5c.* The race and gender of the trainer and trainee will interact to influence the reactions toward the trainer. Specifically, reactions toward White male trainers will be favorable from all trainees. Reactions toward a White female, a Black male, and a Black female trainer will be the least favorable from White male trainees.

*Reactions toward the trainer as a predictor.* Although the linkage between reactions and other training outcomes has been lacking (Alliger et al., 1997), the reactions previously examined have typically been reactions toward the training course. In line with Kirkpatrick’s (1976) model, it is supposed that reactions should influence trainees’ learning and transfer. In the context of training, the trainer’s role may be as important as the content of the course. As a consequence, the trainees’ reactions toward the trainer may influence subsequent training outcomes. More specifically, because the trainees’ reactions could potentially affect the attention they give to the course material, it is expected that reactions toward the trainer could influence the trainees’ learning and transfer of the training material.

*Hypothesis 6a.* Trainees with more favorable reactions toward their trainer will demonstrate higher performance levels on affective and cognitive learning measures.
Hypothesis 6b. Trainees with more favorable reactions toward their trainer will demonstrate higher performance levels on the transfer measures, as measured by a hiring scenario, a simulated team scenario, and a conflict situational judgment test.

Training Focus

A second design feature is whether diversity training should focus on the similarities or the differences between people. Some researchers have indicated that finding commonalities among trainees is essential for the effectiveness of diversity training, as it leads to a reduction in conflicts and misunderstandings (Cox, 1991; Kirkland & Regan, 1997; Laabs, 1993). Other researchers have advocated a recognition/highlighting of differences, which can lead to more creativity and innovation (Mobley & Payne, 1992; Plummer, 1998; Von Bergen et al., 2002).

Individuals like and are more comfortable interacting with others who are similar to themselves. They may even be more likely to “gravitate” toward those who are perceived to be similar to themselves (Pyle & Bond, 1997). The similarity may be on the surface, as in race and gender, but also may go deeper as people of the same race and gender are likely to have similar backgrounds (Chatman et al., 1998).

In fact, the differing experiences faced by people of different genders and racioethnic backgrounds shape group identities (Cox, 1991). These group identities could cement the division between groups, as members of each group are likely to interpret interactions based upon their own group identity. The outcome of such interpretations may make the interaction between groups more difficult as members misconstrue the meanings of words or behaviors and communicate ineffectively (Gelfand, Kuhn, & Radhakrishnan, 1996; Triandis, Krowski,
& Gelfand, 1994). Evidence for the negative outcomes of relying on group identity comes from research showing that out-groups are evaluated less favorably (Judd & Park, 1988).

In impression formation, the amount of attention given to others' attributes leads to the use of stereotyping, or conversely, more individuating processes. As such, the categorization of groups could continue, as the identities of groups are made more salient. Since physical attributes tend to be the most salient during face-to-face interactions, the associated stereotypes are likely to be prominent (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). However, having a greater number of attributes to attend to causes one to use more individuating processes (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Thus, group labels become just another attribute as opposed to the defining attribute/category. The focus on multiple individual differences in fact serves as a strategy for undermining the effects of stereotypic expectancies, possibly resulting in a loss of the superordinate category (i.e., stereotype; Hamilton et al., 1985).

Alternatively, a focus on similarities among the individuals in a work group could create a common fate (Gaertner et al., 1999). These individuals' common fate (i.e., interdependency) is likely to enhance a common group identity, in which individual differences are minimized (Fiske & Ruscher, 1993) and a superordinate group is emphasized (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1999). With an outcome dependency, individuals are evaluating other members more favorably leading to enhanced group cohesiveness (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). This tendency toward positive evaluation is consistent with social identity theory, in which members strive to create a positive group identity (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1981).

When members from different identity groups form a team, the salience of group identities may make it more difficult for members of the team to work with one another. Organizations' effective management of the potential conflict between groups could
successfully turn diversity into a competitive advantage (Triandis, et al., 1994). However, the focus during training could either attenuate or intensify the perceived differences among members of a team. The focus could ultimately determine the processes and outcomes that are impacted. That is, increasing the perceived similarity among individuals could result in reducing their perceived diversity, while increasing a common group identity. The common group representation could increase cohesiveness and attractiveness (Gaertner, Mann, Dovidio, Murrell, & Pomare, 1990), while possibly constraining the range of perspectives or creativity. Conversely, increasing the perceived diversity among individuals could reduce their perceived similarity, while increasing individuation. The individuating processes may allow for more creativity and better decision-making, though inhibiting the level of cohesiveness within the group.

For individuals, the focus of the training could determine the manner in which they apply the material learned during the training. Those individuals who focus on differences may be more likely to perceive creativity within teams, choose more instigative methods to handle conflict among employees, and highlight characteristics of applicants to a greater extent than individuals who attend training with a focus on similarities. In contrast, these individuals will be more likely to perceive cohesion in group processes, choose methods to reduce conflict among employees, and look for a common identity with applicants in a selection process.

_Hypothesis 7._ A diversity training program with a focus on similarities will result in differing transfer outcomes for trainees, as measured by perceptions of group processes, applicants in a hiring situation, and a conflict situational judgment test, than a diversity training program with a focus on differences.
Method

Participants

Participants were 251 undergraduate students from psychology courses who received credit for their participation. Of these participants, there were 117 men and 134 women, among whom 139 were White, 14 Black, 30 Hispanic, and 49 Asian (19 individuals answered "Other").

Design

In order to assess both the design and the evaluation of training, a 2 (Training: Diversity vs. Control) by 2 (Trainer Gender) by 2 (Trainer Race: White vs. Black) between-subjects experimental design was used. In order to assess the design of training in more detail, a factor, focus of training (similarities vs. differences), was nested within the diversity training level of the between-subjects design. This design created eight diversity training cells, each with 24 trainees (c.f., one cell with 23), totaling 191 who attended diversity training. Within the diversity training cells, the two levels of training focus (96 trainees who focused similarities of others vs. 95 trainees who focused on differences of others) were collapsed across the different trainer race and gender manipulations. The four cells of the control condition each had 15 trainees, totaling 60 participants who attended the control training (i.e., a wine ordering training course).

Diversity Training Course

In constructing the training course, the importance of linking the content with the objectives of the course has been noted (Wheeler, 1994). In an effort to meet many of the objectives in Table 1, the training course was adapted from the *Human Diversity Workshop* (Banks, 1994) and a program by the National Coalition Building Institute (1993). The topics
in the present course attempted to increase awareness and build (interpersonal) skills, which have been cited as critical to successful initiatives (Hopkins, Sterkel-Powell, & Hopkins, 1994; Rynes & Rosen, 1995; Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1998). Therefore, the training course included: an awareness/education piece on the business case for a diversity and a diverse workforce, situational exercises capitalizing on experiential learning by providing practice of skill building in conflict resolution (Morrison et al., 1993), and vignettes utilizing critical incidents that may arise in the workplace (Kirkland & Regan, 1997).

The training course was presented via computer using a web browser. Online training has become predominant method for the delivery of training within organizations (e.g., Hewlett-Packard; Sugrue, 2003. The picture of the trainer was displayed in the corner of the web page for the entirety of the training course. Pictures were pilot tested to equate trainers of different races and genders for attractiveness and professionalism. The three-way interaction of picture by gender by race was non-significant for both attractiveness ($F (2, 8) = 1.87, p > .05, \eta^2 = .32$) and professionalism ($F (2, 8) = .90, p > .05, \eta^2 = .18$). In addition to the trainer characteristics manipulation, the focus of the training was stressed repeatedly throughout the duration of training. While some participants were asked to focus on the similarities of members within a team, other participants were asked to focus on the differences of members within a team (see Appendices A and B for participant manual and training material). Though this training program lasted less than a day for the participants, this is typical of most diversity initiatives in organizations (Rynes & Rosen, 1995).

Wine Ordering Course

In order to ascertain whether there were differences in reactions toward the trainer as a function of the content of the training course, it was necessary that the control condition
complete a training course without any reference to material that would overlap with the content of diversity, e.g., conflict resolution, workplace issues. Thus, a course was modified to cover etiquette in the process of wine connoisseurship from Halverson, Knight, Paige, and Podratz (2001; see Appendices C and D for participant manual and training material).

**Procedure**

Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: diversity training or control training (wine tasting course). Individuals in the diversity training group were randomly assigned to one of the eight possible training conditions: 1) White male trainer with focus on similarities, 2) White female trainer with focus on similarities, 3) Black male trainer with focus on similarities, 4) Black female trainer with focus on similarities, 5) White male trainer with focus on differences, 6) White female trainer with focus on differences, 7) Black male trainer with focus on differences, and 8) Black female trainer with focus on differences. Similarly, individuals in the control condition were randomly assigned to one of the four possible conditions: 1) White male trainer, 2) White female trainer, 3) Black male trainer, 4) Black female trainer. Once in their assigned condition, participants in the experimental condition completed their respective diversity training session individually, and participants in the control condition completed a wine ordering training session individually.

Following training, participants completed a measure meant to assess their reactions toward the trainer. All subsequent measures were related to diversity training for both the control and experimental conditions. Participants filled out a reactions measure toward the course, followed by a learning assessment. The participants then completed a task self-efficacy measure as well as an attitudinal diversity measure. Participants were then given the hiring task, during which they rated their perceptions of the qualifications and hirability of 34
applicants. Next, they completed a scenario in which they rated their perceptions of a team’s diversity and group processes. Once they completed these tasks, they completed a conflict situational judgment test (SJT), created by Olsen-Buchanan, Drasgow, Moberg, Mead, Keenan, and Donovan (1988). Upon completion of the SJT, they filled out individual difference measures: demographic information and a personality measure. 

Training Evaluation

Reactions. As suggested by Alliger et al. (1997), a 20-item utility reaction measure was used to assess participants’ reactions regarding the usefulness of the training program (Appendix E; adapted from Holladay, Knight, Paige, & Quiñones, 2003). The three subscales from this scale were backlash (α = .60), organizational message (α = .84), and likelihood of transfer (α = .90).

In addition to the utility reaction items, a scale was created to evaluate the trainer (Appendix F). Traditional items used to assess trainers tend to focus on the trainees’ liking of their trainer. However, there are a number of competencies in addition to likeability that trainers need to exhibit, such as credibility, experience, and knowledge. As no established scale currently exists for measuring the perceived competency of a trainer, 10 items were created and used to evaluate the trainees’ affective response toward the trainer (α = .86; see Appendix D). All of the reaction items were rated on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Learning. A five-item self-efficacy measure adapted from Quiñones (1995) was given to participants to serve in assessing the motivational outcome of the affective learning component (α = .74; Appendix G, Part 1). A measure adapted from DeMeuse and Hostager
(2001) of the attitudes and perceptions of workplace diversity was used to evaluate the attitudinal outcome of the affective component ($\alpha = .90$; Appendix G, Part 2).

In order to evaluate the trainees’ knowledge (cognitive component), a test was given at the end of training to all participants (see Appendix H). There were two parts to the knowledge test to ascertain the participants’ cognitive skills. The first part of the test consisted of 20 statements that participants rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) resulting in a maximum of 100 points. To ensure the effective manipulation of the independent variable training focus, two additional items were included in this test: 1) “To increase a group’s effectiveness, you should focus on the differences within the team,” and 2) “To use diversity as an advantage, you should recognize the similarities of the individuals within a group.” The results from these manipulation checks showed that the individuals within the training condition that focused on similarities responded in less agreement with the first item ($M_1 = 1.45$, $SD_1 = .71$, $t_1 (189) = -20.18, p < .01$) and in more agreement with the second item ($M_2 = 4.59$, $SD_2 = .59$, $t_2 (189) = 11.50, p < .01$) than the individuals within the training condition that focused on differences ($M_1 = 4.03$, $SD_1 = 1.03$; $M_2 = 2.91$, $SD_2 = 1.30$). The results of these analyses showed that the manipulation was successful in that: 1) those individuals who focused on similarities supported the belief that a group’s effectiveness would be enhanced by the similarities individuals share with one another, and 2) those individuals who focused on differences supported the belief that a group’s effectiveness would be enhanced by the differences individuals have to set them apart from one another.

The second part of the test consisted of five multiple-choice items scored zero for incorrect and one for correct resulting in a possible total of five points. The five items on this
test ranged in average difficulty from .37 to .81. Exercises (e.g., asking participants to select a person for a job) were given to all participants to assess their behavioral skills.

*Transfer.* Two areas of transfer were assessed. First, in an effort to assess the transfer of trained skills, participants performed a hiring task and conflict situational judgment test. Second, in an effort to assess the transfer of group processes, participants completed a scenario describing a diverse team. Participants were asked to make subjective ratings of the simulated team’s group processes.

*Tasks*

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of diversity training, trainees completed individual tasks evoking a situation in which the knowledge and skills gained during diversity training could be useful to participants. Furthermore, these tasks required participants to evaluate teams in scenarios allowing for a simulated team’s processes to be rated.

*Hiring scenario.* Participants assumed the role of hiring manager and rated a number of applicants on their hirability, P-J fit, personal liking and P-O fit. The application forms and subsequent measures were adapted from an earlier study by Podratz and Dipboye (2002; see Appendix I for an example application). A picture of the applicant appeared in the upper right hand corner of the application form. These pictures were pilot tested in order to ensure comparability in their attractiveness for applicants of different races and genders. The two-way interaction between race and gender was non-significant for attractiveness, $F(1, 7) = .15$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$. The applicants differed on race (Black vs. White), gender (male vs. female), and level of qualification (low vs. high).
The level of qualification was determined by GPA, major's relevance to position, and work experience. A low qualified application was composed of those applicants with a GPA on average of 2.5 (GPA's were randomly generated to be within plus or minus .2 of 2.5), a major in the school of Humanities (e.g., English), and work experience consisting of two years previous employment with one employer. A high qualified application was composed of those applicants with a GPA on average of 3.5 (GPA's were randomly generated to be within plus or minus .2 of 3.5), a major in the school of Business (e.g., Marketing), and work experience consisting of five years previous employment with 2-3 years with two separate employers. Applicant forms were pilot tested to ensure that the qualifications of the applicants were perceived as low or high on their suitability for the position. Five judges rated the applicant forms on a five-point scale during a pilot study. As expected, the high qualified applicants' forms were rated higher than the low qualified applicants' forms for hirability \( F(1,4) = 118.73, p < .001, \eta^2 = .97 \), person-job (P-J) fit \( F(1,4) = 293.05, p < .001, \eta^2 = .99 \), liking \( F(1,4) = 19.81, p = .01, \eta^2 = .83 \), and person-organization (P-O) fit \( F(1,4) = 49.61, p < .001, \eta^2 = .93 \).

There were 17 low qualified applicants and 17 highly qualified applicants. Of the 34 applicants, 16 were White males, 6 were White females, 6 were Black males, and 6 were Black females. They were distributed evenly across the low and high qualified applications so that there were 8 White males, 3 White females, 3 Black males, and 3 Black females in each level of qualification. Three applications of each subgroup were chosen as a minimum in order to control for the effect of any one stimulus (Fontenelle, Phillips, & Lane, 1985). In total, 34 different applicant forms were used, thereby avoiding the possibility that specific race effects could be attributed to differences in personal characteristics of an applicant. A
larger number of White male applicants were included to increase realism. The proportion (16/34) of applicants was higher to more accurately present a realistic hiring situation, as representation of Blacks remains comparatively low in U.S. organizations (Hayes James, 2000).

All applicants attended public universities that are considered second tier schools (U.S. News, 2003). Second tier schools were chosen due to the large number of state schools in this category, allowing for a geographically representative sample of schools. Further, this level of schools enabled the qualifications manipulation to be based on GPA, previous work experience, and major, without a specific school association adding to or detracting from the manipulation itself. The names of all companies used in the forms were fictitious. All addresses given for the applicants consisted of credible street names and accurate postal zip codes. Birth dates were randomly generated to fall within 1975-1977, so as to appear plausible given the years work experience and attendance of college.

After providing ratings of the thirty-four applicant forms in the packet, participants listed the criteria (e.g., race, qualifications, school, GPA, etc.) they used in their decision making process. Participants responded to an open-ended statement, which instructed them to “Please list the criteria that you used to evaluate the applicants on the previous pages.”

*Simulated team scenario.* A scenario was constructed for the purposes of the present study describing a series of four-person teams that were being put together to work on a project (see Appendix J for an example scenario). The actual diversity of each group was the same for all four scenarios (-18 according to Blau’s index; Blau, 1977), yielding the expectation that the teams were comparable in their diversity. In each scenario, two attributes of all team members were **different** and two attributes of all members were the **same**. The
four attributes of the team members described were race, gender, job title, and level within the company. To illustrate the combination of these attributes, one scenario had all team members of the same gender and same level within the company, while they varied in their races and job titles.

Trainees again took on a managerial role in assessing how a new team would work together on an upcoming project. Given the benefits (e.g., creativity, decision-making) and costs (e.g., cohesion, conflict) covered in the training regarding the presence of diversity within teams, it was expected that the individuals attending diversity training would transfer this knowledge to the scenario task as compared to those attending the control training. Furthermore, it was expected that those individuals who focused on similarities during diversity training would view diversity as more likely to lead to better functioning while those who focused on differences would view diversity as more likely to lead to detrimental functioning, e.g., highlighting uniqueness would be more likely to lead to conflict.

To determine the functioning and effectiveness of a diverse team, the team processes assessed included cohesion, workload sharing, conflict, participation, heterogeneity, attraction, decision-making, and communication. Specifically, an 11-item measure of key group processes that were likely to be influenced by diversity training was used for participants to subjectively rate a team. One item was used to assess the overall perceived diversity present within the teams presented in the scenarios ("The individuals in this team are"), which was rated on a 1 (Very Disimilar) to 5 (Very Similar) Likert scale. The subsequent ten items were included in the same questionnaire in which the statements were rated by participants on a Likert agreement scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Two items adapted from (Jehn, 1995) assessed relationship conflict and
task conflict, respectively ("Team members will experience conflict with one another" and "Team members will disagree about how to complete the project duties"). Two items adapted from Stokes (1983) assessed the perceived cohesion within a team ("Each member will feel included by the group during their interactions" and "This team will work well together"). Two items adapted from Campion, Medsker, and Higgs (1993) and from Watson and Michaelson (1988), respectively, were used to measure perceptions of equal participation ("Each member of this team will have a real say in how the team carries out its work" and "One or two members will tend to dominate the discussion" [R]). One item was adapted from Stokes (1983) to measure perceptions of attraction to team members ("If they were to participate in another team like this one, they would want it to include members who are very similar to the ones in this group"). One was constructed to assess team's decision-making ability ("This team will make highly effective decisions during their interactions."). One item from Campion et al. (1993) measured perceptions of the teams' communication ("Team members will share information about their work with other team members."). Finally, one item from Campion et al. (1993) measured perceptions of teams' workload sharing ("Members on this team will contribute equally to the work."). A composite measure was formed from these eleven items across the four scenarios, representing an aggregate team process measure (α = .80).

*Conflict situational judgment test.* A situational judgment test (SJT) developed by Olsen et al. (1988) was used to measure trainees' ability to handle conflict as a consequence of attending diversity training. The test puts individuals through multiple scenarios in which they are asked to choose the most appropriate managerial action to resolve a conflict. Each scenario provides a branching scene dependent upon their previous choice. The actions taken
can be: 1) no action, 2) policy, 3) arbitrate, and 4) reactive problem-solving. At the conclusion of the scenarios, the SJT provides assessments of individuals’ conflict resolution models by taking into account whether the conflict has short-term, long-term, and/or interpersonal dimensions. The scoring on the SJT was such that a correct answer was coded as +1, an incorrect answer was coded as −1, and neutral responses received no points.

Olsen-Buchanan and colleagues (1988) prescribe that the best managerial action is a contingency model in which the best action depends on the particular dimensions of the conflict. It is expected that individuals who participate in diversity training will have scores that more closely reflect the model’s prescribed actions than those individuals who do not participate in diversity training. That is, individuals who participate in diversity training will recommend actions that are more consistent with the actions that should be taken by a manager to resolve conflicts among employees within an organization than those individuals who do not participate in diversity training.

*Individual Difference Measure*

A 50-item personality measure was used to assess individuals’ personalities (International Personality Item Pool, 2001; Appendix K). Participants rated these statements on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*Very Inaccurate*) to 5 (*Very Accurate*). The IPIP contains ten items for each of the Big Five constructs, extroversion (α = .78), agreeableness (α = .82), conscientiousness (α = .83), neuroticism (α = .88), and openness to experience (α = .78). For the purpose of the study, the construct openness to experience was of particular interest as its underlying meaning may influence trainees’ openness to the learning of the content in the training course. Consequently, openness to experience was considered as a potential covariate in some analyses.
Results

Data were analyzed for outliers. Analyses were conducted both with outliers removed and with outliers included. The overall results of the analyses did not change, thus the results are reported with the outliers included.

Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for study variables. The following analyses look at the relationships of the study variables in greater depth, providing a direct test of each hypothesis.

Training Evaluation

Reactions

Hypothesis 1 stated that participants attending diversity training would perceive greater usefulness, as measured by utility reactions toward training, than participants attending the control training condition. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) revealed a significant effect for training on reactions, Wilks’ Lambda = .94, \( F(2, 247) = 4.85, p < .01, \eta^2 = .06 \). Follow-up Univariate Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests revealed that the effect of training was non-significant for organizational message \( (F(1, 249) = .64, p > .05, \eta^2 = .003) \) and likelihood of transfer \( (F(1, 249) = .19, p > .05, \eta^2 = .001) \), but significant for backlash \( (F(1, 249) = 14.11, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05) \). Participants in diversity training \( (M = 1.99, SD = .54) \) perceived the training to result in less backlash than participants in the control condition \( (M = 2.30, SD = .58) \). Participants attending diversity training did not differ in the perceptions of organizational message \( (M_1 = 3.31, SD_1 = .72) \) or likelihood of transfer \( (M_2 = 2.91, SD_2 = .68) \) from participants in the control condition \( (M_1 = 3.22, SD_1 = .80, M_2 = 2.99, SD_2 = .77) \). The findings from these analyses provide support for Hypothesis 1.
Table 2

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among All Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Trainee Gender</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Trainee Race</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Trainee Age</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Training Condition</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Trainer Race</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Trainer Gender</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Backlash</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Organizational Message</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Likelihood of Transfer</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Trainer Reactions</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.52**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Behaviors</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Likert test</td>
<td>74.93</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Multiple choice test</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Team Process</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Conflict SJT</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Openness to Experience</td>
<td>37.64</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Self-efficacy</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Behaviors</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Likert test</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Multiple choice test</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Team Process</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Conflict SJT</td>
<td>- .06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>- .08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>- .06</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 251. * p < .05, ** p < .01.

a Coded 1 = Men, 2 = Women.

b Coded 1 = White, 2 = Non-White.

c Coded 0 = Control (wine tasting training), 1 = Diversity training.

d Coded 1 = White, 2 = Black.

e Coded 1 = Similar, 2 = Different.

fn = 191.
Learning

Affective. In Hypotheses 2a thru 2c, it was stated that participants who participated in diversity training would demonstrate higher levels of affective, cognitive, and behavioral learning respectively compared to individuals who did not participate in diversity training. Contrary to Hypothesis 2a, there was no difference between individuals who participated in diversity training ($M_1 = 4.29, SD_1 = .53; M_2 = 3.92, SD_2 = .47$) and those who did not in terms of their self-efficacy ($M_1 = 4.28, SD_1 = .47; t(246) = -.14, p > .05$) or their attitudes toward diversity ($M_2 = 3.85, SD_2 = .52; t(249) = -1.16, p > .05$). These results do not support Hypothesis 2a.

Cognitive. However, participants in diversity training expressed greater levels of cognitive learning on both a Likert item ($t(249) = -11.05, p < .01$) and a multiple choice ($t(249) = -5.79, p < .01$) test than individuals in the control condition. On the likert test, participants in the diversity training ($M = 76.93, SD = 6.40$) scored on average eight points higher than individuals in the control condition ($M = 68.55, SD = 4.66$). Again on the 5-item multiple choice test, participants who attended diversity training ($M = 3.01, SD = 1.17$) scored higher than participants who attended the control training condition ($M = 2.02, SD = 1.14$). These results provide support for Hypothesis 2b.

Behavioral. In an additional measure of learning, individuals who participated in diversity training (100% correct) demonstrated higher levels of behavioral learning, as measured by a skill demonstration exercise, than individuals who did not participate in diversity training, (90%; $t(247) = -4.56, p < .01$). Further analysis revealed that participants in diversity training were more likely to select to the correct person for the
job than participants in the control condition, $\chi^2 = 19.37, p < .01$, supporting Hypothesis 2c.

It is interesting to note that affective learning did not differ across training conditions. In an exploratory analysis of those individuals who participated in diversity training, cognitive learning (the likert test) was used as a predictor of affective learning. It was found that those individuals who exhibited greater cognitive learning as a result of diversity training, responded more favorably in their attitudes toward diversity ($r = .19, p = .01$), though not in their self-efficacy ($r = .08, p > .05$).

In another set of exploratory analyses, a correlation was computed with openness to experience and affective learning. It was found that those individuals in diversity training who had higher scores on openness to experience exhibited greater affective learning in terms of self-efficacy ($r = .17, p = .017$), but not in terms of attitudes toward diversity ($r = .13, p > .05$).

Transfer

_Hiring scenario._ Hypotheses 3a and 3b stated that individuals who participated in diversity training would demonstrate greater ability to transfer trained skills and group processes than individuals who did not participate in diversity training. In the first test of this hypothesis, participants performed an in-basket exercise, making ratings on applicants’ hirability, P-J fit, liking, and P-O fit. It was expected that trainees who participated in diversity training would rely more on applicant qualifications and less on race or gender than trainees who did not. A repeated measures design was used with training as the between-subjects variable, race, gender, and qualifications of the applicants as the within-subjects variables, and trainee race and gender as covariates.
Table 3 shows the complete results from the analyses. The expected interactions between applicant race and training condition and applicant gender and training condition were non-significant (p’s > .05), lending no support to Hypothesis 3a. However, a two-way interaction between training condition and applicant qualifications was found for hirability (Wilks’ Lambda = .98, $F(1, 247) = 4.29, p = .04, \eta^2 = .02$). Specifically, those individuals in diversity training ($M = 4.28, SD = .40; M = 1.84, SD = .54$) made more extreme ratings of applicants than those individuals who were in the control training condition ($M = 4.12, SD = .40; M = 1.89, SD = .54$) depending on the applicants’ qualifications.

In addition to making likert ratings, participants were asked to list the criteria used in making their ratings. Participants who attended diversity training ($M = .04, SD = .20$) reported using characteristics of protected groups, e.g., race and gender, as criteria less than participants who attended the control training condition, ($M = .12, SD = 32; t (249) = 2.14, p = .03$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 3a.

*Conflict situational judgment test.* In another test of transfer, it was expected that individuals who participated in diversity training would make more effective decisions as a manager handling conflicts among employees than individuals who did not participate in diversity training. The analysis revealed that there was no difference between the diversity training condition ($M = -.19, SD = 2.35$) and the control training condition ($M = -.12, SD = 2.19$) in terms of their scores on the empirical conflict resolution, $\tau(243) = -.21, p > .05$, providing no support for Hypothesis 3a.
Table 3

Results from the Repeated Measures ANOVA with Training Condition as the Between-Subjects Factor and Applicant Race, Applicant Gender, and Applicant Qualifications as the Within-Subjects Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Wilks' Λ</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lambda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>7.92**</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>214.83**</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>237.57**</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>8.60**</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>32.50**</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x Applicant Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x Applicant Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>4.29*</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$\eta^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race x Applicant Gender</td>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>7.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Gender x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x Applicant Race x Applicant Gender</td>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x Applicant Race x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x Applicant Gender x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race x Applicant Gender x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>4.04*</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x Applicant Race x Applicant Gender x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, ** p < .01.
Simulated team scenario. It was expected that diversity training would result in the greater transfer of perceived group processes than a control condition. However, individuals who attended diversity training ($M = 3.15, SD = .30$) did not rate the simulated group's processes different than those who did not attend diversity training ($M = 3.19, SD = .25; t(248) = 1.05, p > .05$), lacking support for Hypothesis 3b.

In an exploratory analysis of those individuals who participated in diversity training, perceptions of the likelihood of transfer was tested as a correlate of group processes. It was found that those trainees who perceived a greater likelihood of transfer resulting from diversity training also perceived more favorable group processes in a simulated diverse team setting ($r = .18, p = .01$).

Training Design

Trainee reactions toward trainer. Hypotheses 4a thru 4c stated that trainees in the control condition would rate male and White trainers higher than female and Black trainers, respectively, in terms of competence, credibility, experience, knowledge, and preference, as compared to trainees in the diversity training condition who would rate trainers similarly. While the two-way interactions between training content and gender (4a) or race (4b) were non-significant in terms of trainees' reactions toward their trainers, there was a three-way interaction between training content and trainer gender and race on trainees' reactions toward their trainer, ($F(1, 243) = 6.25, p = .01, \eta^2 = .03$; Table 4). As shown in Figure 2, the race and gender of the trainer had no effect on trainee reactions in the diversity training participants with White male ($M = 3.79, SD = .49$) and female ($M = 3.84, SD = .49$) and Black male ($M = 3.72, SD = .49$) and female ($M = 3.85, SD = .49$) trainers being rated similarly. However, trainer race and gender did influence trainee
Table 4

Results from ANOVA Predicting Trainer Reactions from Training Condition, Trainer Race, and Trainer Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Condition</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Race</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Gender</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x Trainer Race</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x Trainer Gender</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Race x Trainer Gender</td>
<td>3.77*</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training x Trainer Race x Trainer Gender</td>
<td>6.25**</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 251.*

*p < .05, **p < .01.*
Figure 2

Diversity Training Condition

Control Training Condition
reactions in the control condition. Specifically, the pattern of means show that Black male trainers \((M = 4.14, SD = .49)\) were rated higher than White male trainers \((M = 3.66, SD = .49)\), while White \((M = 3.99, SD = .49)\) and Black \((M = 3.83, SD = .49)\) female trainers were rated comparably.

Hypotheses 5a-5c predicted that the race and gender of the trainee would interact with the race and gender of the trainer in affecting reactions toward the trainer. Due to small sample sizes present for some of the racial categories (e.g., 14 Black trainees), trainee race was dichotomized into White vs. non-White. An ANOVA was conducted predicting reactions toward the trainer from trainee race, trainee gender, trainer race, trainer gender, and training condition. The results from the ANOVA are shown for the main effects and interactions of interest in Table 5. The results show that trainer race and gender did not interact with trainee race and gender, providing no support for Hypothesis 5.

Reactions toward Trainer of Diversity Training as a Predictor

To test the remaining hypotheses (6a – 7), only trainees who participated in diversity training were considered for the analyses. The rationale for excluding participants in the control condition from these analyses was the directed nature of the hypotheses toward identifying the influence of reactions for a diversity trainer on other diversity training outcomes.

Learning. Hypothesis 6a stated that reactions toward the trainer would influence learning outcomes. Specifically, it was expected that trainees who reacted more favorably toward their trainer would exhibit greater signs of learning as demonstrated in cognitive tests, self-efficacy, and attitudes. To test the hypothesis, correlations between reactions
Table 5

Results from ANOVA Predicting Reactions Toward Trainer from Trainee Race, Trainee Gender, Trainer Race, Trainer Gender, and Training Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Race</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Gender</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee Gender</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee Race</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Gender x Trainee Gender</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Race x Trainee Race</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Gender x Trainee Gender x Training</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Race x Trainee Race x Training</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Race x Trainer Gender x Trainee Race</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Race x Trainee Gender x Trainee Race x Training</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 251.
toward the trainer and learning outcomes were computed. It was found that reactions did not have a significant relationship with trainees’ learning on a multiple-choice test ($r = .07, p > .05$) or self-efficacy ($r = .07, p > .05$). However, reactions toward the trainer did have a significant relationship with trainees’ learning on a likert test ($r = .14, p = .049$) and attitudes toward diversity ($r = .30, p < .01$). As expected, trainees with more favorable trainer reactions had higher scores on the likert test and more positive attitudes toward diversity. The above results provide some support for Hypothesis 6a.

**Transfer.** In Hypothesis 6b, it was hypothesized that reactions toward the trainer would influence transfer outcomes. It was expected that trainees who held more favorable reactions toward the trainer would be more likely to transfer the behaviors learned during training than those trainees who held less favorable reactions. In one test of this hypothesis, a correlation was computed examining the relationship between team processes and reactions. As expected, reactions toward the trainer were significantly related to trainees’ perceptions of teams’ processes. Specifically, more favorable reactions toward the trainer were predictive of more favorable perceptions of diverse teams processes ($r = .16, p = .03$).

In an additional test of the influence of reactions on transfer, a hiring task was used in which it was expected to show the extent to which race and gender played a role in selection decisions. In order to test the influence of reactions on trainees’ decisions, it was necessary to perform a median split on the reactions measure. Following the median split, four repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted with trainer reactions as the between-subjects variable and applicant race, gender, and qualifications as the within-subjects variables assessing applicants’ hirability, P-J fit, liking, and P-O fit. As shown in
Table 6, the four-way interaction of reactions toward trainer by applicant race by applicant gender by applicant qualifications was significant for ratings of hirability (Wilks’ Lambda = .97, $F(1, 189) = 6.18, p = .01, \eta^2 = .03$), P-J fit (Wilks’ Lambda = .97, $F(1, 189) = 6.42, p = .01, \eta^2 = .03$), liking (Wilks’ Lambda = .95, $F(1, 189) = 9.57, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$), and P-O fit (Wilks’ Lambda = .97, $F(1, 189) = 4.93, p = .03, \eta^2 = .03$).

To explore these interactions, simple effects were tested. The results of these analyses revealed that the driving influence behind the four-way interaction was the presence of a three-way interaction for the group of trainees with more favorable reactions. This interaction was not present in the group with less favorable reactions toward their trainer. That is, for the group with more favorable reactions, the three-way interaction between race, gender, and qualifications of the applicant was significant for hirability (Wilks’ Lambda = .95, $F(1, 88) = 4.24, p = .04, \eta^2 = .05$), PJ fit (Wilks’ Lambda = .95, $F(1, 88) = 4.29, p = .04, \eta^2 = .05$), likeability (Wilks’ Lambda = .88, $F(1, 88) = 12.46, p < .01, \eta^2 = .12$), and P-O fit (Wilks’ Lambda = .93, $F(1, 88) = 6.29, p = .01, \eta^2 = .07$). The presence of these interactions showed that the reliance on the race and gender of the applicant was dependent on the applicant’s qualifications. While this reliance was present for the group of trainees who had more favorable reactions toward the trainer, the same reliance was not present for the group of trainees with less favorable reactions.

Table 7 shows the means and standard deviations for the four-way interactions.

The trainees’ with less favorable reactions ($M = .01, SD = .09$) reported using characteristics of protected groups, e.g., race and gender, less as criteria than trainees’ with more favorable reactions ($M = .08, SD = .27; t(189) = -2.39, p = .02$).
Table 6

Results from the Repeated Measures ANOVA with Reactions Toward Trainer as the Between-Subjects Factor and Applicant Race, Applicant Gender, and Applicant Qualifications as Within-Subjects Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactions toward Trainer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>11.32**</td>
<td>11.32**</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>9.32**</td>
<td>9.32**</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>7.79**</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>36.72**</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>3061.26**</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>4158.48**</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>233.35**</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>736.44**</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions x Applicant Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions x Applicant Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race x Applicant Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>24.70**</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>34.45**</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>12.24**</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>11.03**</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>27.03**</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>22.72**</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>29.63**</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$\eta^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Gender x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions x Applicant Race x Applicant Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions x Applicant Race x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions x Applicant Gender x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race x Applicant Gender x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions x Applicant Race x Applicant</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>6.16*</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>4.05*</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>8.96*</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>3.95*</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01.
Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for the Interaction Between Reactions Toward the Trainer, Gender, Race, and Qualifications of the Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Qualifications</th>
<th>High Qualifications</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Qualifications</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>High Qualifications</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an additional test of 6b, reactions toward the trainer was expected to be related to scores on a conflict SJT. The relationship between reactions and conflict SJT scores was non-significant, $r = -.09, p > .05$. The above results provide some support for Hypothesis 6b.

*Training Focus*

Hypothesis 7 stated that the focus of the training would influence the trainees' performance on transfer tasks. In the first test of this hypothesis, repeated measure ANOVAs were conducted with training focus as the between-subjects variable and applicant race, applicant gender, and applicant qualifications as the within-subjects factors. Table 8 shows the results from the analysis. There were no interactions between focus and the within-subjects factors for P-J fit and likeability ($p > .05$). However, there was an interaction between qualifications of the applicant, the gender of the applicant, and the focus of the training for hirability (Wilks' Lambda = .97, $F(1,189) = 6.07, p = .02, \eta^2 = .03$). When qualifications of the applicant were high, trainees who focused on differences ($M = 4.19, SD = .41; M = 4.24, SD = .42$) during training rated the applicants lower than trainees who focused on similarities ($M = 4.34, SD = .41; M = 4.34, SD = .42$) regardless of gender. When qualifications of the applicant were low, female applicants were rated similarly by trainees in both focus conditions ($M = 1.85, SD = .56; M = 1.86, SD = .56$). However, male applicants were rated lower by trainees who focused on similarities ($M = 1.79, SD = .55$) than by trainees who focused on differences ($M = 1.88, SD = .55$; see Figure 3).

Furthermore, there was an interaction between qualifications of the applicant, the race of the applicant, and the focus of the training for P-O fit (Wilks' Lambda = .98,
Table 8

Results from the Repeated Measures ANOVA with Training Focus as the Between-Subjects Factor and Applicant Race, Applicant Gender, and Applicant Qualifications as Within-Subjects Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>4.57*</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>8.31**</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>27.17**</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>2478.26**</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>3132.47**</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>189.63**</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>546.72**</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>Wilks' λ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Race</td>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Race</td>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Gender</td>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Gender</td>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>18.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race x Applicant Gender</td>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>26.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race x Applicant Gender</td>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>27.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>6.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td>Hirability</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>5.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>23.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>22.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Grade x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hireability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>18.43**</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Race x Applicant Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hireability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Race x Applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hireability</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>4.63*</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Gender x Applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hireability</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>6.02*</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Race x Applicant Gender x Applicant Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hireability</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>5.30*</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$\eta^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Race x Applicant Gender x Hirability</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Race x Applicant Gender Applicant Qualifications P-J Fit</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Race x Applicant Gender Applicant Qualifications Liking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus x Applicant Race x Applicant Gender Applicant Qualifications P-O Fit</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01.
\( F(1, 188) = 4.63, p = .03, \eta^2 = .02 \). Figure 4 shows that when qualifications of the applicant were high, trainees who focused on differences \( (M = 3.73, SD = .51; M = 3.81, SD = .56) \) evaluated applicants of different races more extremely in terms of P-O fit than trainees who focused on similarities \( (M = 3.92, SD = .51; M = 3.88, SD = .55) \), with White applicants being rated lower than Black applicants. When qualifications of the applicant were low, trainees who focused on differences \( (M = 2.41, SD = .62; M = 2.40, SD = .64) \) during training evaluated applicants higher than those who focused on similarities \( (M = 2.34, SD = .62; M = 2.35, SD = .64) \) regardless of race.

There was no difference between the training focus conditions in trainees’ reported use of characteristics of protected groups, e.g., race and gender, as criteria \( t(189) = .70, p > .05 \).

The effect of training focus on the team process composite was non-significant, \( r = -.07, p > .05 \). However, the influence of training focus on conflict SJT was significant, \( t(184) = 2.58, p = .01 \). Specifically, the trainees whose focus was on similarities \( (M = .29, SD = 2.32) \) performed higher in their management of the conflicts among employees than trainees whose focus was on differences \( (M = -.53, SD = 1.98) \).

**Discussion**

Diversity training has become a presence as a management tool in many organizations. Billions of dollars are spent on integrating this practice into organizational resources (Jones, 2003). Research providing a theoretical understanding and empirical evaluation has been forthcoming, though to a degree lagging behind the practical application. The present study moves toward bridging the gap between theory and
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practice by offering theoretical underpinnings for the use of diversity training as well as by undertaking an empirical evaluation of the training.

Summary of Findings

Evaluation of training. The experimental design of this study was useful for establishing the direction of causality among variables (i.e., attending training caused changes in reactions, and behaviors). Individuals attending diversity training reacted more positively in their perceptions of the utility of the course, as demonstrated by lower perceived backlash than individuals attending the control training. This finding illustrates the importance of training in reducing negative feelings toward diversity in the workplace, consequently fostering a positive climate for diversity (Table 9: meeting the objective to improve work environment).

Furthermore, trainees who participated in diversity training demonstrated greater behavioral and cognitive learning. However, these trainees did not differ in their affective learning, as indicated by their similar levels of self-efficacy and attitudes toward diversity to trainees in the control condition. These findings lend support to the school of thought that stresses the changing of attitudes may require different techniques than that of behavior modification. For example, reducing prejudice or stereotypic attitudes in a contemporary form may require techniques involving interactions with different others (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1999).

While affective learning was not influenced by diversity training, it was found that those individuals in diversity training who exhibited greater cognitive learning during training, also exhibited greater affective learning (i.e., more positive attitudes toward diversity), and that those individuals who had a higher openness to experience
Table 9

Summary of Findings Corresponding to Training Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Objectives</th>
<th>Training Evaluation Outcome Dimensions</th>
<th>Potential Criteria</th>
<th>Test and Meeting of Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve Work Environment for All Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved awareness (e.g., knowledge of business case for diversity)</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Recognition/recall tests</td>
<td>Hypothesis 2, Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communication of policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Preventing and resolving litigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Provides statistical information (i.e., changing demographics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Provide appropriate use of terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Provide purpose of such initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cultural change/improving climate</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Self-report measure</td>
<td>Hypothesis 2, Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Creating an environment of fairness and equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Fostering a positive climate for utility of diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Objectives</td>
<td>Training Evaluation Outcome Dimensions</td>
<td>Potential Criteria</td>
<td>Test and Meeting of Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve Work Relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase personal effectiveness:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Commitment</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Self-report measure</td>
<td>Hypothesis 1, Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Interaction comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Role conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing specific skills:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Communication</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Targeted behavioral observation</td>
<td>Hypotheses 2 and 3, Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Conflict mediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Attitude change:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Self-report measure</td>
<td>Hypothesis 2, No support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve the Quality and Efficiency of Work Being Conducted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase organizational effectiveness and productivity:</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Targeted behavioral observation</td>
<td>Hypothesis 2, Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Grievance rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Absenteeism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also had a higher self-efficacy. These findings show that there may be individual differences present in the trainees' learning process. Certain background factors may exist for the trainee that will influence whether or not they are “ready” for some of the ideas presented in the course (Goldstein, 1993).

The importance of training can be realized in individuals’ ability to incorporate the material learned from the training course into their actions in situations outside the course. Beyond learning and reactions, the design of the present study incorporated tasks that extended the application of the training into managerial duties. Specifically, the current study presented participants with an in-basket exercise, in which they evaluated applicants for a management position and assessed the processes of diverse teams, and with a conflict situational judgment test. The present findings did show that individuals from diversity training were more likely to rely on the qualifications of the applicants in making a decision to hire than individuals who did not participate in diversity training. Individuals did not differ in their ratings of the applicants in terms of the applicants’ P-J fit, likeability, or P-O fit. It may be the case that individuals are unable to make complete assessments from paper resumes without some more diagnostic information, such as an interview. Following trainees into an interview setting would allow for a test of their reliance on criteria during a realistic hiring practice. Another extension of this research would be to examine hiring proportions after implementation of diversity training in organizations, providing a test of the influence of diversity training on hiring decisions in a naturalistic setting.

The above findings contrasted those findings showing that training did not make a difference in terms of trainees’ reliance on the applicants’ race and gender in ratings of
hirability, P-J fit, likeability, or P-O fit. However, in the explicit examination of the criteria employed by trainees, there was a difference in reported use of applicant race and gender dependent on the training condition. Transfer of training thereby was supported by the finding that the individuals in the training condition relied less on race and gender in selecting applicants than participants in the control condition. That is, individuals in the control condition reported using characteristics included in a protected group, such as race and gender information, to a greater extent than did individuals who participated in diversity training. While the use of race and gender in decisions does not necessitate their leading to negative outcomes, illegal discrimination is a possible consequence. Overall, these findings coupled with the findings discussed previously (i.e., greater reliance on qualifications in the hirability of the applicants) show that trainees attending diversity training relied less on characteristics of protected groups in their decision-making processes.

It should be noted that the content of the training course plays an important role in the prediction of increased accuracy (i.e., use of qualifications) among diversity training participants in their hiring decisions. In this training course, trainees were instructed to rely less on individual differences of protected groups and to focus more on the job-related characteristics that the applicant held in relation to the workplace. Alternatively, it would be expected that a content highlighting the use of protected groups for an affirmative action rationale would lead trainees to increase their reliance on that respective information. Thus, depending on the desired outcomes, the content of the training course needs to receive attention so that their realization can be achieved.
It was also expected that diversity training would influence individuals’ perceptions of a diverse team’s processes. However, trainees regardless of their training did not perceive the processes differently. Given that trainees were not observing teams, but instead reading about them, it is possible that the participants were unable to engender a complete visualization of the team and how the individuals of the team would interact with one another. A next step in research might be to have individuals observe diverse teams in a natural setting. Moreover, the training itself was individual-based. Future research could have trainees attend the training in groups and assess performance of a team and perceptions of team processes after having participated in the training course.

A final test of transfer involved trainees of both the training and control conditions taking a situational judgment test in which they took on the role of a manager who was responsible for resolving conflicts among subordinates. It was expected that participants attending diversity training would be more successful in choosing the course of action for conflict resolution. However, as the results revealed, there was no difference between the diversity training and control conditions. These results are tempered by results of the analyses examining the influence of the training focus, which will be discussed later.

Reactions toward trainer. In addition to the evaluation of diversity training, the examination of design features within the context of training was undertaken. The interaction among trainer and trainee has been neglected in past research (c.f., Steiner et al., 1991). In the present study, it was found that reactions toward the trainer were dependent upon the trainer’s gender and race in conjunction with the content of the
training course. In diversity training, participants did not perceive a trainer more favorably, i.e., to be more competent, more likeable, or more appropriate for the course, based upon the trainer's race or gender. However, in the control training condition, participants did react more favorably to a trainer based on race and gender. Specifically, individuals rated the Black male trainer most favorably.

This finding corroborates past research showing that the presence of race or gender effects in the evaluation of instructors depends on the content of the course (Basow, 1995; Hendrix, 1998). The above finding also highlights that the content of the training course may be able to explain the similar ratings achieved by all the trainers in the diversity training conditions. The subject matter of the course was aimed at reducing trainees' focus on race or gender in interactions with others. As a consequence, it could be the case that the previous finding is further evidence of the course effectiveness given trainees' non-reliance on the trainer's demographic characteristics.

Past research has experienced mixed findings regarding the interaction between individual characteristics of the rater and individual characteristics of the ratee. In the present study, there was no such interaction in the exploratory analyses conducted, for example, between the race of the trainer and race of the trainee. These findings may highlight the role that the trainer plays in the effect, in which the trainees are more in tune with the race and/or gender of the trainer than focusing on their own race and gender in relation to the trainer. However, it may be the case that the lack of a face-to-face interaction with the trainer could have resulted in the null findings present in this study. A setting in which the trainer was in contact with the trainee would provide a situation conducive to more fully testing the interactive effect.
Another constraint in testing the interactive effect between the trainer and trainee was the small sample size present in some of the racial categories for the trainees. Due to this restriction, it was necessary to combine minority groups into a non-White group for comparison with an all-White group. Furthermore, the trainer race manipulation was restricted to White vs. Black for the initial nature of this research. These restrictions in the present study can be remedied in future research by exploring other racial groups in the trainer position, precluding a neglect often present in research on race effects (Avery, Hernandez, & Hebl, 2004), and by containing a more even racial distribution among trainees, allowing for a stronger test of this interactive effect.

It was also of interest to more fully examine the impact of trainer reactions in diversity training participants, given the relationship of reactions with other important training outcomes (e.g., Alliger et al., 1997; Sitzmann, Casper, Brown, & Witzberger, 2003). Based upon an inference of Kirkpatrick’s model, it was expected that reactions toward the trainer would lead to learning and transfer. Thus, the examination of trainer characteristics within the context of diversity training was explored. The present findings revealed that reactions toward the trainer influenced trainees’ learning and transfer. Specifically, it was found that those trainees with more favorable reactions toward their diversity trainer exhibited greater cognitive and affective learning (as indicated by a likert test and attitudes toward diversity, respectively).

Furthermore, it was found that those trainees with more favorable reactions toward the diversity trainer also had more favorable perceptions of a diverse team’s processes. These trainees also relied on the applicant’s qualifications dependent upon the race and gender of the applicant in hiring decisions. Thus, it seems that the trainees with
more favorable reactions were engaging in more complex processing compared to the trainees with less favorable reactions, i.e., they relied only on race in conjunction with gender for hirability. These results provided support for the hypotheses predicting the influence of reactions toward the trainer on training outcomes. However, reactions did not influence self-efficacy, a multiple choice learning test, or scores on the conflict SJT. Reactions toward the trainer are important in trainees’ application of learning from the course. However, given the sparse research in this area, it becomes necessary to continue exploring boundary conditions of this effect.

Training focus. Researchers in the area of diversity have outlined the benefits of individuals recognizing their similarities with others while at the same time pointing out that benefits can arise from individuals capitalizing on the uniqueness of each person. Although findings in the social domain on ingroup/outgroup differences offer some insight into the implications of the diversity training focus, the direct application has remained separate from this area of research. The present research was interested in the influence of the focus of diversity training on transfer outcomes. Specifically, it was expected that the focus of training would highlight the importance of different behaviors, and as such, result in differences among trainees in their transfer behaviors.

The focus of the training did interact with characteristics of the applicants to influence trainees’ evaluative decisions of their hirability and P-O fit. It appears that the focus of the training is responsible to some extent for how trainees use applicant characteristics in making evaluative decisions. While the focus of training did not influence perceptions of group processes, it did influence scores on a conflict SJT. That is, trainees who focused on similarities during training made better managerial decisions
in resolving conflicts than trainees who focused on differences. This result also sheds some light on the null results that existed between the training and control conditions on the conflict SJT. In other words, participants in the control training condition had scores that fell between the scores of the trainees who focused on similarities and the trainees who focused on differences. Consequently, any difference that existed between the training and control condition was suppressed by the averaging of scores between the two diversity training conditions. It appears then that the effectiveness of training is dependent on the lens through which trainees are directed to look. While highlighting and valuing uniqueness may seem beneficial, it appears as though there are associated costs. A next step would be to investigate the combination of the similarities focus and the differences focus to determine if blending the two allows for the most effective training. Furthermore, taking this design feature into a team-based diversity training setting would allow for a more direct test of its influence on perceptions of team processes.

Limitations

The present training course was conducted with college students as the trainees, posing a potential limitation to the study. In an organization, individuals who participate in training are depended upon to use the knowledge and the behaviors in their jobs. Organizations spend a great deal of money on training, placing a responsibility and expectation on the employees to transfer the training to the workplace. In this setting, negative consequences for the employees can be enforced. With the present sample, the accountability to an authority figure, in this case an organization, and to the expensive nature of the training was not present. The accountability to the organization can also serve as a motivational source to the employees that would not exist for the students. As
such, conducting research on diversity training with a sample of employees would allow for greater external validity of the present results.

An additional difference between employees in an organization and a student sample is that the experience each sample brings with it to the training. Specifically, the employees' workplace itself may predispose them to having certain conceptions upon entering a training program. Organizational policies may be in place that orient employees to feel and act in a certain way prior to training. Moreover, previous practices that have been accepted within the workplace could have an influence upon individuals' beliefs. For example, a growing number of sexual harassment cases within an organization may send a message to employees who are attending the training course. The workplace compared to university experiences may give trainees entering the program different histories. However, it is still the case regardless of employee or student status that each individual has experience interacting with diverse others. As such, each individual has some baseline experience to draw upon for relevance to the training.

Furthermore, the students actually participated in the training course, increasing the likelihood of students having similar experiences to employees as a result of attending the training course. The training course, though focusing on diversity in the workplace, has direct relevance to students in diverse college settings. This application can be seen through the growing number of universities that offer diversity training to resident students (Humphreys, 2000). The attendance of training and prevalence of such a course in universities give credence to the generalization from the current sample to other populations.
Another potential limitation of the study was that it took place in a laboratory setting. Given the initial nature of this research, it was necessary to exert a great degree of control over the training, providing a situation conducive to evaluate the training program. Typical implementation of organization training interventions does not lend itself to the controlled comparison among groups of employees (Agars & Kotke, 2004) or to the manipulation of design features. To ensure control within this experiment, the trainers were in attendance via a website (i.e., their pictures) vs. in-person. While this manipulation may increase artificiality of the situation, this is not dissimilar to the training courses offered at organizations through websites. Furthermore, pictures allowed for an equating of trainers on attractiveness and professionalism that would be unrealistic to manage in physical interactions between trainers and trainees.

Additionally, the laboratory setting afforded the opportunity to evaluate behavioral exhibitions demonstrated both during and immediately following the training. Most research in this area has relied on self-report measures of behavioral outcomes (e.g., Hanover & Cellar, 1998). The present study took a necessary step in observing actual behavioral demonstrations from trainees in transfer tasks.

The nature of diversity itself may have caused trainees to react and/or respond to the topic in a politically correct manner. However, an important feature of the experimental design in the present study is the random assignment of participants to the conditions. The random assignment of participants to conditions ensures the probability that participants across conditions should be similar in their characteristics (i.e., attitudes) prior to training. Thus, if the topic of diversity leads to politically correct responses from participants, this should have occurred across the diversity training and control
conditions. Any differences found between the two conditions in reactions, learning, or transfer outcomes can then be attributed to the training as opposed to a social desirability perspective. Furthermore, if the participants of the diversity training condition had responded solely from this perspective, there would not have been any differences found among them in the outcomes measured. For example, the difference found between the trainees who focused on similarities compared to those who focused on differences within the diversity training condition lends evidence to participants not responding solely in a socially desirable manner due to the topic of diversity.

The design of the laboratory experiment constrained the training in the present study to one hour. Although the timeframe is a potential limitation, the majority of training courses in organizations last less than one day in length (Rynes & Rosen, 1995). In fact, it should be encouraging that differences were found as a result of the training in the current study, which only lasted one hour. Specifically, human resource professionals could target specific behaviors related to diversity in hour long modules and have the expectation that learning and transfer could result from the training. It would be expected that training lasting longer could potentially increase the resulting learning and transfer, as the trainees would have more time to attend to knowledge and skills presented to them.

Finally, the measurement of transfer took place directly following the training. While the measure itself provides evidence of transfer, another measurement at a subsequent time period would test the level of trainees' retention. Ghodsian, Bjork, and Benjamin (1997) have discussed the timing of transfer measurement, showing the initial measure of transfer directly following training can be a representative indicator. Given the content of the transfer tests (i.e., introducing a novel or altered task) in the present
study, it is generally considered acceptable to administer the tests immediately following the acquisition of the skills to predict later performance (Ghodsian et al., 1997).

In contrast, retention tests immediately following training are not expected to be as informative of trainees' learning. Instead, such tests should be administered after a delay so that a true measure can be obtained (Ghodsian et al., 1997). A next step in research would be to test the length of training as well as the retention of trainees' learning. A longitudinal study evaluating the duration of training effects could show the effects of the length of training and the timing of transfer tests, allowing for a better understanding and also serving as an indicator of when refresher trainer might be needed. As posited by Baldwin and Ford (1988) “maintenance curves represent the changes that occur in the level of knowledge, skills, or behaviors exhibited in the transfer setting as a function of time elapsed from completion of the training program” (p. 96). Following trainees over time, as in a longitudinal design, would allow for the assessment of their maintenance curves.

Future Research

In addition to the avenues for future research described throughout the summary of results and limitations sections, there are a number of other issues that could be addressed by continued research. To evaluate diversity training, the three levels of reactions, learning, and transfer were considered and focused upon in the present experiment. However, a fourth level, results, remains an important level that future research should attend to in the evaluation and determination of the effectiveness of diversity training. The results level shown in the integrated model in Figure 1 makes an
effort to tie the exhibited behaviors to hard outcomes, such as the performance and satisfaction of employees.

Typical organizational outcomes that have been tied to diversity include innovation, satisfaction, turnover, absenteeism, team performance, evaluations of productivity, and strategic change (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Chatman et al., 1998; Eigel, 1996; Jackson, Brett, Sessa, Cooper, Julin, & Peyronnin, 1991; Konrad, Winter, & Gutek, 1992; O’Reilly, Caldwell, Barnett, 1989; Riordan & Shore, 1997; Wiersema & Bantel, 1992). Turnover in a team emphasizes the negative impact that diversity can have on an organization in both costs associated with recruitment and morale (Robinson & Dechant, 1997). Diversity training could provide companies with the necessary tools to eliminate the backlash and process loss that comes from diverse teams (Burke & Black, 1997). In doing so, they are able to retain their employees in the organization and possibly reap performance gains. Thus, tying results to diversity training would be a critical component to its continued use as a human resources management tool.

Along another line of research, there are a number of trainee individual differences that could influence the training outcomes. For example, Holladay and Quinones (2004) investigated the influence of trainee job level on reactions toward a diversity training course, finding that level (manager vs. employee) influenced the favorable reactions toward the course. Given the relationship of reactions to other training outcomes, it would be expected that an employee’s job level would also influence learning and transfer outcomes of diversity training as well. Thus, future research could assess individual differences, such as trainee job level, as potential moderators in the current model.
The present study made efforts toward ensuring that the content of the diversity training course was representative of those courses implemented in organizations. However, there were a number of sections in the course that could have played a role in the findings. That is, the segment that focused on effective interpersonal skills may have played a key role in the trainees' role as a manager during the conflict situational judgment test. Future research could manipulate the pieces of diversity training, i.e., emphasizing one piece of diversity training over another. For example, highlighting interpersonal skills compared to an educational piece covering diversity statistics could affect trainees' ability to interact with diverse individuals differently. Such research could offer direction for the greater generalization of diversity training programs and also give human resource professionals guidance in preparation of courses depending on their desired outcomes.

Although the methodology of the present study used an online medium for the presentation of the training material, there are alternative methods for doing so. For example, the presentation of the educational piece of diversity training may be most appropriate for computer online training programs. Alternatively, the interpersonal piece involving conflict management may be most appropriate in a team-based training setting. Future research could directly test this question of matching material to methodology. The research would provide a mechanism to human resource professionals for ensuring the material is effectively and optimally communicated to trainees. This becomes especially relevant as 74 percent of organizations reported technology-delivered training was online (Sugrue, 2003). The present study does provide initial evidence that the online medium for diversity training can be an effective communication means of the material.
Conclusion

The present study makes steps toward bridging the gap between research and practice in the area of diversity training. The findings from this experiment provide evidence for the effectiveness of diversity training in modifying reactions, learning, and transfer behaviors. While the race and gender of the trainer were not a significant influence on trainees’ reactions toward their trainer for those individuals attending diversity training, reactions toward their trainer played an important role in influencing learning and transfer outcomes, suggesting that reactions are “part of the larger nomological network of variables that influence training effectiveness” (Morgan & Casper, 2000, p. 302). The focus of training also played a role in determining the effectiveness of transfer outcomes, highlighting a need to attend to the desired outcomes of the training. The findings in this research provide evidence to professionals for the continued use of diversity training as a management tool and evidence to researchers for the continued investigation in this topic area.
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Appendix A

Participants’ Training Materials:

About the Instructor

Dr. Carter is an expert in the fields of interpersonal communications training, goal setting skills, decision making skills, and diversity applications. Dr. Carter has researched the impact of interpersonal skills, goal setting skills, and decision making skills upon relations among diverse people. The results of these studies leave no doubt as to the powerful impact of skills training.

Dr. Carter has served as researcher with the Carkhuff Institute of Human Technology, professorships at several universities, training consultant with Human Technology, Inc., and C.E.O. of Carter Associates, Inc.

With 25 years experience working with businesses and government organizations, Dr. Carter and **his/her** associates serve as organizational consultants, training developers, trainers, and trainers of trainers.
Observation of Others

Directions: Think about three of your friends. Take a couple of minutes to note what makes you **different/similar** from them..
Diversity

all the different characteristics
that make one individual
different from another

In other words

That person is different from me

Diversity encompasses both:

- Visible attributes (race, gender, age, etc.)

- Invisible attributes (personality, values, tenure, etc.)
Skill

Seek out knowledge
about the attributes of one another

Learning about others will help you appreciate how we all have something “in common/unique about us”.
Benefits of Diversity

- Creativity and Innovativeness
- Productivity
- Decision-making
- Marketing to a more global customer base
- Quality of ideas
- Competitiveness of the organization

Costs

- Conflict
- Reduced interpersonal attraction
- Communication
Benefits of Diversity

Directions: Describe two situations in the past (either in your own personal history or in world history) where you think diversity would have been beneficial.

Directions: Describe three situations in the workplace where diversity would be beneficial.
“Laws permitting the right to abortion should be abolished.”
Skills for Conflict Resolution

- Be able to articulate all sides of a conflict
- Reiterate the concerns of an adversary so that he or she feels heard
- Ask questions so that you can understand the position of view point of the other person
- Be able to seek out and utilize common interests in a conflict
- Use conflict to result in new solutions
- View conflict as an opportunity for positive change
4-Step Conflict Resolution Process Model

Step 1: Establish a supportive climate

Step 2: Determine each side's perceptions

Step 3: Isolate causes of differences

Step 1: Select appropriate solution
STEP 1:
Establish a Supportive Climate

Skills to be used in step 1:

1. Be able to articulate all sides of a conflict

2. Reiterate the concerns of an adversary so that he or she feels heard
STEP 2:
Determine Each Side’s Perceptions

Skills to be used in step 2:

3. Ask questions so that you can understand the position or view point of the other person
STEP 3:
Isolate Causes of Conflict

Skills to be used in step 3:

4. Be able to seek out and utilize common interests in a conflict
STEP 4:
Select the Appropriate Solution

Skills to be used in step 4:

5. Use conflict to result in new solutions

6. View conflict as an opportunity for positive change
Conflict Resolution

Directions: List some issues that you see are related to the topic of diversity in the workplace that could potentially result in conflict.
Listening

The ability to use verbal cues to understand the experiences and point of view of others.

Listening for Point of View

- Main Idea or Content
- Feeling
- Values
Simone’s Statement

“I have been here a couple of weeks now. These people have no idea what it is to be Black. They don’t know discrimination. What ticks me off is that they have no sensitivity at all. They are just in their own worlds.”
Learning to Listen

Directions: Describe your biggest challenge in listening with an open mind to another person who has an opinion or viewpoint different from your own. Identify at least two specific practices that will allow you to become more open-minded in your listening.
Identifying Point of View

- **Main Idea or Content**
  
  *They are thinking only about themselves.*
  *They are not aware of others.*

- **Feeling**
  
  *Anger (“What ticks me off...”)*

- **Values**
  
  *Awareness*
  *Fairness*
Responding

The ability to communicate, in our own
words, the significant feelings and/or views
expressed by other people.

Communicating Understanding

Responding to:

- Main Idea
- Feeling and Content
Exploring with Alicia

Alicia: I am from the southwest of the United States. My family is Spanish speaking and we are a mix of both Mexican and Native American Apache people. So I see myself as a blend of two cultures. Also my being a woman is another part of my cultural mix.

Coworker:

Alicia: Yes, and I have been learning through my life to appreciate these things and how they make me distinct. Although sometimes I think that being a woman becomes the most significant part of my background. This is especially true as I relate to others in the workplace.

Coworker:

Alicia: Yes, and I think that is because I have had to deal more with others’ reactions to me as a woman that their reactions to the other parts of my culture.

Coworker:

Alicia: And it has been troublesome. I would have to say it causes problems for others. And they have tried to make it my problem.

Coworker:

Alicia: Well, I am learning to deal with it.
Exploring with Alicia

Alicia: I am from the southwest of the United States. My family is Spanish speaking and we are a mix of both Mexican and Native American Apache people. So I see myself as a blend of two cultures. Also my being a woman is another part of my cultural mix.

Coworker: So you are saying that you really are a combination of several backgrounds.

Alicia: Yes, and I have been learning through my life to appreciate these things and how they make me distinct. Although sometimes I think that being a woman becomes the most significant part of my background. This is especially true as I relate to others in the workplace.

Coworker: So all three of these factors have been important to you, although it seems that being a woman has taken on a greater importance.

Alicia: Yes, and I think that is because I have had to deal more with others’ reactions to me as a woman than their reactions to the other parts of my culture.

Coworker: You are finding out that what other people have had to deal with most about you is your being a woman.

Alicia: And it has been troublesome. I would have to say it causes problems for others. And they have tried to make it my problem.

Coworker: It has been disturbing to you how people have let your being a woman get in the way of relating to you.

Alicia: Well, I am learning to deal with it.
Discrimination

The process of making a distinction or choice on the basis of a perceived feature or characteristic.

Illegal Discrimination

Conduct which unjustifiably distinguishes between people on a basis which is prohibited by law. These bases include:

- Race
- Color
- Religion
- National Origin
- Sex
- Age
- Disability
Making the Tough Decision

Joan is the supervisor of a software development support branch of a technical assistance division for a large company. Her group is responsible for a task that requires that one of her staff visit the sites of each of the branch's client groups to meet with their staffs to review specifications for software development/assistance.

Joan must select someone from her staff to visit the client sites:

- Mary is a White woman with four years of experience, is an effective employee, and has had successful relationships with clients in the past.
- Charles is a Black man with two years of experience, is an effective employee, and has had below-average relationships with past clients.
- Carlos is a Spanish-speaking male with one year of experience, is an average employee, and has had successful relationships with clients in the past.
- Chris is a White male with one year of experience, is an effective employee, and has had successful relationships with clients in the past.

Joan should make her decision be considering the following:

Her objective: to pick an office staff member to meet with clients about software specifications.

Her alternatives: Mary, Charles, Carlos, and Chris

Criteria: Experience, effectiveness, skill in relating to client.

How would you evaluate the alternatives?

Who did you pick?
Your Analysis

Directions: Use + (=1) to indicate excellent, +- (=0) to indicate average, - (= -1) to indicate below average. Then add them to get the results per column (person).

Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Mary</th>
<th>Charles</th>
<th>Carlos</th>
<th>Chris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating to Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results
# Joan’s Analysis

## Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Mary</th>
<th>Charles</th>
<th>Carlos</th>
<th>Chris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>+ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating to Clients</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Trainer Script to appear on internet web page:

Hello, and welcome to the Human Diversity Workshop. My name is Dr. AJ Carter/Dr. Anita Carter and I will be guiding you through the next few exercises. Please turn to Page 1 of your packet now to learn more about my training background and myself. You have a couple of minutes to read over this information before we continue.

The intentions of this workshop are to expand your knowledge and skill for relating to others in the context of a diverse work environment and to explore underlying ideas or concepts that are critical to effective performance in a “diverse” environment. More importantly, this workshop will provide you with a chance to learn and practice specific skills for relating with others in a diverse setting.

The workshop is designed to help you communicate respect when working with people from diverse backgrounds. It will prepare you for a wide range of circumstances where you will be joining with others to accomplish something. You will also learn some valuable strategies for recognizing and resolving difficulties that might arise in settings where people from different backgrounds work together.

Please turn to Page 2 of your packet.

Take a few moments to think about three of your friends. Next make a few notes on what makes you similar to them.

Please turn to Page 3 of your packet.

Diversity refers to all the different characteristics that make one individual different from another, which leads to a person telling him/herself “That person is different from me.”

This definition indicates that diversity is not restricted to the protected groups, such as race and gender, but can encompass a number of different attributes such as personality and values as well. Thus, there are both attributes that are visible (e.g., race) and invisible (e.g., personality) that make people diverse.

Everyone has some thing that makes them in some way different from others. However, when working in a group environment, it is important to focus on the similarities of the group members to increase the group’s effectiveness.

Please turn to Page 4 of your packet.

In order to appreciate others and truly value diversity, it becomes important to seek out knowledge about other people’s attributes. By doing so, you are able to appreciate and learn how everyone has similarities with one another (i.e., attributes in common).
Please turn to Page 5 of your packet.

Diversity has a number of potential benefits such as better decision making, greater creativity and innovation, and more successful marketing to different types of customers. Furthermore, by increasing diversity an organization is likely to be more competitive, as it could potentially reach a broader client base and a broader applicant pool.

However, in order to achieve these benefits it is necessary to learn skills that will reduce costs, such as conflict or breakdown in the channels of communication, and allow effective interactions to occur among people of diverse backgrounds.

As noted, potential conflicts that may arise among people of diverse backgrounds are costs associated with increased diversity. Conflicts, when left unchecked, can lead to barriers such as bias and stereotyping. These behaviors can remove the potential benefits of diversity.

Please turn to Page 6 of your packet.

Take a couple of minutes to describe some situations in the past (either in your own personal history or in world history) where you think diversity would have been beneficial. For, example, in the Bay of Pigs incident, diversity may have allowed for better decision-making.

Now take a couple of minutes to describe some situations in the workplace where diversity would be beneficial.

Please turn to Page 7 of your packet.

Read the following statement and think about your values in relation to it:

"Laws permitting the right to abortion should be abolished."

This statement brings differing degrees of reactions in people. While some people believe in the statement, others disagree. These differences are reflective of the diverse values people hold. This diversity in values can potentially lead to conflict.

Please turn to Page 8 of your packet.

As noted earlier, a cost of diversity is conflict that can result among members of teams and/or organizations. It, therefore, becomes important to seek effective ways to resolve conflict. There are a number of skills that can be used in resolving a conflict. We will cover six of these skills: articulating all sides of a conflict, reiterating the concerns of an adversary so that he or she feels heard, asking questions so that you can understand the position of viewpoint of the other person, seeking out and utilizing common interests in a
conflict, using conflict to result in new solutions, and viewing conflict as an opportunity for positive change.

Note the importance of listening (as discussed in more detail later) when trying to learn the different sides of a conflict. With objectivity, different viewpoints can be shared and people can make more informed decisions. These skills will allow for a broader range of solutions to be generated as well as deeper consideration of the alternatives.

Keep in mind the example above (abortion) is an emotionally charged subject. Not all conflict results from differences in values. In a work setting, conflict can arise from a difference of opinions on the best course of action for completing a task.

Please turn to Page 9 of your packet.

One potential situation that is likely to lead to conflicts in a work setting is the use of teams. Teams have become a common, and even the predominant, method organizations choose to accomplish work goals and achieve productivity gains. Because of this practice, the skills for conflict resolution become necessary for effective communication within teams.

Conflict within teams can arise due to the different ways in which people approach the work. When working in a group environment, it is important to focus on the team’s similarities to increase its effectiveness.

I will take you through a 4-step process that can aid you in resolving a conflict. The conflict resolution skills previously described will be integrated into this 4-step conflict resolution process model.

Please turn to Page 10 of your packet.

The first step in the conflict resolution process is to establish a supportive environment for the team. Important questions to ask during this step are: 1) Do people on each side of the conflict feel that they can voice their view? 2) Do they feel comfortable that other team members will listen to their viewpoint with open minds?

During this step, you should focus on the use of skills #1 and #2: articulating all sides of a conflict and reiterating the concerns of an adversary so that he or she feels heard.

Please turn to Page 11 of your packet.

The second step in the conflict resolution process is to determine each side’s perceptions. An important question to ask during this step is: 1) What do people on each side think of the conflict?

During this step, you should focus on the use of skill #3: asking questions so that you can understand the position or viewpoint of the other person.
Please turn to **Page 12** of your packet.

The third step in the conflict resolution process is to isolate the causes of the conflict. An important question to ask during this step is: 1) What differences underlie the behaviors of the people on each side of the conflict?

During this step, you should focus on the use of skill #4: seeking out and utilizing common interests in a conflict.

Please turn to **Page 13** of your packet.

The fourth step in the conflict resolution process is to select the appropriate solution for conflict resolution. An important question to ask during this step is: 1) What is best for the team?

During this step, you should focus on the use of skills #5 and #6: using conflict to result in new solutions and viewing conflict as an opportunity for positive change.

At this step in the model, it becomes important to remember the benefits of diversity, such as quality of ideas and better decision-making. By utilizing this 4-step process of conflict resolution, you are more likely to capitalize on the team’s diversity and come up with a solution or idea that is “greater than the sum of its parts.”

For example, if members of a team are disagreeing about the way to approach their work, the best strategy to resolve the conflict may be to integrate the members’ approaches. Remember a positive by-product of conflict could be the generation of alternatives. Do not limit yourself to only the two alternatives that each side of the conflict presents, but utilize the conflict to result in a number of possibilities for how to best approach the team’s work.

The best way to resolve conflict depends on the situation. That is, in some situations the best strategy may be to combine the two sides’ viewpoints. In other situations the best strategy may be to rely on policy to resolve the conflict. As a result, it also becomes important to consider all of the consequences of each strategy/solution when resolving a conflict.

Please turn to **Page 14** of your packet.

Take a couple of minutes to describe some issues related to the topic of diversity in the workplace that could potentially result in conflict. Then consider how you would resolve a conflict between employees if it did in fact arise.

During the next lesson you will develop skills for acknowledging the points of view of people from various backgrounds. These skills will build our capacity of acknowledging the points of view of people from backgrounds different from our own.
Again, when working with people from different backgrounds, it is important to focus on your similarities to increase the group’s effectiveness.

Please turn to Page 15 of your packet.

Listening for point of view means using verbal cues to understand the experiences and point of view of others. Listening for point of view of people from various backgrounds includes three elements:

Listening for content in the form of the main idea of what a person is saying.
Listening for the feeling expressed by the other person.
Listening for the person’s values or the ideas that are important to him or her.

When listening for point of view, you should maintain our objectivity and remain non-judgmental.

Now turn to Page 16 of your packet.

Please read Simone’s Statement to yourself:

“I have been here a couple of weeks now. These people have no idea what it is to be Black. They don’t know discrimination. What ticks me off is that they have no sensitivity at all. They are just in their own worlds.”

First, let us try to identify the main point in Simone’s Statement. As a person speaks, think about what this person is saying and formulate and the main point of his/her message into your own words. For example, one main point that Simone is making is: They are thinking only about themselves. They are not aware of others.

Please turn to Page 17 of your packet.

To identify the feeling, you should use both verbal and nonverbal information that the other person is communicating. In this example, Simone’s use of the phrase, “What ticks me off” indicates that she is feeling angry. That statement gives her observations an emotion: anger.

Lastly, a person’s values may reflect a mix of an individual’s unique experiences and the experiences of his or her cultural group. Based on her statement, Simone might have the values of awareness and fairness, because we can infer that the lack of those values causes her to feel angry.

Please turn to Page 18 of your packet.

Learning how to listen for a person’s point of view can help you determine their values, and learning about people’s values helps you relate to them.
When listening to people from different backgrounds, it is important to focus on your similarities to increase the effectiveness of your interactions with them.

Take a moment to describe a challenge to listening with an open mind. Write down some behaviors you can practice that will allow you to become more open-minded in your listening.

Next we will explore how to communicate understanding of a point of view. Communicating understanding of point of view means making a statement that accurately presents the main idea and/or feeling expressed by a person. To communicate your understanding of point of view you will use a skill called Responding. With the skill of responding you can feel more confident that you will be able to have a constructive conversation with someone who is different from you.

Please turn to Page 19 of your packet.

Responding is the skill we use to help us maintain a balance between acknowledging the point of view of another person and giving our own point of view. As you interact with people from backgrounds that are different than your own, it is important that you balance giving your point of view with an accurate understanding of another person’s point of view. It is also important that you concentrate on the similarities that you have with that other person so that the interaction will remain effective.

There are two ways of responding: 1) responding to content or main idea, and 2) responding to feeling and content.

For example, you could have responded to Simone’s main idea by saying, “Simone, you are saying that your coworkers are not aware of others and they are only thinking about themselves.”

Or, you could have responded to Simone’s display of emotion by saying, “Simone you are angry that they are insensitive to your individuality and what it means to be Black.”

Please turn to Page 20 of your packet.

Now it is your turn to try responding. Read Alicia’s statements, and try responding to her statements as her “Coworker.” Write as if you are talking directly to Alicia. You have a few minutes to complete this exercise.

Please turn to Page 21 of your packet.

Take a minute to compare some of your statements to the examples given. Notice how the coworker responded to both the main idea and the feelings communicated to them in Alicia’s statement.
Culture or background need not be experienced as a barrier, but rather, it can be experienced as something to learn about the other person, a part of the overall point of view of another person. Understanding people’s backgrounds may be helpful in relating with them as individuals and working together with them.

The next lesson is about how to recognize and resolve discrimination as it might arise when people from various backgrounds relate to each other. Recognizing and resolving discrimination builds upon the skills you have learned for communicating respect to people from different backgrounds.

Discrimination involves a thought process for making a decision or selection. In and of itself, the practice of discrimination is not wrong, but the bases for discrimination can be.

We are concerned with the form of discrimination that is based on the background of people, which is regarded as unfair. One type of unfair discrimination is illegal discrimination.

Please turn to Page 22 of your packet.

Discrimination is illegal only when it is based on any of the following criteria prohibited by civil rights laws: race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, and disability.

All unfair treatment, including illegal discrimination finds at its core an ineffective decision making process. Effective decision-making has several essential elements. To make an effective decision an individual or organization needs to consider four elements: an objective, listing of alternatives, criteria for making a choice, and an evaluation process. Without these, the decision is likely to be ineffective and more likely to be experienced as unfair or illegal.

Discrimination or unfair treatment is not limited to minority groups and women. With ineffective decision-making, there is a chance that people from any group may experience unfair treatment.

One should resist stereotypes when making judgments of others. One helpful tool for resisting your stereotypes is to rely on job-related criteria in making a decision regarding employees. By relying on the criteria, you are able to reduce your chances for using information, such as gender, in making your decision. This tool also reduces your chances for illegal discrimination against employees resulting from your decision.

Please turn to Page 23 of your packet.

Now read about Joan’s tough decision. Try to identify the objective, the alternatives, the criteria, and how to evaluate the alternatives.

Turn to Page 24. You have about 4 minutes to think about this decision. Use the table to help you in making this decision.
Please turn to Page 25 of your packet.

Compare your analysis with Joan’s analysis. Based on her analysis, Joan has decided to pick Mary for the project. By systematically evaluating the options, Joan has reduced her chances of treating others unfairly, even unintentionally, and reduced her chances that others will perceive her decisions as unfair. That is, Joan did not use criteria, such as gender or race, that are protected by law that could result in her illegally discriminating against her employees.

Questions may still arise from workplace decisions, but they can still be handled by using our skills to acknowledge the points of view of others, and by using our skills for effective decision-making.

You have completed the Human Diversity Workshop exercises, and an important next step is to think about using these workshop skills in your work setting. If you use these skills in your work setting, you will begin to realize benefits when working with others from a variety of backgrounds.

To review, you learned the following skills through the course of this workshop:

- Focusing on similarities to make the group interaction successful
- Resolution of conflict
- Acknowledging point of view (listening, responding)
- Recognition and resolution of discrimination

Sometimes, problems arise and you must recognize and resolve these problems of bias and discrimination. You have learned and practiced skills during this workshop that will help you to make human diversity work. Relating to our human diversity is a great challenge and a great opportunity.

I want to thank you for your time today. Before leaving, you will be asked to fill out a number of questionnaires. However, if you have completed the training course in less than an hour, please go back and review the material. Again, thank you for your time.
Appendix C

About the Instructor

Dr. Carter is an expert in the field of development and processing of wine. Dr. Carter has researched the impact of knowledge and skills pertaining to wine drinking as well as the complementary processes involved in enhancing the essence of wine subtleties. The results of these studies leave no doubt as to the success training can lead to the improvement of wine connoisseurship.

Dr. Carter has served as researcher with the Grapevine Winery, consultant with several vineyards, training consultant with Ordering Wine Without Fear, Inc., and C.E.O. of Carter Associates, Inc.

With 25 years experience working with organizations (wineries and vineyards), Dr. Carter and his associates serve as organizational consultants, training developers, trainers, and trainers of trainers.
Time for Wine

White wines:

- Best with light foods and appetizers
- Usually served earlier in the evening
- Good when it is hot out
- Most often paired with white meat and fish
- Often served slightly chilled but not ice cold

Red wines:

- Best with richer foods
- Considered a heavier wine
- Some strong fish go well with lighter red wines
Time for Wine

Rose wines:

- Good compromise between red and white wines
- Good when it is warm out
- Good for lunch or brunch
- Served with ham or light meats
- Special occasions like Valentines’ Day

Champagne:

- Served with spicy or Asian foods
- Great for celebration
What’s in a Name?

- **White Wines**
  - Chardonnay
  - Sauvignon Blanc
  - Riesling
  - Pinot Grigio/Gris
  - Soave

- **Champagne**
  - Korbel
  - Asti Spumante

- **Red Wines**
  - Bordeaux
  - Cabernet Sauvignon
  - Chianti
  - Pinot Noir
  - Merlot
  - Lambusco

- **Rose**
  - White Zinfandel
The Flavors of Wine

• **Tannin**
  o Leave your mouth feeling dry
  o Bitter taste that is found primarily in red wines
  o Ranges from astringent to firm to soft

• **Sweetness**
  o Ranges from dry to off dry to sweet

• **Acidity**
  o Makes you salivate; does not leave your mouth feeling dry
  o Usually found in white wines
  o Ranges from tart to crisp to soft

• **Alcohol**
  o Ranges from 11 to 14% (by law is less than 14%)
## What Goes with What

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOODS</th>
<th>Tannic Wines</th>
<th>Sweet Wines</th>
<th>Acidic Wines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salty</td>
<td>is less bitter with salty foods</td>
<td>tastes less sweet with salty foods, makes salty foods taste better</td>
<td>less acidic with salty foods, makes salty foods taste saltier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet</td>
<td>makes sweet foods taste less sweet</td>
<td>is good with sweet foods</td>
<td>less acidic with sweet foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatty</td>
<td>tends to taste softer with fatty foods</td>
<td></td>
<td>counterbalanced by fatty foods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Best Bang for your Buck

- Expect to pay between 2 to 3 times as much as the store price when you buy wine in a restaurant

- Don’t buy the house wine

- Less expensive wines are better and cheaper than ever before

- The bigger the bottle the better the value
The Ordering “Ritual”

• **The Wine List**
  
  o Usually organized by type, occasionally by price
  o If you don’t know what to order, you can ask for the sommelier or wine expert
  o If you don’t know how to pronounce a wine, you can order by the bin number, or point

• **The waiter/waitress presents the bottle**
  
  o Check that he/she brought the wine that you ordered
    ▪ Vintage, Producer, Type

• **The waiter/waitress presents the cork**
  
  o Visually examine the condition of the cork
    ▪ Signs of a bad cork: dry & crumbly, wet & shriveled, moldy
The Ordering “Ritual” (continued)

• The waiter/waitress pours the host a small amount of wine

  o Visually examine the wine for clarity
  o With modern wine-making technology, you will probably never see a cloudy wine
  o Swirl the wine in the glass and smell the wine
  o Taste the wine
  o If the wine is acceptable, give the waiter/waitress a nod of approval

    ▪ If you are not sure you can ask the opinion of others at the table
    ▪ If the wine is not acceptable, send it back

• The waiter/waitress pours wine for the guests, and then for the host
Corkage, etc.

- **Bringing your own wine**

- **Call ahead**
  - Make sure the wine is not on the restaurant’s wine list
  - See if the restaurant will allow you to bring your own bottle
  - Find out the corkage fee

- **The waiter/waitress will serve your wine**
Corkage, etc. (continued)

• Unfinished wine
  
  o Ask your server if you may remove the bottle from the restaurant
  o Policies differ

• How long will opened wine keep?
  
  o 1-3 days
  o Keep both red and white wines in the refrigerator
  o Remove reds about an hour before drinking
Tipping

- Tipping
  
  - Historically, waiters were tipped only on the food portion of the bill. You were expected to tip the sommelier separately.

  - Now, since a single waiter usually serves both the wine and the food, you should tip 15-20% of the entire bill.
Decanting

- Decanting wine
  - Decant wine if it is red and over ten years old
    - Don’t hesitate to ask your waiter to decant your wine
  - Wine is decanted to remove sediments
    - Sediments in wine is not sufficient reason to send it back
Quick Pronunciation Guide

- **Cabernet Sauvignon** (cab er nay saw vee nyon)
- **Pinot Grigio** (pee noh Gree joe)
- **Pinot Noir** (pee noh nwahr)
- **Sommelier** (saw mul YAY)
- **Rose** (row SAY)
- **Chablis** (shah blee)
Appendix D

Trainer Script to appear on internet web page:

Hello, and welcome to the Ordering Wine Without Fear Workshop. My name is Dr. Anita Carter and I will be guiding you through the information and skills presented in this training course. Please turn to Page 1 of your packet now to learn more about my training background and myself. You have a couple of minutes to read over this information before we continue.

The intentions of this workshop are to expand your knowledge and skills in topics relating to ordering wine, such as the type of wine you should order with chicken or the appropriate process you should go through in ordering wine. More importantly, this workshop will provide you with a chance to learn specific skills for ordering wine in a refined setting.

The workshop is designed to help prepare you for a wide range of circumstances where you could be asked to order wine. You will also learn some valuable strategies for avoiding embarrassing situations or committing etiquette taboos.

The first lesson we will cover is the correct time for wine. Each type of wine brings out the flavor in food. However, how well a wine complements the food depends upon your knowledge of the right wine to choose.

Please turn to Page 2 of your packet.

There are primarily four wine categories: white, red, rose (or pink), and champagne.

White wines go best with light foods and appetizers, are usually served earlier in the evening, and are good when it is hot out. They are most often paired with white meat and fish. They are often served slightly chilled but not ice cold. White wines are usually made from white grapes.

Alternatively, red wines can be thought of as a deeper and heavier wine. It is most suited for heavier and richer foods, such as steak. While primarily fish should be paired with white wines, some strong fish can go well with a lighter red wine.

Please turn to Page 3 of your packet.

A rose is a pink wine. It is a good compromise between red and white wines. It is good when it is warm out, with brunch or lunch, with ham or light meats, or on special occasions like Valentine’s Day. Sweet wines are best with dessert.

Champagnes are great for celebration, and with spicy or Asian foods.

Next, we will turn to some specific wines that fall into the categories previously mentioned.
Please turn to Page 4 of your packet.

Some examples of white wines are Chardonnay, Sauvignon Blanc, Riesling, Pinot Grigio/Gris, and Soave.

Examples of red wines are Bordeaux, Cabernet Sauvignon, Chianti, Pinot Noir, Merlot, Beaujolais, Lamusco.

An example of a Rose (or Blush wine) is White Zinfandel.

Some champagnes are Korbel and Asti (which means sweet as opposed to Brut which is dry) like Asti Spumante.

Please turn to Page 5 of your packet.

The four major components of wine’s flavor are: alcohol, sweetness, acidity, and tannin. These correspond to the four taste senses of salty, bitter, sweet, and savory.

Tannic wines are those that leave your mouth feeling dry. It is a bitter taste that is found primarily in red wines. The range of tannin is from astringent to firm to soft. Tannic wines make sweet foods taste less sweet, tend to taste softer with fatty foods, are less bitter with salty foods, and tend to dry one’s mouth with spicy foods.

Sweetness in wines ranges from dry to off dry to sweet with Brut meaning dry. A sweet wine tastes less sweet with salty foods, makes salty foods taste better, and is good with sweet foods.

Acidity in wines rages from tart to crisp to soft. Unlike tannin, acidity makes you salivate and does not leave your mouth feeling so dry. It is usually found in white wines. It tastes less acidic with salty foods, less acidic with sweet foods, makes salty foods taste saltier, and is counterbalanced by fatty foods.

The alcoholic content of table wines (by law) is less than 14%. Most wines range from 11 to 14%.

Please turn to Page 6 of your packet.

Please review the table in your packet. This table provides a summary of how the different flavors/components of wine interact with foods.

For example, from the table you can see that Tannic wines taste less bitter with salty foods.

Please turn to Page 7 of your packet.
There are some points you should be aware of when you purchase wine in a restaurant versus in a store. A wine (e.g., Cakebread Chardonnay) that costs $37 in a liquor store will typically cost between $100 and $120 in a restaurant. So you should expect to pay between two to three times as much in the restaurant compared to store value.

Warning: You should stay away from ordering the "house" wine. Restaurants tend to mark up the price of house wines even more than other wines.

Do not be afraid to order the less expensive wines on the list. The less expensive wines are better and cheaper than ever before. Also, if you are ordering an entire bottle, then typically the bigger the bottle the better the value.

Next, we will go through the steps of properly ordering wine for the table.

Please turn to Page 8 of your packet.

You will usually be presented with a wine list upon sitting down to the table. The wines are listed by type and within type occasionally by price.

If you are not certain of what to order, don’t hesitate to ask the waiter/waitress for help. For example, if you like dry wines, ask the server to suggest a wine that fits with your taste.

Instead of mispronouncing the name of a wine, you can always refer to it by bin number or point to it on the menu.

Next, the server will present the bottle to you. At this point, you should inspect the label to ensure it is the wine you ordered.

The waiter/waitress will the present the cork for you to examine. A bad cork will either be dry and crumbly or wet and shiveled.

Please turn to Page 9 of your packet.

You will be poured a small amount of wine to examine for its clarity. You should swirl and then smell the wine, after which, you should taste it. If it is acceptable, a customary gesture is for you to give a nod of approval to the server. (If it is unacceptable, then you can send it back at this point).

Once you have finished this process, the waiter/waitress will pour wine for the rest of the table ending with you (as the person who ordered the wine).

There are certain restaurants where it is acceptable to bring you own wine. We will review some common practices for you to be aware of if this is the case.

Please turn to Page 10 of your packet.
First, you should always call ahead to the restaurant to check to make sure that they do allow people to bring their own wine bottles. Also, if they do allow you to bring your own wine, there is typically a corkage fee associated. You will want to find out how much this fee is so as not to be surprised.

Please turn to Page 11 of your packet.

If you order a bottle of wine for the table and you do not finish it, you should always ask your server if you can have the bottle corked to take with you. Some restaurants have policies in place allowing you to do so.

Once the bottle has been opened, a wine will usually keep for somewhere between one and three days. You can keep both red and white wines in the refrigerator, but you will need to remove the red wine approximately an hour before serving.

Please turn to Page 12 of your packet.

Because the waiter/waitress now serves both the food and the wine, you are expected to tip between fifteen and twenty percent of the entire bill.

Please turn to Page 13 of your packet.

Decanting is the process that removes sediments from wine.

You should not send a wine back if it has sediments. However, if your wine is red and over ten years old, you should not hesitate to ask your server to decant your wine.

Please turn to Page 14 of your packet.

The next part of this workshop gives you a brief guide on how to pronounce some of the more common wines. Please take a few moments to review these names and say them to yourself.

You have completed the Ordering Wine Without Fear Workshop, and an important next step is to think about using these workshop skills in a dining setting.

To review, you learned the following skills through the course of this workshop:

- Time for wine
- Flavors of wine
- Wine ordering ritual
- Corkage, tipping, and decanting

I want to thank you for your time today. Before leaving, you will be asked to fill out a number of questionnaires. Again, thank you for your time.
Appendix E

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This training course would be useful to an organization.
2. I feel personally threatened by this training course.
3. I would be motivated to attend this course.
4. This course has increased my comfort in interacting with people of another race.
5. I will use the behaviors learned in this training course in my interactions.
6. This training course should be mandatory for all employees in an organization.
7. This training course would improve the working environment in an organization.
8. This course has increased my comfort in interacting with people of another gender.
9. This training course has motivated me to interact with people who differ from me.
10. I feel that this training course was meant to sensitize White males.
11. This training course should be mandatory only for management in an organization.
12. I will use the knowledge that I learned from this training course in my interactions.
13. This training course has increased my awareness of diversity.
14. This course has increased my comfort in interacting with people of another lifestyle.
15. This training course focuses too much on helping minorities get ahead.
16. This training course would help create a competitive advantage in an organization by teaching the value of diversity.
17. I would be motivated to attend more courses dealing with these topics.
18. This training course would create too much of a 'politically correct' atmosphere in an organization.
19. This training course has changed my attitudes toward people who are different from me.
20. I feel that this course would create a backlash against diverse groups in an organization.
Appendix F

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The trainer of this course was qualified to give a course on this material.
2. The trainer for this course was credible.
3. The trainer was effective in delivering the material of this course.
4. The trainer’s experience was an appropriate match for the material of this course.
5. The trainer’s knowledge of this material was inadequate.
6. The trainer did not have a thorough understanding of the topics of this course.
7. The trainer was incompetent in delivering the material of this course.
8. The trainer was believable in delivering the material of this course.
9. The trainer for this course was likeable.
10. The trainer was preferable for the material of this course.
Appendix G

Part 1:

Directions: One of your tasks involves working with others who may be different from yourself. How do you feel about your ability to work with diverse others?

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

1. I feel confident in my ability to effectively perform a task with a group of diverse others.

2. I don’t feel that I am as capable of performing a task with a group of diverse others as other people.

3. On average, other people are probably much more capable of performing a task with a group of diverse others than I am.

4. I am not confident that I can effectively perform a task with a group of diverse others.

5. I doubt that my performance will be adequate on a task with a group of diverse others.

Part 2:

Directions: Please indicate the number that best reflects your view of diversity in the workplace for each of the following 20 items.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

1. I believe that diversity is fair.

2. Diversity is stressful for me.

3. I feel enthusiastic about diversity.

4. Diversity is expensive for organizations.

5. Diversity leads to harmony in organizations.

6. I feel frustrated with diversity.

7. I feel hopeful about diversity.

8. I believe that diversity is worthless.
9. I support diversity efforts in organizations.

10. I withdraw from organizational diversity efforts.

11. Diversity is rewarding for me.

12. I feel resentful about diversity.

13. Diversity is an asset for organizations.

14. Diversity leads me to make personal sacrifices.

15. I participate in organizational diversity efforts.

16. I resist organizational diversity efforts.

17. I believe that diversity is good.

18. Diversity is unprofitable for organizations.

19. Diversity is enriching for me.

20. I believe diversity is unjustified.
Appendix H

Directions: Please rate your level of agreement for the following statements. Please make sure to read each statement carefully in its entirety. **Respond to the statements based upon the knowledge you gained during training.**

Part 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When making an effective decision, you should consider the possible costs.

2. When talking about diversity, we are focusing only on topics that surround “protected” groups (race, gender, nationality, ethnicity, disabled, age).

3. A skill required in conflict resolution is the ability to determine each side’s perception of the conflict.

4. Listening includes listening for the main idea of what a person is saying.

5. We should restrain from giving our own view when responding to another’s point of view.

6. When making an effective decision, you should consider a criterion to be used.

7. Acknowledging another person’s point of view involves the following two skills: Listening and Observing.

8. Benefits of diversity in an organization include increased cohesion.

9. During a conflict, you should articulate one side of the argument.

10. You should communicate your understanding of another person’s feelings when responding.

11. One way to ensure against unfair treatment is to consider appropriate criteria, such as race, in your decision.

12. Benefits of diversity in an organization include increased competitiveness.

13. Diversity means “that person is different from me.”
14. To increase a group’s effectiveness, you should focus on the differences within the team.

15. One should use a conflict to result in new solutions.

16. Any type of discrimination is illegal.

17. Benefits of diversity in an organization include increased creativity.

18. One way to ensure against unfair treatment is to systematically evaluate people by taking into consideration if they are in a “protected” group.

19. Listening includes listening for values important to the other person.

20. In trying to resolve a conflict, you should reiterate what the other person is saying.

21. To use diversity as an advantage, you should recognize the similarities of the individuals within a group.

22. The best strategy for resolving a conflict is to combine the two sides’ viewpoints into a solution.

Part 2:

24. The element that should not be considered in making an effective decision is a(n):
   a. Alternative
   b. Evaluation
   c. Cost

25. During a conflict, one should always:
   a. Use the conflict to result in a combined solution of the two sides’ viewpoints
   b. View the conflict as an opportunity to isolate the caused of differences
   c. Articulate one side of an argument

26. Listening includes, listening for:
   a. The strength of his or her point of view
   b. The values important to him or her
   c. The fairness of his or her point of view

27. Benefits of diversity in an organization include increased:
   a. Cohesion
   b. Communication
   c. Competitiveness
28. Identifying a feeling involves:
   a. Listening to non-verbal cues
   b. Communicating your approval
   c. Watching for concealed expressions
Appendix I

NAME       Ken Anderson

ADDRESS    11 14TH St. NE
Washington DC  20002  

DATE OF BIRTH  6/30/75

EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>B.B.A.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYER</th>
<th>YEARS EMPLOYED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Graphics, Co.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branson Insurance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluate this applicant by indicating one of the alternatives for each question.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely not Uncertain Definitely

1. If you had to make a recommendation at this time, would you recommend hiring this person?

2. Would you recommend that the organization invite this person for the next round of interviews?

3. How well does this applicant’s knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA’s) fit the requirements of the position?

4. How well do you think this applicant’s education and experience fit the position?
5. Regardless of the applicant’s fit to the organization and job, how much do you think you would personally like to work with this applicant?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor fit</td>
<td>Moderate fit</td>
<td>Very good fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Apart from the applicant’s fit from the job, and given your overall impression, how good a fit do you think there is between the applicant and the organization?

7. Apart from the applicant’s fit to the job, to what degree do you think this applicant fits the current employees in this organization?
Appendix J

Team Evaluation Task

Background:

A project has come up at Braxton Smith & Co. that needs immediate attention. The project manager has to choose individuals to work on a team for this project. The team will consist of the 4 employees described below. These 4 employees have never worked together as a team on prior projects, resulting in a team with no set norms or standards. However, because of the urgency of the project, it is important that they work together well and quickly.

While all team members have an equal amount of information and knowledge about the project, the specific knowledge that each member has may not necessarily overlap with the other team members’ knowledge. In other words, an employee’s information may be unique or redundant with other team members’ information. Even though all the employees of this team have knowledge about this project, none of them have worked on it previously.

The project will require employees to meet on several occasions in person and will most likely require many meetings lasting for several hours. Consequently, the members of the team will be interacting with one another frequently for long periods of time.

To detail some the project duties, it will be necessary for the team to develop a budget for the project and a timeline for completion. In addition to working on the project, team members are expected to keep up with any other responsibilities that they may already have as part of their jobs. As a result, the project manager has left it up to the team to decide when to work on the project and has indicated that there will not be an assigned team leader for the project.

Instructions:

Below you will see 4 possible groupings for the project team. Your task will be 1) to review each team and 2) then to rate each team on how you think the team members will interact within their team.
Team A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Level within Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Member 1</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>Vice-President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member 2</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member 3</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member 4</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directions: For the following question, please indicate your perception of the composition of the above team.

The individuals in this team are:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Similar

Directions: For the following questions, please indicate your level agreement using the following scale.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree

1. Team members will experience conflict with one another.
2. Team members will disagree about how to complete the project duties.
3. Each member will feel included by the group during their interactions.
4. This team will work well together.
5. Each member of this team will have a real say in how the team carries out its work.
6. One or two members will tend to dominate the discussion.
7. If they were to participate in another team like this one, they would want it to include members who are very similar to the ones in this group.
8. This team will make highly effective decisions during their interactions.
9. Team members will share information about their work with other team members.
10. Team members will experience conflict with one another.
Appendix K

On the following pages are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully, and then write the number of the number on the scale that best reflects your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strongly</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_______ 1. Am easily disturbed.

_______ 2. Get upset easily.

_______ 3. Am the life of the party.

_______ 4. Get irritated easily.

_______ 5. Like order.

_______ 6. Often forget to put things back in their proper place.

_______ 7. Have a soft heart.

_______ 8. Am relaxed most of the time.

_______ 9. Spend time reflecting on things.

_______ 10. Take time out for others.

_______ 11. Change my mood a lot.

_______ 12. Pay attention to details.

_______ 13. Worry about things.

_______ 14. Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.

_______ 15. Am exacting in my work.

_______ 16. Insult people.

_______ 17. Don't like to draw attention to myself.
18. Make people feel at ease.
19. Am quick to understand things.
20. Get chores done right away.
21. Feel others' emotions.
22. Start conversations.
23. Seldom feel blue.
24. Follow a schedule.
25. Am full of ideas.
27. Leave my belongings around.
28. Am always prepared.
29. Use difficult words.
30. Talk to a lot of different people at parties.
31. Do not have a good imagination.
32. Have a rich vocabulary.
33. Don't mind being the center of attention.
34. Am not interested in abstract ideas.
35. Have a vivid imagination.
36. Have frequent mood swings.
37. Often feel blue.
38. Don't talk a lot.
39. Feel little concern for others.
40. Sympathize with others' feelings.
41. Am quiet around strangers.

42. Shirk my duties.

43. Get stressed out easily.

44. Have excellent ideas.

45. Have little to say.

46. Keep in the background.

47. Make a mess of things.

48. Am not really interested in others.

49. Feel comfortable around people.

50. Am not interested in other people's problems.