University of Groningen

Being part of diversity

Jansen, Wiebren S.; Otten, Sabine; van der Zee, Karen I.

Published in:
Group Processes & Intergroup Relations

DOI:
[10.1177/1368430214566892](https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430214566892)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2015

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Jansen, W. S., Otten, S., & van der Zee, K. I. (2015). Being part of diversity: The effects of an all-inclusive multicultural diversity approach on majority members' perceived inclusion and support for organizational diversity efforts. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 18(6), 817-832.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430214566892>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Being part of diversity: The effects of an all-inclusive multicultural diversity approach on majority members' perceived inclusion and support for organizational diversity efforts

Group Processes & Intergroup Relations

2015, Vol. 18(6) 817–832

© The Author(s) 2015

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1368430214566892

gpir.sagepub.com

Wiebren S. Jansen,¹ Sabine Otten,¹ and Karen I. van der Zee²

Abstract

In two experiments we tested how explicitly including the cultural majority group in an organization's diversity approach (all-inclusive multiculturalism) affects the extent to which majority members feel included in the organization and support organizational diversity efforts. In Study 1 we focused on prospective employees. We found that an all-inclusive diversity approach, compared with the "standard" multicultural approach in which the majority group is not explicitly made part of organizational diversity, led to higher levels of anticipated inclusion for those with a high need to belong. In Study 2 we turned to sitting organizational members. Here, we again found that an all-inclusive multicultural approach increased perceptions of inclusion, but now the effect was present regardless of individual levels of need to belong. Perceived inclusion, in turn, was positively related to majority members' support for organizational diversity efforts. Together, these findings underline the effectiveness of an all-inclusive multicultural approach towards diversity.

Keywords

all-inclusive multiculturalism, diversity approaches, inclusion, multiculturalism

Paper received 27 March 2014; revised version accepted 5 December 2014.

Due to demographic changes in the European and U.S. workforce, Western organizations have become progressively culturally diverse (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). As cultural diversity can have a profound impact on employee well-being and organizational performance, successful diversity management is essential (Jackson & Joshi, 2011; van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). Indeed, many organizations recognize this challenge and attempt to actively manage diversity by

implementing diversity initiatives such as offering diversity awareness training programs, setting up

¹University of Groningen, The Netherlands

²VU University, The Netherlands

Corresponding author:

Wiebren S. Jansen, Department of Social Psychology,
University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712 TS
Groningen, The Netherlands.
Email: w.s.jansen@rug.nl

diversity task forces, and including diversity in organizational mission statements (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006).

Yet, while the effectiveness of diversity initiatives is largely dependent on the receptiveness of majority members, diversity efforts and communication often deal exclusively with minority groups (James, Brief, Dietz, & Cohen, 2001). That is, diversity initiatives are more often than not launched to solve problems that minorities are primarily faced with, such as workplace discrimination and underrepresentation of minorities in leadership positions. As an unintended consequence, this one-sided focus may lead majorities to perceive diversity to be “only for minorities”. Indeed, majority members were found to be less interested in working for organizations that indicate to value diversity (i.e., pursue a “multicultural” diversity approach; Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011), and have been shown to endorse diversity efforts consistently less than minorities (Wolsko, Park, & Judd, 2006).

In the present research we examine whether majority members’ perceived lack of inclusion and their resistance to organizational diversity efforts can be attenuated by explicitly including the majority group in the organization’s diversity approach (“all-inclusive multiculturalism”; first introduced by Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008). Diversity approaches reflect the organizations’ normative beliefs and expectations about the reason to diversify, the value of cultural diversity, and its connection to work processes (Stevens et al., 2008).¹ In our view, diversity approaches constitute contextual cues that employees use to evaluate their inclusionary status (cf. Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Dittmann, & Crosby, 2008). Formulating diversity approaches in a more inclusive manner, such that both majority and minority groups are considered part of organizational diversity, therefore has the potential to enhance majorities’ perceptions of inclusion. Inclusion, in this regard, refers to the extent to which an individual perceives to be an accepted organizational member that is allowed to be him- or herself within the organization (cf. Jansen,

Otten, van der Zee, & Jans, 2014). In addition, we expect that when majority members perceive to be more included, they will also be more supportive of organizational diversity efforts. We test these predictions in two experiments. First, we assess whether an all-inclusive diversity approach (compared with a “standard” multicultural approach) affects the extent to which *prospective* majority employees anticipate to be included in an organization. Second, we test how *sitting* organizational members belonging to the cultural majority group react to all-inclusive diversity approaches.

Diversity Approaches as Contextual Cues

In response to increasing levels of cultural diversity, many organizations have launched diversity initiatives. In fact, according to a survey of companies listed in the *Fortune 1000*, 95% of large U.S. organizations implemented some form of diversity management, with mentoring programs and diversity awareness trainings most frequently mentioned (Gresing-Pophal, 2002). As reflected in these examples, traditionally, the main goals of diversity management were to avoid discriminatory employment practices and to foster a work climate in which differences between employees are tolerated and accepted. More recently, many employers moved away from such a problem-focused approach and began to perceive diversity as a strategic resource that can be utilized to enhance organizational performance (Jackson & Joshi, 2011). The rationale behind such a multicultural approach is that people from different backgrounds possess different skills, perspectives, and social networks, which can be used for the benefit of the larger organization (Cox, 1991; Haslam, Eggers, & Reynolds, 2003; Stevens et al., 2008).²

Paradoxically, while a multicultural approach in principle should foster a work environment in which all employees feel included, multicultural activities are often met with resentment, skepticism, and resistance by nonminorities, who represent overlooked, yet critical stakeholders in

diversity issues (Brief et al., 2005; Stevens et al., 2008; Thomas & Plaut, 2008). Indeed, researchers have argued and demonstrated that managing diversity through a multicultural approach can generate significant backlash among majority members, as manifested in lower levels of organizational identification, reduced motivation, and increased discrimination of minorities (Linnehan & Konrad, 1999; Thomas & Plaut, 2008; Verkuyten, 2005).

Several explanations for majority members' negative attitudes towards a multicultural approach have been put forward in the literature. Among these are perceived losses in status and social dominance, in-group bias, and prejudice (e.g., James et al., 2001; Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, & Chow, 2009; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). While these are all important and plausible reasons, in the present research, we focus on an explanation that is often overlooked: majority members may perceive to be excluded by organizational policies and initiatives that emphasize the value of diversity (cf. Plaut et al., 2011).

To provide a fundamental understanding of why nonminorities may perceive to be excluded by a multicultural diversity approach, we build on previous research that suggests that people monitor their social environment for contextual cues that indicate the social fit or safety of their (social) identity (Leary & Baumeister, 2000; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). Social identity safety refers to the perception that one's social identity is not threatened in a particular group context (Markus & Steele, 2000). Contextual cues indicating the safety of a social identity can either be physical (e.g., observing that members of one's own group are present in the organization) or affective (e.g., noticing that one's group is valued by the organization). Research suggests that when a specific setting (e.g., an organization) is perceived to be socially safe, people display higher levels of trust and motivation, and also perform better (Adams, Garcia, Purdie-Vaughns, & Steele, 2006; G. L. Cohen, Steele, & Ross, 1999; Irving & Hudley, 2005).

While there is ample evidence that *minority* members use contextual cues, such as diversity approaches, to determine the safety of their

social identity within the organization (e.g., Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008), research on how susceptible *majority* members are to organizational diversity approaches is still more scarce (for exceptions, see Avery, 2003; Rau & Hyland, 2003). In the present study we attempt to extend this body of research by investigating how and why majority members react to (multicultural) organizational diversity approaches. Our premise is that majorities, just like minorities, may use organizational diversity approaches to assess whether their social identity is safe and thereby whether they are included. To the extent that an organization only stresses the contribution of minority groups in their diversity initiatives, a multicultural strategy is thus likely to result in lower levels of perceived inclusion among majority group members.

In response to the perceived exclusionary effect of multiculturalism, researchers have sought to develop more inclusive approaches, with perhaps the most prominent being the *all-inclusive multicultural* (AIM) approach (Stevens et al., 2008). The main premise of the AIM approach is that majority members' resistance to a multicultural approach is reduced when their cultural group is included in an organizational conception of diversity (e.g., in mission statements). Similar to the multicultural approach, the AIM approach acknowledges the importance of an individual's demographic group membership. Unlike the multicultural approach, the AIM approach explicitly emphasizes that this holds for members of all groups, including majority members.

In a series of studies, Plaut et al. (2011) tested the effectiveness of the AIM approach. In their first study, majority members (White Americans) appeared to be faster in an implicit association task at pairing multiculturalism with exclusion than with inclusion. In their second study, this association disappeared through a subtle framing of diversity efforts as targeted at all groups, including White Americans. This indicates that the AIM approach, at least at an implicit level, can attenuate the exclusionary effect of the "standard" multicultural approach. It also suggests, however, that majority members may benefit at a more

explicit level. That is, they may explicitly anticipate (if they are *prospective* employees) or perceive (if they are *sitting* organizational members) higher levels of inclusion when their cultural group is mentioned in the organization's diversity approach. Hence, our first hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 1: Explicitly including the cultural majority group in an organization's diversity approach will increase the extent to which majority members anticipate/perceive to be included in the organization.

While it is assumed that all people monitor their social context to assess the safety of their social identities, research suggests that some people may be especially attentive to contextual cues. Specifically, people who have a high need to belong (i.e., a strong desire to be included into groups; Baumeister & Leary, 1995) have been found to be particularly sensitive to cues pertaining to their inclusionary status (Pickett, Gardner, & Knowles, 2004). In line with these findings, other research revealed that prospective majority employees high in need to belong (NTB) were less attracted to an organization espousing a multicultural approach than those low in NTB (Plaut et al., 2011, Study 5). Following from this, we expect that majority members high in NTB may benefit most from an AIM approach towards diversity. This leads us to our second hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: The effect of explicitly including the cultural majority group in an organization's diversity approach on majority members' anticipated/perceived inclusion is moderated by an individual's NTB, such that the effect is stronger for those high in NTB than for those low in NTB.

The Present Research

We test the previous hypotheses in two studies. In Study 1 we focus on *prospective* organizational members, as previous research suggests that organizational diversity approaches may be used

by potential employees to get an initial impression of how they would fit in (Rau & Hyland, 2003). In Study 2, using a similar paradigm, we test these hypotheses for *sitting* organizational members. This second study not only allows us to explore whether the pattern of results of Study 1 are similar for a different group of majority members, but also permits us to test whether an all-inclusive diversity approach may in fact enhance majority members' support for organizational diversity efforts.

Study 1

Method

Participants and procedure. All 153 participants of Study 1 were visitors to a job fair in the Netherlands. Thirty-nine participants were left out because they indicated that they themselves ($n = 8$) or at least one of their parents ($n = 31$) was born in a country other than the Netherlands.³ The mean age of the remaining 114 participants was 38.06 years ($SD = 12.14$ years; range 18–70 years), of which roughly half (56%) were female. Fifty-six percent had at least a college education. The respondents were asked to participate in a study in which they would evaluate a trifold brochure of the management consulting firm “CCG Consultancy”. As an incentive to participate, each participant had the chance to win a coffee machine. After providing informed consent, the participants were instructed to study the brochure of CCG Consultancy. They were unaware that this was a fictitious organization. The brochure contained the experimental manipulation, consisting of two conditions to which participants were randomly assigned: multiculturalism ($n = 60$) versus all-inclusive multiculturalism ($n = 54$). After participants indicated they had studied the brochure in detail, they completed a brief paper-and-pencil questionnaire concerning their impression of the company and were subsequently debriefed.

Stimulus materials. A trifold brochure was used to introduce the fictitious management consulting firm “CCG Consultancy.” The bulk of the

brochure outlined the company in detail: the services, expertise, portfolio, and possible career opportunities. These sections remained constant across both conditions. The section containing the experimental manipulation was labeled “Our HR vision”. It consisted of a quote from the HR director describing the company’s diversity approach and was largely similar to the manipulation used by Plaut et al. (2011).⁴ Participants in the *multicultural condition* read the following:

Many companies miss the point when thinking about putting together the best team of people. At CCG we know that diversity, for example in cultural background, is very important. Therefore, we are very happy to have employees with a Moroccan, Turkish, or Antillean background. It is exactly this diversity that strengthens our organization.

Participants in the *all-inclusive multicultural condition* read the following:

Many companies miss the point when thinking about putting together the best team of people. At CCG we know that diversity, for example in cultural background, is very important. Therefore, we are very happy to have employees with a Moroccan, Turkish, or Antillean background. But, of course, we also value our Dutch employees. It is exactly this diversity that strengthens our organization.

In addition to these text-based cues, we included two pictures of employees in each brochure to further strengthen our manipulation. In both conditions, one picture depicted a female cultural minority employee. In fact, the same picture was used in both conditions. In the MC condition, this was complemented with a picture of a male minority employee. In contrast, in the AIM condition, the second picture depicted a male majority employee. In a previously conducted pilot study ($n = 73$) we established that the people displayed were equally attractive and could be correctly identified as belonging to either the cultural majority or one of the cultural minority groups.

Measures. As mentioned before, after reading the brochure, participants completed a brief questionnaire. They responded to the questions in the order as listed below.

Manipulation check. At the beginning of the questionnaire we stressed that the quality of the present research was only warranted if participants had read the brochure with sufficient attention. For each section, we subsequently asked them to recall what was written in the brochure. As a check of our manipulation, participants were asked to list the cultural groups mentioned in the section “Our HR vision”.

Inclusion. We adapted three items from the Perceived Group Inclusion Scale (Jansen et al., 2014) to assess the extent to which participants anticipated to be included within the organization. An example item is: “Imagine you work at CCG. How likely is it that you would fit in?” ($\alpha = .79$). Answer categories ranged from 1 (*very unlikely*) to 6 (*very likely*), $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.88$.

Need to belong. NTB was measured with seven items of the original 10-item scale of Leary, Kelly, Cottrell, and Schreindorfer (2013). An example item is: “I have a strong need to belong” ($\alpha = .67$). Respondents indicated the degree to which they agreed with each statement on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*), $M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.46$.

Control variables. To ensure that possible differences in anticipated inclusion between our conditions could be solely ascribed to our manipulation, we measured several potential confounding variables. First, we asked respondents to what extent they were attracted to the consultancy sector in the first place: “Regardless of your impression of CCG, to what extent would you like to work in the consultancy sector?” Respondents answered on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*absolutely not*) to 5 (*very much*), $M = 3.32$, $SD = 0.94$. In addition, we included the conventional control variables age, gender, and level of education. Level of education was measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1

(*elementary school*) to 5 (*university degree*), $M = 4.08$, $SD = 1.08$. Finally, we asked respondents to rate the attractiveness of the design of the brochure on a 10-point scale, $M = 6.47$, $SD = 1.43$.

Results

Manipulation check. To test the success of our manipulation, we coded whether participants listed the Dutch as being one of the cultural groups that were mentioned in the HR vision. In line with what we expected, in the multicultural condition only five participants (8%) listed that the Dutch were mentioned in the HR vision, whereas in the AIM condition 45 participants (83%) indicated the Dutch were mentioned. Because we did not want to undermine the random assignment to conditions, we decided to include the data of these participants in our analyses.⁵

Preliminary analyses. We first performed a number of preliminary analyses (chi-squares and *t*-tests) to check whether our conditions were equivalent in terms of the control variables listed before. We found that all of the control variables were equally distributed across our conditions, with the exception of the extent to which respondents were attracted to the consultancy sector in the first place. Particularly, people in the multicultural condition indicated to be more attracted to work in consultancy ($M_{MC} = 3.49$; $SD = 0.88$) than those in the all-inclusive multicultural condition ($M_{AIM} = 3.13$; $SD = 0.97$), $t(111) = 2.08$, $p = .04$). Hence, we will control for this in the main analysis.⁶

Main analysis. A regression analysis was conducted to examine whether diversity approaches and an individual's NTB influence the extent to which people anticipate to be included in an organization (see Table 1). Dummy codes were used for the diversity approach condition (0 = multiculturalism, 1 = all-inclusive multiculturalism). The NTB scores were standardized, and the interaction term was construed based on these standardized scores (e.g., J. Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). In addition, we standardized the control

variable "consultancy preference." Results indicated there was no significant main effect of diversity approach condition, $M_{MC} = 4.57$; $M_{AIM} = 4.63$; $b = 0.18$, $t(109) = 1.11$, $p = .27$, or of NTB, $b = -0.09$, $t(109) = -0.72$, $p = 0.47$, on anticipated inclusion. Yet, in line with our second hypothesis, there was a significant effect of the interaction between diversity approach condition and NTB on anticipated inclusion, $b = 0.37$, $t(109) = 2.19$, $p = .03$.

An inspection of the simple slopes (see Figure 1) revealed that participants high in NTB expected to be more included in the organization when the Dutch group was explicitly mentioned (all-inclusive multiculturalism) than when it was not (multiculturalism), $b = 0.53$, $t(109) = 2.38$, $p = .02$. For those low in NTB, there was no difference in anticipated inclusion between the two conditions, $b = -0.18$, $t(109) = -0.79$, $p = .43$.⁷

Conclusions and Discussion

Results from Study 1 revealed no main effect of our diversity approach manipulation on the extent to which majority members anticipated to be included in the organization. Although this is different from what we initially expected (Hypothesis 1), this finding seems consistent with previous research on organizational attractiveness among prospective majority employees. In particular, Avery (2003) found that the display of racial diversity in recruitment advertisements did not affect the extent to which majority members were attracted to the organization. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, however, we did find an effect for majority members with a high NTB. For these people, the explicit inclusion of their cultural group in organizational diversity appeared to be especially important.

A possible explanation for why we did not find a main effect of our manipulation is that our respondents were *prospective* employees rather than *sitting* organizational members. One could argue that people who are not yet part of an organization may be less attuned to cues sent out by an organization than those who are already part of the organization. For prospective

Table 1. Regression of anticipated inclusion on diversity approach condition and NTB.

Step	Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>SE (B)</i>	ΔR^2	R^2
Step 1				.07**	.07
Step 2	Consultancy preference	0.25**	0.09		
	Diversity approach (MC = 0, AIM = 1)	0.18 <i>ns</i>	0.17	.02 <i>ns</i>	.09
	NTB	0.11 <i>ns</i>	0.09		
Step 3				.04*	.13
	Consultancy preference	0.24**	0.09		
	Diversity approach (MC = 0, AIM = 1)	0.18 <i>ns</i>	0.16		
	NTB	−0.09 <i>ns</i>	0.12		
	Diversity Approach x NTB	0.37*	0.17		

Note. Total $F(4, 105)$ for Step 3 = 3.87**, adjusted $R^2 = .10$.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Figure 1. Anticipated inclusion as a function of diversity approach condition and NTB (adjusted means are displayed).

employees, diversity messages communicate the degree to which one will be included in a future scenario. The hypothetical nature of this information may explain why an all-inclusive diversity approach only affected those who were especially attentive to inclusionary signals (i.e., have a high NTB). For sitting organizational members, however, diversity messages are likely to have a much more direct impact on their perceived position within the organization (cf. Vos, Jansen, Otten, Podsiadlowski, & van der Zee, under review). As

a result, for these majority members, the AIM approach may be more effective. Thus, we performed a second study in which we explored whether for sitting organizational members the AIM approach has positive consequences regardless of individual levels of NTB.

Study 2

In addition to focusing on *sitting* organizational members rather than *prospective* employees, Study

2 elaborated on Study 1 by considering inclusion not only as a dependent variable, but also by exploring whether inclusion, in turn, predicts the extent to which majority members support organizational diversity efforts. Previous research suggests that when majority members perceive to be more included in their company's conception of diversity (as is the central goal of the AIM approach), they also tend to endorse organizational diversity efforts more (Plaut et al., 2011, Study 4). Besides Hypotheses 1 and 2, we therefore tested two additional hypotheses in Study 2:

Hypothesis 3: The extent to which majority members perceive to be included is positively related to their support for organizational diversity efforts.

Hypothesis 4: Perceived inclusion mediates the link between an organization's diversity approach and majority members' support for organizational diversity efforts.

Method

Participants and procedure. The participants of Study 2 were asked to take part in a study in which they would evaluate the internationalization vision of their university. All 142 participants were students of the University of Groningen and were recruited in a university cafeteria. Forty-three participants were left out because they indicated that they themselves ($n = 35$) or at least one of their parents ($n = 8$) was born in a country other than the Netherlands. The mean age of the remaining 99 respondents was 21.39 years ($SD = 2.32$ years; range 16–28 years), and exactly two thirds of these participants ($n = 66$) were female. The vast majority of students were enrolled at the Faculty of Arts ($n = 76$) or Law ($n = 20$). Students enrolled in the second year of their study ($n = 27$) were in the majority, followed by first-year students ($n = 22$), and third-year students ($n = 17$). The remaining participants ($n = 33$) were enrolled at the university for four years or longer. Similar to Study 1, each participant was given the chance to win a coffee machine

as an incentive to participate. After providing informed consent, the participants were instructed to study a brochure with the internationalization vision of the university. The brochure contained the experimental manipulation, consisting of two conditions to which participants were randomly assigned: multiculturalism ($n = 42$) and all-inclusive multiculturalism ($n = 57$). After participants indicated they had studied the brochure in detail, they completed a brief paper-and-pencil questionnaire concerning their impression of the internationalization vision and were subsequently debriefed.

Stimulus materials. Similar to Study 1, we constructed (two versions of) a brochure that conveyed the diversity/internationalization approach of the University of Groningen. The design was in accordance with the official house style of the university and the content was inspired by the actual internationalization brochure. The brochure was divided into two parts: "Facts" and "Future". The "Facts" part listed a few key internationalization figures. In the multicultural condition, only the number of international students was mentioned, whereas in the all-inclusive multicultural condition, both the number of international *and* the number of Dutch students were listed. Specifically, the numbers presented in a bulleted list were:

1,100 visiting students; 2,974 of 27,345 are international students [AIM condition: 24,371 Dutch and 2,974 international students]; 800 of 1,500 are international PhD candidates [AIM condition: 700 Dutch and 800 international PhD candidates]; 18.2% of the academic staff is international; 115 nationalities currently study or work at the University; 93 English-taught Master's degree programmes; 20 English-taught Bachelor's degree programmes; 8 Erasmus Mundus programmes.

In the "Future" section, the university's diversity approach was presented. Similar to in our first study, participants in the *multicultural condition* read the following:

The university realizes that diversity, for example in the cultural background of staff and students, is very important. In fact, the presence of international students has helped us to be what we are today: a leading university. We are therefore particularly happy with our international students. It is exactly this diversity that strengthens our organization.

Participants in the *all-inclusive multicultural* condition read the following:

The university realizes that diversity, for example in the cultural background of staff and students, is very important. In fact, the combined presence of Dutch and international students has helped us to be what we are today: a leading university. We are therefore particularly happy with both our Dutch and international students. It is exactly this diversity that strengthens our organization.

Again, we supplemented these text-based cues with a visual manipulation. That is, in each brochure, we included two pictures of students. In the multicultural condition, both pictures depicted an international student. In the all-inclusive multicultural condition, one picture depicted an international student while the other depicted a native Dutch student. Similar to Study 1, we previously conducted a pilot study ($n = 57$) to match the pictures on attractiveness, and to ensure that the students displayed could be correctly identified as being either Dutch or non-Dutch. Again, we used a picture of one male and one female student in each brochure to further safeguard the comparability of the pictures across our conditions. Finally, the last section of the brochure mentioned the concrete internationalization plans of the university. In both versions of the brochure it stated that the university strived to increase the number of international students to 5,000 by the year 2015.

Measures. As mentioned before, after reading the brochure, participants completed a brief questionnaire. They responded to the questions in the order as listed next.

Manipulation check. Similar to Study 1, we emphasized in the beginning of the questionnaire that it was very important that participants had read the brochure carefully. We subsequently asked them a number of questions about the brochure, including our manipulation check: "Which group(s) of students was/were mentioned in the internationalization brochure?" Participants could choose between three answers: (a) international students, (b) Dutch students, and (c) both international and Dutch students.

Inclusion. We adapted six items from the Perceived Group Inclusion Scale (Jansen et al., 2014) to assess the extent to which participants perceived to be included by the internationalization vision. An example item is: "With this vision the university signals that I belong" ($\alpha = .87$). Answer categories ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*), $M = 4.42$, $SD = 0.66$.

Need to belong. NTB was measured with six items of the original 10-item scale of Leary et al. (2013). An example item is: "I have a strong need to belong" ($\alpha = .71$). Answer categories ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*), $M = 3.31$, $SD = 0.60$.

Diversity support. The extent to which participants supported the university's internationalization plans (to increase the number of international students to 5,000 by the year 2015), was measured with three items, including: "I support these internationalization plans" ($\alpha = .65$). Participants responded on a 6-point Likert-type scale, with answer categories ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*), $M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.76$.

Control variables. Similar to Study 1, we included a number of control variables to ensure that possible differences in perceived inclusion and support for diversity could be solely ascribed to our manipulation. First, we asked respondents to estimate the percentage of international students enrolled in their degree course, $M = 15.60\%$, $SD = 19.12\%$. Second, we asked them whether they had ever been abroad for an extended period

of time (six months or longer). A minority of participants ($n = 19$) confirmed this. Third, we asked students to indicate on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*not likely at all*) to 5 (*very likely*) how likely it was that they would someday work abroad, $M = 3.19$, $SD = 0.99$. Fourth, we measured the conventional control variables age and gender. Finally, we asked respondents to rate the attractiveness of the design of the brochure on a 10-point scale, $M = 7.24$, $SD = 1.07$.

Results

Manipulation check. To test the success of our manipulation, we coded whether participants correctly indicated whether the Dutch students were mentioned in the internationalization brochure. In the MC condition, 36 participants (86%) correctly indicated that only international students were mentioned. In the AIM condition, 56 (98%) participants correctly completed the manipulation check, indicating that both the Dutch and the international students were mentioned. Consistent with Study 1, we chose to include the data of the seven participants who failed the manipulation check in our analyses, as we did not want to undermine the random assignment to conditions.

Preliminary analyses. Similar to Study 1, we first performed several preliminary analyses (chi-squares and t -tests) to check whether our conditions were equivalent in terms of the control variables listed before. These analyses revealed that none of the control variables differed across our conditions. We therefore decided not to include these variables in our main analysis.⁸

Main analysis. We tested all of our hypotheses using the PROCESS macro of Hayes (2013). This included using a bootstrapping procedure to test the significance of the indirect effect of diversity approach condition on diversity support through inclusion. Table 2 shows the results. Confirming Hypothesis 1, there was a main effect of our diversity approach manipulation on perceived inclusion. That is, participants in the AIM condition reported significantly higher levels of perceived inclusion, $M_{AIM} = 4.58$, than those in the

MC condition, $M_{MC} = 4.21$; $b = 0.37$, $t(95) = 2.86$, $p < .01$. There was no main effect of NTB on perceived inclusion, $b = -0.05$, $t(95) = -0.49$, $p = .62$. Also, the interaction term of the diversity approach manipulation and NTB did not reach significance, $b = -0.08$, $t(95) = -0.38$, $p = .71$. Hypothesis 2 could therefore not be confirmed. As displayed in the right pane of Table 2, and consistent with Hypothesis 3, perceived inclusion positively predicted majority members' support for diversity, $b = 0.33$, $t(96) = 2.80$, $p < .01$. Finally, supporting Hypothesis 4, the bootstrapping results indicated the presence of an indirect effect. That is, explicitly including the Dutch in the internationalization vision increased majority members' support for internationalization through higher levels of perceived inclusion, $q = 0.12$, 95% CI [0.02, 0.27].^{9,10}

Conclusions and Discussion

In line with Hypothesis 1, we found that explicitly including the majority group in an organization's diversity approach resulted in higher levels of perceived inclusion among sitting organizational members. In contrast to Study 1, the positive effect of an all-inclusive approach was now present irrespective of the level of NTB. This fits our reasoning that diversity messages are more powerful and immediate contextual cues for sitting organizational members than they are for prospective members. The beneficial effect of the AIM approach even appeared to be just as strong for people with a high NTB as for those with a low NTB. Consistent with Hypothesis 3, perceived inclusion was positively related to majority members' support for organizational diversity efforts. Finally, confirming Hypothesis 4, we found that explicitly including the majority group increased their support for internationalization through higher levels of perceived inclusion.

General Discussion

As a result of increasing levels of cultural diversity, contemporary organizations face an important challenge: How to become an organization in which employees from all cultural backgrounds

Table 2. Results of moderation and mediation analyses.

Predictor	DV: Inclusion				DV: Diversity support			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE (B)</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>B</i>	<i>SE (B)</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Constant	4.42	0.06	68.34**		2.73	0.52	5.26**	
Diversity approach (0 = MC, 1 = AIM)	0.37	0.13	2.86**		0.08	0.15	0.52 <i>ns</i>	
NTB	−0.05	0.11	−0.49 <i>ns</i>					
Diversity Approach x NTB	−0.08	0.22	−0.38 <i>ns</i>					
Inclusion					0.33	0.12	2.80**	
				.08				.09

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

feel included? To meet this challenge, many organizations have implemented a multicultural diversity approach in which the value of cultural diversity is emphasized. Yet, while in theory a multicultural approach should turn diversity into an organizational resource and thereby enhance organizational performance, multicultural activities are frequently met with resistance and skepticism by majority members (Brief et al., 2005). One plausible reason for why this may occur is that diversity initiatives are usually exclusively targeted at minorities. Yet, provided that majorities are crucial stakeholders in diversity initiatives, securing their support for diversity seems essential (James et al., 2001).

The present research aimed to further explore how majority support for diversity can be fostered. We posited that diversity approaches, such as multiculturalism, constitute powerful contextual cues that are used by employees to assess whether their social identity is considered to be valuable by the organization. Accordingly, to the extent that an organization only emphasizes the contribution of minority members in organizational diversity, majority members may perceive to be excluded by a multicultural approach to diversity, and, as a result, may resist organizational diversity efforts. In two studies we tested whether this perceived exclusionary effect can be attenuated by explicitly making majority members part of organizational diversity approaches (an all-inclusive multicultural approach towards diversity; Stevens et al., 2008).

In Study 1 we focused on *prospective* majority employees. Here, we found that explicitly acknowledging that the cultural majority is an

integral part of an organization's diversity approach led to higher levels of anticipated inclusion, but only for those with a high NTB. In Study 2 we turned to *sitting* organizational members belonging to the cultural majority. Here, we again found that an AIM approach increased perceptions of inclusion, but now the effect was present irrespective of the level of NTB. Perceptions of inclusion, in turn, predicted majority members' support for organizational diversity efforts. Together, these results confirm that AIM is an effective strategy to enhance majority members' perceptions of inclusion and thereby to foster majority support for organizational diversity efforts.

Implications and Directions for Future Research

The present research extends previous work in a number of ways and gives rise to several interesting questions for future research. In the first place, we assessed the merits of the AIM approach in a more explicit manner than has previously been done (cf. Plaut et al., 2011). Thereby, our studies offer additional support for the beneficial effects of the AIM approach. In this respect, our results are particularly compelling as we demonstrated that AIM affects the extent to which participants anticipated/perceived to be included in the organization *in general*, rather than how they *specifically* feel included in organizational diversity.

In addition, our research further qualifies the effectiveness of an all-inclusive approach towards

diversity. In particular, we found differential effects for prospective employees and sitting organizational members. Although we did not test this directly, our findings suggest that the AIM approach in specific, but also diversity approaches in general, may be more consequential for sitting organizational members than for prospective employees. Yet, even among prospective employees, we found that those high in NTB anticipated to be more included when their cultural group was explicitly mentioned. The AIM approach thereby addresses the needs of a potentially very important group of prospective employees. Precisely because they have a strong motivation to be part of a group, prospective employees with a high NTB may prove to be the most faithful organizational members and are most likely to remain committed to the organization for an extended period of time. Thus, ensuring that majority members are included in organizational diversity is not only important to address the needs of sitting organizational members, but also to enhance the organization's attractiveness for future employees.

Relatedly, our work may inform future research attempting to understand for which majority members the AIM approach is most effective. We conceptualized diversity approaches as contextual cues that indicate the safety of one's social identity. Accordingly, we proposed that the success of the AIM approach is dependent on the extent to which majority members are attuned to these cues. In the present research we focused on majority members' NTB as an indicator of this sensitivity. Yet, majority members' responsiveness to all-inclusive signals may also depend on the extent to which their cultural group membership is psychologically relevant to them. Corresponding with this notion, research conducted among cultural minority members indicates that diversity approaches have stronger effects on those who are highly identified with their cultural group (Gonzales & Cauce, 1995; Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Likewise, future research may test the idea that the explicit inclusion of the cultural majority group in an organization's diversity approach is especially important

for highly identified majority members. Such investigation is likely to further improve our understanding of the workings of the AIM approach.

Yet another contribution of the present work is that it provides support for the beneficial effects of the AIM approach in a different socio-cultural context than that of most previous work. In particular, most existing research on cultural diversity in general, and the AIM approach in specific, has focused narrowly on immigrant cultures, and in particular on the U.S. context (e.g., Jackson & Joshi, 2011; Plaut et al., 2011; Purdie-Vaughns & Dittmann, 2010; Stevens et al., 2008). Yet, different from the US, the cultural majority group within the Netherlands is not an immigrant group itself. Nevertheless, our findings suggest that AIM may also be a successful strategy when the majority group does not have an immigration background. We may even speculate that in this particular situation the AIM approach may be especially effective. Members of a majority group without an immigration background may have a less positive stance towards, or feel less included in, organizational diversity than majority members who do have an immigration background. In other words, explicitly including the majority group in organizational diversity may be especially important in contexts in which the majority group is not an immigrant group itself. While we did not directly investigate this in our studies, future research may elaborate on this notion by including the presence of an immigration history of the majority group as a factor in its (experimental) research design.

Importantly, although our results highlight the importance of how diversity approaches are communicated, we hold that an AIM approach towards diversity should not only be superficially manifested. Organizations should be careful not to induce the impression among majority members that the all-inclusive character of the organization's diversity approach is nothing more than window-dressing. Phrased differently: organizations should "put their money where their mouth is" and also implement structural changes to include majority members in organizational

diversity (Stevens et al., 2008). An example of such a structural all-inclusive intervention is ensuring that majority members are also part of diversity structures, such as diversity task forces. In this context, research conducted among minorities showed that a mismatch between an organization's diversity approach and the perceived representation of minorities within the organization led to higher levels of mistrust (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). An interesting question to address in future research is whether the effectiveness of an all-inclusive multicultural approach is contingent upon the extent to which majority members are in fact represented in diversity structures.

Potential Limitations

A possible methodological shortcoming of our studies might have been that we measured respondents' need to belong (in Study 1 and Study 2) and consultancy interest (in Study 1) after our experimental manipulation. Ideally, these measures would have been assessed before the manipulation. Yet, we felt that the setting of our two experiments (Study 1: job market; Study 2: university cafeteria) demanded that participants would be able to complete the experiment in one go, rather than having to complete a first questionnaire, subsequently study the brochure, and then complete a second questionnaire. Besides this practical reason, there is reason to believe that our manipulation did not affect responses to these measures. The NTB items do not measure the extent to which an individual desires to be part of a *specific* group (such as the fictitious consultancy firm we used in Study 1). Rather, they are intended to capture the degree to which people *in general* have the need to be included into groups (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Similarly, the item used to measure "consultancy interest" was deliberately phrased such that the individual's preference to work in consultancy independent of our manipulation was captured. Together, while we do not expect that our manipulation affected responses to the NTB items and the initial preference to work in consultancy, we

recommend that future studies, and especially lab studies, assess these measures before the manipulation.

In addition, one could argue that a possible limitation of the present research is our use of a student sample in Study 2. Yet, although student samples arguably have less external validity than employee samples, we think that using students as participants may in fact have resulted in a conservative test of our hypotheses. Universities are typically very large organizations. Hence, the way they approach diversity may be less consequential for students than organizational diversity approaches are for regular employees. Thus, the fact that even students were affected by our manipulation underlines the relevance of adopting an all-inclusive, rather than a "standard", multicultural approach towards diversity. Nonetheless, future research could validate the current findings by replicating our second study with an employee sample.

A potential second point of criticism regarding our second study may concern the nature of our manipulation. Although the explicit mentioning (or lack thereof) of the majority group in the diversity statement parallels Study 1, in Study 2 we extended this manipulation by listing either only the number of international students (MC condition) or both the number of international and Dutch students (AIM condition) in the brochure. In our view, both aspects signal to the majority group that they are considered to be a valuable part of the university's internationalization vision. Yet, one may also argue that displaying the number of Dutch students enrolled in the university may simply remind Dutch students of the fact they constitute the majority group, rather than that they necessarily perceive that the university attributes an important role to them in its internationalization vision. We therefore hold that future manipulations can be more precise by disentangling these two aspects.

Concluding Remarks

Altogether, the present research underlines the importance of an all-inclusive multicultural approach towards diversity. We argued and

demonstrated that making majority members explicitly part of organizational diversity enhances the extent to which they perceive to be socially included, and, as a result, increases their support for organizational diversity efforts. These findings are particularly important considering that majority members are key stakeholders whose support is essential for successful diversity management.

Funding

This research was financially supported by Instituut Gak.

Notes

1. Different terms have been used throughout the existing literature to describe the concept of diversity approaches. Examples include *diversity perspectives* (Ely & Thomas, 2001), *ideologies* (Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000), *models* (Plaut, 2002), and *paradigms* (Thomas & Ely, 1996). In order to avoid confusion, we opted to use a single term in this article. In line with Stevens et al. (2008), we favor the term *diversity approaches*.
2. What we and others have labeled a *multicultural* approach closely resembles the *integration and learning* perspective of Ely and Thomas (2001). Whereas multiculturalism is a more common term in the acculturation and intergroup literature, integration and learning is more widely used in the organizational psychology literature. Both refer to the belief that diversity is a valuable resource to improve organizational learning and innovation.
3. In accordance with both the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS, 2014) and with most other social-scientific research conducted in the Netherlands, we chose to operationalize an individual's ethnicity by considering his or her country of birth. People who were themselves and/or had at least one parent that was born outside of the Netherlands are typically considered to belong to an ethnic minority.
4. Among the largest ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands are people from Moroccan, Turkish, or Antillean descent. These groups are considered to be "non-Western" immigrant groups. They not only differ from "Western" immigrants in their country of heritage, but also typically have a lower socioeconomic status and report higher levels of unemployment. Because of this, diversity initiatives within Dutch organizations are often focused on these groups in particular. Accordingly, we decided to focus on these groups in our manipulation.
5. A plausible explanation for why the number of failures on the manipulation check in the AIM condition was relatively high might be that participants were Dutch themselves. Hence, the Dutch are probably more a "ground" from which they differentiate and specify other cultural groups. Yet, whether these participants did not read and process the information on the approach properly, or whether they simply forgot to list their own ethnic group, cannot be determined. The results of our analyses (see following) when we did exclude the 14 participants who failed the manipulation check were essentially the same.
6. The results of our main analysis (see following) were largely similar when we did include all control variables.
7. We also performed the analysis without the 14 people who failed the manipulation check. The results were largely similar. That is, there appeared to be no significant main effect of diversity ideology condition, $b = 0.20$, $t(95) = 1.05$, $p = .30$, or of NTB, $b = -0.08$, $t(95) = -0.59$, $p = .56$ on anticipated inclusion. In addition, the interaction effect between the diversity ideology condition and NTB on anticipated inclusion was (marginally) significant, $b = 0.35$, $t(95) = 1.91$, $p = .06$. Again, the simple slope analysis revealed that explicitly including the Dutch in the diversity ideology enhanced anticipated inclusion for people high in NTB, $b = 0.53$, $t(95) = 2.07$, $p = .04$ but not for people low in NTB, $b = -0.17$, $t(95) = -0.63$, $p = .53$.
8. The results of our main analysis (see following) did not substantially change when we did include the control variables.
9. Similar to as in Study 1, we also performed the analysis without the people who failed the manipulation check ($n = 7$). The results were essentially the same. That is, participants in the AIM condition reported significantly higher levels of perceived inclusion ($M_{\text{AIM}} = 4.59$) than those in the MC condition ($M_{\text{MC}} = 4.20$), $b = 0.40$, $t(88) = 2.86$, $p < .01$. Again, there was no main effect of NTB on perceived inclusion, $b = -0.06$, $t(88) = -0.54$, $p = .59$. Also similar, the interaction term of the diversity

approach manipulation and NTB did not reach significance, $b = -0.04$, $t(88) = -0.18$, $p = .85$. In addition, perceived inclusion again positively predicted majority members' support for diversity, $b = 0.31$, $t(89) = 2.58$, $p = .01$, and explicitly including the Dutch in the internationalization vision increased majority members' support for internationalization through higher levels of perceived inclusion, $\beta = 0.13$, 95% CI [0.03, 0.29].

10. We also estimated the reverse path. That is, we tested whether our diversity approach manipulation affected the extent to which majority members perceived to be included through their support for diversity efforts. The bootstrapping results indicate that this indirect effect was not significant, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI [-0.02, 0.15].

References

- Adams, G., Garcia, D. M., Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Steele, C. M. (2006). The detrimental effects of a suggestion of sexism in an instruction situation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42(5), 602–615. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2005.10.004
- Avery, D. R. (2003). Reactions to diversity in recruitment advertising—are differences black and white? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 672–679. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.672
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497–529. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497
- Brief, A. P., Umphress, E. E., Dietz, J., Burrows, J. W., Butz, R. M., & Scholten, L. (2005). Community matters: Realistic group conflict theory and the impact of diversity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 830–844. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2005.18803925
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2012). *Demographic characteristics of the labor force* (current population survey). Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsrace2012.pdf>
- CBS. (2014). *Definitions*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbs.nl/en-GB/menu/methoden/begrippen/default.htm?Languageswitch=on&ConceptID=37>
- Cohen, G. L., Steele, C. M., & Ross, L. D. (1999). The mentor's dilemma: Providing critical feedback across the racial divide. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(10), 1302–1318. doi:10.1177/0146167299258011
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cox, T. (1991). The multicultural organization. *Executive*, 5(2), 34–47. doi:10.5465/AME.1991.4274675
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229–273. doi:10.2307/2667087
- Gonzales, N. A., & Cauce, A. M. (1995). Ethnic identity and multicultural competence: Dilemmas and challenges for minority youth. In W. D. Hawley & A. W. Jackson (Eds.), *Toward a common destiny: Improving race and ethnic relations in America* (pp. 131–162). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Grensing-Pophal, L. (2002). Reaching for diversity. *HR Magazine*, 47(5), 53–56.
- Haslam, S. A., Eggers, R. A., & Reynolds, K. J. (2003). The ASPIRe model: Actualizing social and personal identity resources to enhance organizational outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76(1), 83–113. doi:10.1348/096317903321208907
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Irving, M. A., & Hudley, C. (2005). Cultural mistrust, academic outcome expectations, and outcome values among African American adolescent men. *Urban Education*, 40(5), 476–496. doi:10.1177/0042085905278019
- Jackson, S. E., & Joshi, A. (2011). Work team diversity. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (1st ed., pp. 651–686). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- James, E. H., Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., & Cohen, R. R. (2001). Prejudice matters: Understanding the reactions of Whites to affirmative action programs targeted to benefit Blacks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1120–1128. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1120
- Jansen, W. S., Otten, S., van der Zee, K. I., & Jans, L. (2014). Inclusion: Conceptualization and measurement. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(4), 370–385. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2011
- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, 71(4), 589–617. doi:10.1177/000312240607100404

- Knowles, E. D., Lowery, B. S., Hogan, C. M., & Chow, R. M. (2009). On the malleability of ideology: Motivated construals of color blindness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(4), 857–869. doi:10.1037/a0013595
- Leary, M. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 32, pp. 1–62). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Leary, M. R., Kelly, K. M., Cottrell, C. A., & Schreindorfer, L. S. (2013). Construct validity of the Need to Belong Scale: Mapping the nomological network. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95(6), 610–624. doi:10.1080/00223891.2013.819511
- Linnchan, F., & Konrad, A. M. (1999). Diluting diversity implications for intergroup inequality in organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 8(4), 399–414. doi:10.1177/105649269984009
- Markus, H. R., & Steele, C. M. (2000). Colorblindness as a barrier to inclusion: Assimilation and non-immigrant minorities. *Daedalus*, 129(4), 233–259.
- Pickett, C. L., Gardner, W. L., & Knowles, M. (2004). Getting a cue: The need to belong and enhanced sensitivity to social cues. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(9), 1095–1107. doi:10.1177/0146167203262085
- Plaut, V. C. (2002). Cultural models of diversity in America: The psychology of difference and inclusion. In R. A. Shweder, M. Minow, H. R. Markus, R. A. Shweder, M. Minow, & H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Engaging cultural differences: The multicultural challenge in liberal democracies* (pp. 365–395). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). “What about me?” Perceptions of exclusion and Whites’ reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 337–353. doi:10.1037/a0022832
- Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Dittmann, R. (2010). Reflection on diversity science in social psychology. *Psychological Inquiry*, 21(2), 153–159. doi:10.1080/1047840X.2010.486758
- Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Dittmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(4), 615–630. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.4.615
- Rau, B. L., & Hyland, M. M. (2003). Corporate teamwork and diversity statements in college recruitment brochures: Effects on attraction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(12), 2465–2492. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb02776.x
- Rosenthal, L., & Levy, S. R. (2010). The colorblind, multicultural, and polycultural ideological approaches to improving intergroup attitudes and relations. *Social Issues & Policy Review*, 4(1), 215–246. doi:10.1111/j.1751-2409.2010.01022.x
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the benefits of diversity: All-inclusive multiculturalism and positive organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(1), 116–133. doi:10.1177/0021886308314460
- Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(5), 79–90.
- Thomas, K. M., & Plaut, V. C. (2008). The many faces of diversity resistance in the workplace. In K. M. Thomas & K. M. Thomas (Eds.), *Diversity resistance in organizations*. (pp. 1–22). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group/Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. C. (2007). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 515–541. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085546
- Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(1), 121–138. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.121
- Vos, M. W., Jansen, W. S., Otten, S., Podsiadlowski, A., & van der Zee, K. I. *Colorblind or colorful? The relationship between diversity approaches on inclusion and work outcomes among majority and minority employees*. Manuscript under review.
- Wolsko, C., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2006). Considering the tower of Babel: Correlates of assimilation and multiculturalism among ethnic minority and majority groups in the United States. *Social Justice Research*, 19(3), 277–306. doi:10.1007/s11211-006-0014-8
- Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of multicultural and color-blind perspectives on judgments of groups and individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 635–654. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.635