Can Diversity Training Improve Attitudes?

Franziska Ehrke,
Anne Berthold,
Melanie C. Steffens

Albrecht, Enders, Grund, Kaczmarek, Letsch, Müller,
Schult, Wicke

2013 • Tillburg
Diversity Training

“...is any discrete programme, or set of programmes which aims to influence participants to increase their positive – or decrease their negative – intergroup behaviours, such that less prejudice or discrimination is displayed towards others perceived as different in their group affiliation(s)“

(Pendry, Driscoll, & Field, 2007, p. 29)

- basically aims to reduce prejudice (Paluck, 2006)
- essential first step to implement diversity management (Cox & Blake, 1991)
Diversity Training Effectiveness

"If you ask what is the impact of diversity training today, you have to say 75 percent is junk and will have little impact or no impact or negative impact."

(Marc Bendick, Washington Post, 2008)
# Research-Practice Gap

**Lack of cooperation between researchers and practitioners**

## Research

- Inconsistent results *(Engberg, 2004; Hood, Muller, & Seitz, 2001)*

- Lack of research on diversity training effectiveness *(Paluck & Green, 2009)*

- No application of laboratory-confirmed effects ➔ no demonstration of external validity of social-psychological research

## Practice

- No or negative impact

- Lack of theory-oriented training designs *(Paluck, 2006)*

- Methodological shortcomings of evaluations in the real-world
  - Control groups, randomization…

---

**Introduction**
Intergroup Research

Social Identity Theory
(Tajfel & Turner, 1979)

Self-Categorization Theory
(Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987)

Perceived group diversity

- Superordinate-group diversity
  - Ingroup projection model (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999)
  - Perception of “Europeans” as being diverse reduced ingroup bias on the subgroup level (Waldzus et al., 2003, 2005)

- Outgroup diversity
  - Perceiving national outgroups (Morroccans, Chinese, & Arabs) as heterogeneous reduced prejudice as well as discriminative behavior towards its members (Brauer & Er-rafiy, 2011, see also Vanbeselaere, 1999)
Research Questions & Main Hypotheses

1. Can diversity training increase perceived diversity of superordinate groups?

2. Can diversity training improve intergroup attitudes?

3. Mediation via perceived superordinate group diversity?

![Diagram showing the relationship between diversity training, superordinate group diversity, and attitudes.]

- Diversity Intervention
- Superordinate Group Diversity
- Attitudes

The diagram indicates a positive relationship between diversity intervention and superordinate group diversity, and between superordinate group diversity and attitudes.
# Overview

## Experiment 1

**2-hour Diversity Intervention**

- covered as get-to-know-activities
- no focus on any intergroup context

- Superordinate group
  - students

- Attitudes
  - male vs. female students

## Experiment 2

**1-day Diversity Training**

- awareness of diversity training
- focus on gender

- Superordinate groups
  - adults, Germans

- Attitudes
  - gender: men vs. women
  - age: younger vs. older adults
  - sexual orientation: anti-gay attitudes
  - nationality: East vs. West Germans

---

# Introduction
Experiment 1: 2-hour Intervention

Diversity Intervention

“Get-to-Know-Bingo”

“Surprising Perspectives”
- introducing “stereotypes”
- transfer to social groups via discussion

“The Pot-Smoking Professor”
- group competition: finding alternative categorizations (Hall & Crisp, 2005)
- rapper, police officers ...

Control Intervention

“Pictionary”
- group competition: identifying terms
- rapper, police officer...
- introducing “stereotypes”

“Hypothesis Testing”
- Participants sitting in a circle
- 2 pens were given around
- Finding the rule, how to give the pens to the next person = train hypothesis testing

“I pack my bag with names”

Experiment 1 - Method
Participants, Procedure & Design

**Participants:**
- Freshmen students minoring in psychology
- 84% females
- Age: $M = 20, SD = 3$

**Pre-Measurement** ($N = 62$)

- **Welcoming Session**
  - **Experimental Group** ($n = 31$)
    - Diversity Intervention
  - **Control Group** ($n = 31$)
    - Control Intervention

**Post-Measurement** ($N = 62$)

- **Follow-Up-Measurement** after 1 mth ($n = 50$)
Dependent Variables

### 1. Perceived Diversity (Waldzus et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate group: students</td>
<td>α = 0.70 - 0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup: male/female students</td>
<td>α = 0.76 - 0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Students [male/female students] are very different with regard to their ways of thinking and living.”

### 2. Self-typicality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate group: students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate group: students</td>
<td>α = 0.83 - 0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

„Being a student [man/women] is an important part of my identity.“

### 4. Self-typicality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender ingroup: men/women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender ingroup: men/women</td>
<td>α = 0.78 - 0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Attitudes

#### a) Hostile Sexism towards Men & Women (Glick & Fiske, 1999, 1996)

α = 0.83 - 0.84

“Men act like babies when they are sick.”

#### b) Outgroup Feeling

α = 0.74 - 0.85

unpleasant – pleasent; negative – positive

---

**Experiment 1 - Method**

Paper-&-Pencil questionnaires
- 70 mm continuous scale
- disagree strongly (0) – agree strongly (70)
Results

**H1**

Students

- Perceived Diversity
  - Time 1: 43.65
  - Time 2: 44.39
- other Fs < 1.55

**H2b**

Attitudes

- OG-Feelings
  - Time 1: 51.92
  - Time 2: 53.39
- other Fs < 1

**group x time-interaction:**

- Perceived Diversity:
  $F(1, 60) = 3.87, p_{one-tailed} = .027, \eta^2_p = .06$
- OG-Feelings:
  $F(1, 60) = 9.98, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .14$
- other Fs < 1

no long-term effects after 1 month

Experiment 1 - Results
Results

indirect effect:
- $B = .38$, Boot SD = .04, 95%-CI [-.19;1.65] with 10,000-bootstraps

no mediation through OG-Diversity, $B = .08$, Boot SD = .31, 95%-CI [-.23;1.16]
Discussion

- Can diversity training increase perceived diversity of superordinate groups? (✓ students)
- Can diversity training improve intergroup attitudes? (✓ affective attitudes: spontaneous outgroup feelings)

- No mediation via increased perceived diversity
- No long-term effects
- No effect on hostile sexism

- Explanations?
  - only short intervention
  - blind to participation -> no clear learning message
  - relevant superordinate group?
- too blatant?
Experiment 2

- Real-world diversity training?
  - mediation?
  - long-term effects (2 weeks)?

- Ambivalent sexism (more subtle)

- Transfer effect?
  - other superordinate groups
  - other intergroup contexts

Experiment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-day Diversity Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>awareness of diversity training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Superordinate groups
  - adults, Germans

- Attitudes
  - gender: men vs. women
  - age: younger vs. older adults
  - sexual orientation: anti-gay attitudes
  - nationality: East vs. West Germans
Participants, Procedure & Design

**Participants:**
- 51 (under-) graduate students
- Age: $M = 23$, $SD = 3$
- 77% females
- 94% young adults
- 66% East German; 1 non-German
- 1 lesbian

**Time 1**
- **Online**
  - **Experimental Group**
    - Training Period ($n = 25$)
  - **Waiting Group**
    - Control Period ($n = 25$)

**Time 2**
- **Paper-&-Pencil**
  - **Experimental Group**
    - Follow-Up Period ($n = 25$)
  - **Waiting Group**
    - Training Period ($n = 16$)

**Time 3**
- **Online after 2 weeks**
  - **Experimental Group**
  - **Waiting Group**
    - Paper-&-Pencil
Participants, Procedure & Design

**Experimental Group**
- **Pre-Measurement**: online
  - **Training Period (n = 25)**
- **Post-Measurement**: Paper-&-Pencil

**Waiting Group**
- **Pre-Measurement**: online
  - **Training Period (n = 16)**
- **Post-Measurement**: Paper-&-Pencil

**Participants:**
- **51 (under-) graduate students**
- **Age**: $M = 23$, $SD = 3$
- **77% females**
- **94% young adults**
- **66% East German; 1 non-German**
- **1 lesbian**

**Experiment 2 - Method**
### Dependent Variables

#### Perceived Superordinate-group diversity (Waldzus et al., 2003)

| a) | Adults | *α* = .78 - .85 |
| b) | Germans | *α* = .84 - .86 |

#### Attitudes

| a) | Age: ingroup bias - younger vs. older adults |
| b) | Nationality: ingroup bias - East vs. West Germans |
| c) | Sexual orientation: anti-gay attitudes |
| d) | Gender: Ambivalent Sexism towards women & men |

#### 6 attributes (unfriendly, independent ...)

| ingroup | *α* = .60 - .76 |
| outgroup | *α* = .60 - .74 |

#### 6 attributes (considerate, selfish ...)

| ingroup | *α* = .80 - .86 |
| outgroup | *α* = .76 - .82 |

#### 6 Items

| 6 Items | *α* = .76 - .83 |

#### “In all domains of life, gay men and lesbians should gain the same rights heterosexuals possess.”

#### 20 Items

| 20 Items | *α* = .82 - .88 |

#### Hostile + benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1999, 1996)

### Self-categorization & Identification (only Time 1)

7-point Likert-scale

- *disagree strongly* (1) – *agree strongly* (7)
**Main Results**

**H1a**

**Adults**

- **short-term group × time-interaction:**
  \[ F(1, 48) = 8.69, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .15 \]

- **no long-term effect:**
  \[ F(1,24) < 1 \]

**H1b**

**Germans**

- **short-term group × time-interaction:**
  \[ F(1, 47) = 6.24, p = .02, \eta^2_p = .12 \]

- **long-term effect:**
  \[ F(1,24) = 4.66, p = .04, \eta^2_p = .16 \]
Main Results

H2

**Attitudes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Waiting Group</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 3</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

short-term group × time-interaction:

\[ F(1, 48) = 6.92, p = .01 , \eta_p^2 = .13 \]

long-term effect:

\[ F(1,24) = 8.49, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .26 \]
Main Results

H3

$\beta = .39, p < .01$

Training

Diversity Change “Adults”

$\beta = -.22, p = .12$

$\beta = -.34, p = .02$

Sexism Change

indirect effect:

- $B = -.15, \text{Boot } SD = .08, 95\%-\text{CI } [-.36;.03]$ with 10´000-bootstraps, $\kappa^2 = .13$

no mediation through Diversity Change „Germans“,

- $B = .01, \text{Boot } SD = .06, 95\%-\text{CI } [-.11;.15], \kappa^2 = .01$
## Summary

### 1. Increased perceived diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis (H)</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a) Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b) Germans</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Attitude improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis (H)</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2)</td>
<td>Ambivalent sexism</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a)</td>
<td>Age attitudes (young vs. old adults)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b)</td>
<td>Nationality attitudes (East vs. West Germans)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4c)</td>
<td>Anti-gay attitudes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Mediations via increased perceived diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis (H)</th>
<th>Mediation</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H3)</td>
<td>Training $\Rightarrow$ diversity change “adults“ $\Rightarrow$ sexism change</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training $\Rightarrow$ diversity change “Germans“ $\Rightarrow$ sexism change</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a)</td>
<td>Training $\Rightarrow$ diversity change “adults“ $\Rightarrow$ age bias change</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b)</td>
<td>Training $\Rightarrow$ diversity change “Germans“ $\Rightarrow$ nationality bias change</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Discussion

- Diversity training can improve attitudes
  - ... via increasing perceived diversity of superordinate groups (relevant SOG)

- Long-term effect -> single training vs. several short trainings over a longer period of time to increase effect stability

- Outlook:
  - Which intergroup contexts can benefit, which can´t?
  - Effective strategies for different people? -> Moderations
  - Activation of superordinate-group diversity -> threat (Steffens et al., 2013)
    - Intervention strategies to prevent threat during training for pars-pro-toto-groups?
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