"Getting There": Diversity Trainings as Tools for Change in a Post-Racial Era

Author: David A. Watsula

Persistent link: http://hdl.handle.net/2345/1986

This work is posted on eScholarship@BC,
Boston College University Libraries.

"Getting There":
Diversity Trainings as Tools for Change in a Post-Racial Era

David A. Watsula

A Senior Honors Thesis and Scholar of the College Project
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of a Bachelor
of Arts in Sociology with Honors in
The College of Arts and Sciences

Advisor: Deborah Piatelli, Ph.D.
Second Reader: Paul Gray, Ph.D.

Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
May 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project could not have been completed without the collective effort of a number of individuals. First and foremost, I must express my deepest gratitude for my advisor in the Sociology Department at Boston College, Deb Piatelli. Deb spent countless hours with me formulating a comprehensive study, developing themes and structure for the thesis, and providing moral support during the trials and tribulations of the research process. Deb's devotion to this project went far beyond what I expected from an advisor and for that I am incredibly grateful. I would also like to thank the Sociology Department for being supportive of this project and providing resources and guidance for myself and fellow students. Especially, I appreciate the assistance of Professor David Karp, who forced me to think about my thesis in Spring 2010, giving me time to develop and execute this study, and Professor Juliet Schor, who guided me through the preliminary stages of doing a thesis, providing logistical and intellectual support along the way. Additionally, thank you to Dean William Petri and all involved in the Scholar of the College program for providing the opportunity to take this thesis to the next level.

This section would be incomplete without showing appreciation for the women and men who agreed to participate in this study. You made this study a reality, when it looked like sampling was going to be a major issue. Your experiences and insights are essential to what is presented in the following pages. I can only hope that you gain some useful information from what I have put together, though it will never equal how valuable your words have been in providing me with knowledge about workplace diversity and diversity trainings.

Lastly, I must mention my family, roommates, and friends, who allowed me to bore them with thesis issues and complain about the bumps in the road. I know that you are happier to see this finished than anyone else. Thanks!

ABSTRACT

This study serves to contribute to the growing literature on the effectiveness of diversity trainings. Previous studies on diversity training have produced inconclusive results for diversity training goals, evaluation techniques, and success. These studies rely largely on quantitative methods and large data sets looking at representation, biases, and economics. This study examines the impact of diversity trainings from a different lens. Specifically, in a society that increasingly adheres to a post-racial ideology, diversity trainings can serve as a tool to deconstruct the basis for racial power and privilege and expose the persistence of racism in the workplace. This qualitative, inductive study allows diversity trainers and managers to discuss in-depth their views on diversity and diversity training.

Diversity trainers delineated five diversity training models, all of which discuss power and privilege in different ways or not at all. The presence and nature of this discussion becomes a product of a diversity trainer's personal beliefs and the culture of the organization where training will occur. Manager interviews showed that individual differences in racial awareness entering the training can mediate how managers respond and react to diversity training material. The combination of the training model, organizational culture, and individual racial awareness combine to determine whether or not individual and institutional change around racial power and privilege will occur. Overall, power and privilege is not a common feature of diversity trainings, however diversity training can be used to further this discussion and fight against racism. A model is proposed that presents a way for diversity trainers to combine diversity training models to promote organizational goals, as well as counter post-racial ideology to create critically inclusive and egalitarian workplaces. Moreover, suggestions are made for researchers to better evaluate diversity trainings in the future, so as to truly determine the extent to which diversity training can be used to further organizational goals.

INTRODUCTION

Diversity training has grown into a lucrative industry with U.S. employers spending billions of dollars annually to train their employees (Society for Human Resource Management 2010; Hansen 2003). Starting in the civil rights era with federal legislation, organizations began focusing on workplace diversity and training employees for a variety of reasons. Initially, diversity trainings focused on a *compliance-based diversity* approach, as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) created the legal requirements surrounding diversity (Kelly and Dobbin 1998). At the beginning, then, diversity was intimately tied to the law. Since the inception of diversity training in the 1960s, diversity training as evolved repeatedly. These transformations represent changing sociopolitical contexts over the last four or five decades, which dictate how diversity is conceptualized and what organizational initiatives exist for diversity in a given era. The historical approaches to diversity, which can be identified as *compliance-based diversity, managing diversity, celebrating diversity, valuing diversity,* and *critical diversity,* all influence how diversity is presented in contemporary diversity trainings, however a predominant discourse of post-racialism directs the majority of diversity trainings that currently take place in organizations (Bell 1992; Gallagher 2008; Wise 2009).

Recent data suggests that over two-thirds of corporations in the United States have some form of diversity training in place for employees (Society for Human Resource Management 2010). Current diversity trainings serve to remind employees of the value of a diverse environment, promote agency-specific diversity goals, and/or enhance the overall effectiveness of employee interaction (Comer and Soliman 1996; Lynch 1997; Gilbert et al 1999; Von Bergen et al 2002). Oftentimes, the diversity training is linked to increased productivity and marketability, as well as positive intergroup interactions (Thomas 1990; Kirby and Richard

2000; Thomas 2004; Childs 2005). Many trainings draw from multiple historical approaches to diversity to cover a wide range of topics, including legal requirements, stereotypes, biases, and interpersonal or intergroup communication tools (Paluck 2006). Despite the prevalence of diversity training in organizations, research on the effectiveness of diversity trainings is largely inconclusive. Some studies have shown that diversity training works to decrease biases and increase organizational productivity (Hanover and Cellar 1998; Agars and Kottke 2004; Thomas 2004). Other research has questioned the validity of such reports to claim that diversity trainings are ineffective because they produce unwanted backlash as opposed to decreasing bias, and by pointing out methodological flaws and quantitative discrepancies, such as a lack of representation for women and people of color in managerial positions (Lynch 1997; Von Bergen et al 2002; Wrench 2005; Kalev et al 2006; Paluck 2006; Paluck and Green 2009). Still other research suggests that there is no net outcome, positive or negative, for diversity training (Kochan et al 2003). Missing from this research on evaluation are the specific goals for diversity training. Diversity training is not a monolithic category. Trainers, organizations, and training participants all contribute to how diversity training is presented and received at an organization. This information is essential to understanding the impact that diversity trainings can have for individuals and organizations.

As mentioned, diversity trainings currently take place in a sociopolitical context that is increasingly post-racial. The United States is heralded for "transcending race" so that one's race no longer affects opportunities inside and outside the workplace (Bell 1992; Bonilla-Silva 2001; Gallagher 2008; Wise 2009). In a society that adheres to post-racial ideology, diversity can be conceptualized as something that everyone is a part of, so that dimensions of diversity such as race, class, gender, personality, and marital statues are all presented as equivalent when

contributing to workforce diversity (Thomas 1996; Lynch 1997; Hays-Thomas 2004). Though the equivalency argument is attractive for businesses looking to include all members into the diversity discussion and decrease the backlash that diversity initiatives can induce, conceptualizing diversity in this manner conceals an extremely significant point: racism is *not* over in contemporary U.S. society, even if post-racial ideology is pervasive.

In U.S. industry, nine out of ten executive-level managers are white, seven out of ten of these managers are male, and six out of ten are both white and male (EEOC 2010). Additionally, whites dominate in terms of income and overall wealth and organizations continue to place race and ethnicity at the top of their definition of workforce diversity (Wise 2009; Society for Human Resource Management 2010; U.S. Census Bureau 2011). Consequentially, whites continue to be advantaged economically, psychologically, and socially in contemporary society, something that the predominant mode of diversity training ignores (McIntosh 1988; Wellman 1993; Wise 2008). Examining white privilege promotes an understanding that racism is institutionalized, so that power and privilege based on race become systemic to a society and persist even if individual people of color have succeeded or if cross-racial interpersonal relations seem to be improving. Some diversity trainers are keenly aware of this perpetuation of racism, while others adhere to the post-racial ideology.

This study examines the existence and nature of the racial power and privilege discussion in contemporary diversity trainings that operate within an increasingly post-racial society. This discussion and the subsequent responses by individuals and organizations are mediated by a number of important factors. The historical approaches to diversity used in a diversity training dictate the way diversity is discussed. The way organizations view diversity affects the implementation of diversity programs and the effect diversity trainings can have at creating

organizational change. Moreover, individual participants have their own conceptualizations of diversity and race and racism, which guide how individuals react to diversity information. Because this study is examining power and privilege, the focus will be on white, male managers. These managers have important positions in their organizations, giving them concrete power to make decisions, as well as social power and privilege that comes from their racial and gender groups. Diversity trainings, based on the information they present, have the opportunity to deconstruct post-racial ideology. Discussing diversity with managers in a variety of different organizations, who have different personal beliefs about power and privilege and have had different information presented to them in diversity trainings on these two topics provides insight into what factors effect the individual and institutional changes that diversity trainings can produce, particularly around the issues of race and racism in contemporary society.

The following literature review functions to present the evolution of diversity trainings, the continuing significance of race in an increasingly post-racial society, and the purpose of diversity initiatives in organizations, focusing on diversity trainings. The literature provides the background for an analysis of interviews with diversity trainers and managers about their experiences with diversity training and the role that the trainings play in battling racial power and privilege and countering post-racial ideology in organizations and society at large. Diversity training can be used to generate institutional and individual change around race and racism if strategically implemented and delivered.

CHAPTER I: LITERATURE REVIEW

Evolution of Diversity Practices in Organizations

Diversity in organizations is an ever changing concept. Starting in the 1960s, diversity has been discussed in various ways, each marked by a predominant approach. Historically, five major approaches to diversity are identifiable in the literature: *compliance-based diversity, managing diversity, celebrating diversity, valuing diversity, and critical diversity.* These approaches to diversity arose out of the sociopolitical context in which they were used and dictate normal diversity practices in organizations. The five approaches to diversity represent an integration of a changing sociopolitical climate, indicated by a prevalent racial discourse, and diversity initiatives inside organizations.   Tracing the history of diversity practices in organizations provides the context for contemporary diversity trainings.

The 1960s and 1970s: Federal Law and *Compliance-Based Diversity*

Over the last fifty years, new governmental policies have transformed the demographics of the typical workplace in the United States. In 1961, President John F. Kennedy's Executive Order 10925 required federal contractors to make a concerted attempt to curtail employment discrimination.   Arising from social movements such as the civil rights and women's movements, this birth of "affirmative action" focused on the categories of race, sex, religion, and nationality (age and disability were later included), and was primarily concerned with increasing the representation of different groups in federal employment and in corporations that held federal contracts.   Three years later, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 expanded anti-discrimination legislature beyond federal employment to include all employers and created the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to give employees a legal outlet for

discrimination and to ensure employer compliance. Discrimination can include unequal treatment in the practices and policies involving hiring, recruitment, compensation, task allocation, benefits, etc; however, the specific criteria for an action to be labeled discriminatory, or for an employer to be fully compliant with the law, were left undefined and ambiguous (Kelly and Dobbin 1998).

In an attempt to evade the disadvantageous monetary and public relations repercussions of lawsuits with the EEOC, many companies implemented voluntary training procedures and hired diversity officials to oversee company actions and ensure compliance (Kelly and Dobbin 1998; Hays-Thomas 2004; Anand and Winters 2008). The justification for these new policies and positions rested on the necessity of full compliance with the EEOC. Hence, diversity become intimately tied to legal compliance. The common racial discourse of this time period can be considered a *compliance-based diversity* approach originating from the sociopolitical climate marked by civil rights activism and legislature and focusing on legality. In this perspective, power in organizations is conceptualized as resulting from historical access to the most lucrative levels of employment, something that equal opportunity laws can remedy.

Diversity in the 1960s and 1970s, then, applied to the groups covered under EEO law as being historically precluded from opportunity. In practice, diversity training at this time focused on legal compliance with the EEOC through the representation of previously excluded groups in the workplace. In these 'race-relations' and 'sensitivity trainings,' dominant groups, such as whites, males, and the able-bodied were not included when talking about diversity (Dobbin et al 2007). Instead the information presented was meant to make employees understand the law and what actions may lead to discrimination litigation. As a result, diversity trainings were often negatively perceived as a product of affirmative action, which gave some groups more

opportunity, while disadvantaging others (Ivancevich and Gilbert 2000). The negative perception of affirmative action can be linked to a misunderstanding of the purpose of such programs. Affirmative action is often conceptualized as giving advantages to underrepresented groups simply because of their group affiliation, so that unqualified workers enter the workplace, while competent members of dominant groups are excluded from opportunity. Rather than filling quotas, affirmative action is more commonly put into practice in recruitment and hiring policies to identify qualified members of underrepresented groups, who may not have had access to job opportunities in the past (Feagin and O'Brien 2003). The quota view of affirmative action was the norm in this time period, leading to negative views of diversity training. This was particularly true of white males who felt under attack as members of dominant groups in such diversity programs, where issues of racism or sexism were discussed, resulting in a white male backlash to diversity trainings and policies (Comer and Soliman 1996; Lynch 1997; Von Bergen et al 2002; Kalev et al 2006).

Compliance-based diversity confronted dominant groups in a way that concentrated on legality, while minimizing intergroup relations, creating organizations that viewed diversity as a necessity to avoid lawsuits or a poor public image, but nothing more. Racism was viewed as something of the past and laws could fix any remaining aspects of racism through representation. This legal view of diversity also maintained dominant workplace cultures by focusing on representation (or tokenism) and ignoring whether or not diverse employees were integrated into the organization. The *compliance-based diversity* approach, concentrating on legality and past discrimination, was tested by President Reagan, promoting a shift in racial discourse.

The Early 1980s: Reagan and the Reduction of *Compliance-Based Diversity*

In the 1980s and into the 1990s, diversity training undertook a dramatic shift. President Ronald Reagan considered the maintenance of anti-discrimination procedures to be the responsibility of the individual employer, not the federal government (Kelly and Dobbin 1998; Anand and Winters 2008). This represents Reagan's basic policies of deregulation, reducing government control in business and giving more power to corporations (Heydebrand 1990). Reagan's stance on affirmative action and the EEOC is indicative of this period of deregulation, which caused a decline in active measures to increase workforce diversity. The administration reduced staff and resources at the EEOC, limiting the effectiveness of previous affirmative action legislation (Leonard 1985; Burstein & Monaghan 1986). The diminished role of the EEOC to dictate discrimination policy at the employer level put hired compliance officials in difficult positions. Compliance officials needed to legitimize their positions in the organization to both remain employed and show the worth of federal action against discrimination (Kelly and Dobbin 1998). President Reagan's policies compelled compliance officials to redefine the nature of their jobs, which sparked a transformation in the affirmative action and EEOC compliance field and the *compliance-based diversity* approach.

If a lack of strong governmental support diminished the legal requirements attached to affirmative action and EEOC regulations, what incentive did employers have to continue to follow affirmative action or EEOC plans? This is the question that compliance officials faced in the years of Reagan deregulation. Their answer is instrumental in understanding the state of diversity work at this time. Instead of finding new jobs, compliance officials changed the justification for the jobs they already had. Creatively, compliance officials restructured the conversation to focus not on the legality of affirmative action and EEOC procedures, but on the

business advantages that a diverse workforce brings (Kelly and Dobbin 1998; Hays-Thomas 2004; Anand and Winters 2008). Diversity training became a tool for transforming employee attitudes to reduce biases that can inhibit effective work relationships that can negatively influence productivity, rather than a training to review laws and encourage compliance (Kochan et al 2003). This new conceptualization of the necessity of diversity initiatives turned compliance officials into the Diversity Directors, Directors of Multicultural Affairs, or other similar positions that permeate organizations across the United States. The early 1980s represents a shift in the racial discourse from *compliance-based diversity* to the *managing diversity approach*, focused on business.

In 1986, despite Reagan's reduction in the legal requirements of diversity initiatives, the Bureau of National Affairs found that 88% of Fortune 500 companies had no plan to change their affirmative action structure, while the remaining 12% were prepared to *expand* the plans already in place (Bureau of National Affairs, 1986, p.90 cited in Kelly and Dobbin 1998). Removing the *compliance-based diversity* justification for hired diversity officials put organizations in a position where diversity had to be conceptualized as something to strive for on its own. This conception coupled with an organizational ethos that expected an influx of new, heterogeneous employees worked to completely alter perspectives on diversity. The field of diversity management versus compliance was born.

The late 1980s and 1990s: *Managing Diversity* and the Business Case

In the late 1980s, the view of organizational demographic differences began to change. The publication the Hudson Institute's *Workforce 2000* (Johnston and Packer 1987) predicted a drastic increase of women and people of color entering the job market. Organizations foresaw

various ways that this influx of previously excluded workers would transform workplace culture (Hays-Thomas 2004). Hired diversity officials, with a redefined purpose for their job duties, capitalized on this opportunity to advocate for diversity on new grounds. R. Roosevelt Thomas (1990), one of the first professionals to make a large claim about the changing nature of the workforce, championed the need to move past affirmative action and discussion on racism, sexism, and compliance to managing the diverse workforce in order to procure organizational benefits (Thomas 1990). When the focus is on a *managing diversity* approach, workforce diversity is presented as a business strategy. The notion is that equal opportunity law has "undone" past discrimination, but diversity is still important in organizations because it can be capitalized on for profit. If properly attended to, proponents of diversity management foresee a correlation between workforce diversity and economic competitiveness (Kochan et al 2003). As a result, diversity supporters have proposed a number of competitive advantages to a diverse organization.

Inside the workplace, diversity is expected to increase creativity and productivity, reduce employee turnover and absenteeism, and allow the organization to respond positively to an assortment of problems from a number of different perspectives. Diversity, then, is a market strategy leading to increased productivity. On an interpersonal level, proponents view *managing diversity* as a tool to reduce prejudice and increase commitment. Outside the specific day-to-day operations of the organization, diversity opens doors to new customers and suppliers. In aggregate, diversity should benefit an organization economically, as the advantages cut costs, increase marketability and public image, and create a better work environment (Thomas 1990; Comer and Soliman 1996; Gilbert et al 1999; Kirby and Richard 2000; Lorbiecki and Jack 2000). These economic advantages, however, are only gleaned when diversity is managed effectively.

For example, IBM a model for the potential advantages of organizational diversity, created a plan to manage diversity, including eight task forces concentrated on elements of diversity, such as race, gender, disability, ethnicity and sexual orientation. Each task force is responsible for examining the specific needs of different identity groups and capitalizing on the innovative ideas for marketing, recruitment, and product development that these groups can bring to the company. After the implementation of this program, IBM saw increases in revenue, supplier bases, and representation of different groups at all levels of the company. These results, for IBM, represent an effective diversity management plan. IBM has seen such great success because of the genuine commitment to managing and benefitting from a diverse environment (Thomas 2004; Childs 2005).

Without proper monitoring, however, a diverse workforce can face many challenges. Diversity can be seen as a hindrance to organizational goals. Simply increasing the representation of different groups will not result in the advantages that companies like IBM celebrate. This is a problem of *compliance-based diversity* that a *managing diversity* approach attempts to curtail. Employees need to be developed, so they will not only reach their potential, but also feel comfortable expressing the creativity that different life experiences bring. Additionally, employees enter the workplace with their own biases and stereotypes that are not easily changed or reduced. Extensive work and support is necessary to prevent intergroup conflict (Comer and Soliman 1996; Wrench 2005). Clearly, a workplace sated with conflicts between different groups will fail to experience the productivity and commitment that well-managed organizations show. Diversity has also been challenged as hurting customer relations, as long-time clients may become uncomfortable dealing with new people. Here, the prejudices of the customers may be triggered by increasing diversity. Moreover, some argue that new,

diverse employees simply may not be quality workers or may fail to produce outcomes comparable to previous workers in a homogeneous workplace (Hacker 1992; Thomas et al 2004). Thus, the direct effects of a diverse workforce are debated with some studies suggesting that diversity may have no net impact at all, positive or negative, on the organization (Kochan et al 2003). Despite these mixed results, *managing diversity* became the norm in the U.S. workplace throughout the mid-1990s (Thomas 1991; Cox 1993; Agars and Kottke 2004).

Within a *managing diversity* approach, it became necessary and possible to diminish the white, male backlash apparent in *compliance-based* diversity. A definition of diversity was adopted to move away from legality to the business case of *managing diversity*. This definition of diversity takes a broad approach to understanding the diverse workplace and aims to extend diversity to many ways that people differ. Thus, aspects of individual identity such as age, personality, status in an organization, and lifestyle choices are all part of an organization's diversity. The focus for organizational studies scholars who conceptualize diversity in this way is leaving behind the understanding of diversity as only exemplified by compliance and racial or gender differences (Thomas 1990, 1991; Lynch 1997; Ivancevich and Gilbert 2000; Von Bergen et al 2002, Hays-Thomas 2004). From this perspective, everyone fits into diversity along nearly all dimensions that may affect working in an organization. This equates individual differences so there is no discussion of power in the *managing diversity* approach. Race, age, personality, and managerial status impact individuals and the organization in the same way.

Within the broad definition of diversity, organizations fall on different points of a continuum, depending on how far they extend the diversity label (Hays-Thomas 2004). As stated, the *managing diversity* approach limits diversity to attributes that affect the workplace. Operating concurrently with the managing diversity approach is the *celebrating diversity*

approach. Some organizations use an extremely far-reaching definition of diversity, covering each and every way that people differ, including things such as family histories or color and food preferences (Thomas 1996; Hays-Thomas 2004). This represents an extreme example of the broad definition of diversity. The *celebrating diversity* approach focuses on individuals and the many ways that they differ regardless of the organizational context, while the *managing diversity* approach is always connected to business goals. The connecting factor between *managing diversity* and *celebrating diversity* is that the elements of diversity are considered equivalent, meaning that each person's differences contribute to the organization's diversity to the same degree; hence a discussion of power and privilege is neglected (Hays-Thomas 2004). Though the *celebrating diversity* approach becomes more prevalent in the next era of diversity discourse, the broad view of diversity that these two approaches take provided a number of advantages in the organization.

An all-encompassing view of diversity can remove the connection of diversity work and legality that the *compliance-based diversity* approach adopted. Personal characteristics such as physical appearance, sexual orientation, or office temperature preferences are not covered under anti-discrimination law, but can become obstacles to work success (Hays-Thomas 2004). Taking the stance that everyone is different and everyone's differences matter moves the diversity conversation from legal compliance to organizational respect and effectiveness across all dimensions. Similarly, it reduces negative perceptions of diversity initiatives as rooted in affirmative action policies, as many of the groups included under the *managing diversity* umbrella are not perceived as benefitting from affirmative action (Ivancevich and Gilbert 2000).

A broad definition of diversity is particularly helpful for managing the reactions of white males to diversity initiatives and information. As shown, white males often felt blamed and

confronted in *compliance-based diversity* programs (Comer and Soliman 1996; Lynch 1997; Von Bergen et al 2002; Kalev et al 2006). Widening the scope of diversity brings white males into the conversation, including their attributes into an overall discussion of organizational diversity. This is important because white men continue to be advantaged in the workplace and dominate representation at the top of organizational hierarchies (Crenshaw et al 1995; Delgado and Stefancic 2000; Acker 2006). Acceptance of diversity goals and programs from top management has real implications for the success of diversity programs because many of the occupants of top managerial positions are the white males who may respond negatively to diversity trainings (EEOC 2010). In fact, top-level support is a key feature of many models for increasing organizational diversity (Agars and Kottke 2004). Thus, the move to an all-encompassing definition of diversity can muster support from all levels of an organization. The more restricted, *compliance-based* definition of diversity may lose some of this support.

At the same time, taking the broad stance on diversity removes power from the discussion, so that inequality and privilege becomes hidden. Dimensions of diversity are portrayed as all having the same impact on workplace diversity (Hays-Thomas 2004). This can bring white males into the diversity conversation in a less confrontational way, but it loses the basis for this confrontation in the first place. The purpose of diversity initiatives in the *compliance-based* approach was to counteract unequal treatment based on dimensions of diversity that have been used as a basis for discrimination. Equalizing diversity omits the inequality that existed historically.

In this time frame, then, the *managing diversity* definition broadened with the justification that including all employees in diversity would create a more productive and marketable organization in a sociopolitical and work climate that was globalizing and changing

demographically. The *celebrating diversity* approach existed, but was less common in this era as it expanded diversity far beyond the scope of the organization. The *managing diversity* approach infused with the business case for diversity mindset has continued into the present day, though the social context in which organizations operate has changed.

The 2000s: Inclusion, Valuing Diversity, and Post-Racialism

The *managing diversity* perspective moved organizational diversity rhetoric from compliance and legality to business advantage and competitiveness. Through a broad approach to diversity, it was thought that an increasingly heterogeneous workforce could be capitalized upon. While the broad approach has persisted in current times, the frame of diversity has shifted once again. Currently, there is a push to move beyond legality and market-based drivers for diversity (Pless and Maak 2004). This is derived from a prevailing racial discourse of post-racialism. In a post-racial society, race is no longer seen as major impediment to success for people of color or a privilege for whites (Bell 1992; Gallagher 2008). On a personal level, it may be difficult for people who are different than one another to interact and because of past injustices it may be difficult to integrate underrepresented employees into a new workplace culture, but if people can be integrated, the organization will be fine in terms of diversity (Wise 2009). The message is that we have moved beyond blatant forms of racism, so that race becomes just another dimension of diversity.

Behind the idea that as a nation we have moved beyond race or transcended race is the success of individuals of color. The election of President Barack Obama marked a time when post-racialism was rampant as sociopolitical commentators saw the rise of a person of color to the highest position in United States government as a sign that racism no longer exists (Wise

2009). Similarly, the growing black middle-class is taken as a sign of progress; a progress that diminishes claims of racial discrimination (Bonilla-Silva 2001). Though not malicious or intentional, a post-racial society perpetuates inequality in an unrecognized manner (Bell 1992; Trepagnier 2006; Wise 2009). This can create an "illusion of inclusion" that masks how race continues to work institutionally by shifting the conversation away from race to other differences (Gallagher 2008). This is true of scholars who advocate for less of a focus on racial issues because social class is actually a more significant determinant of outcome in today's world (Wilson 1980). Because of the debate about a post-racial society, three approaches to diversity are apparent in the post-racial society.

Celebrating Diversity in Post-Racial Society

The *celebrating diversity* approach adheres strictly to post-racial ideology, explaining why it has carried over from the earlier era where the *managing diversity* approach was most prominent. In a post-racial society, *celebrating diversity* takes the form of "planetary humanism," where the variety of cultures, beliefs, and appearances around the country or global create differences which should be celebrated and become part of any organization (Nayak 2006). As mentioned above, this approach takes an extremely broad definition of diversity that literally includes every way that people differ. Organizations are considered beyond issues such as racism, since diversity is conceptualized as many differences (Thomas 1996). Additionally, these differences are seen as equivalent, so that power is never mentioned in this discussion (Hays-Thomas 2004). Taking away the power inherent to dimensions of diversity is a fundamental aspect of the post-racial society (Bell 1992; Wise 2009). Diversity, then, becomes about individuals and interpersonal relations. *Celebrating diversity* can bring all people into the

diversity discussion, but can also create a difficult atmosphere for the underrepresented groups, specifically people of color, as the expectation is that race will not be a factor in their opportunities. The more prevalent approach to diversity in contemporary organizations is the *valuing diversity* approach, which still operates within a post-racial ideology, but maintains a semblance of the power discussion.

Valuing Diversity in Post-Racial Society

In terms of outcomes, the *valuing diversity* approach in the post-racial society looks similar to the *managing diversity* approach in the deregulated, globalizing society of the 1990s. Diverse workplaces are still viewed as being more productive for the organization. *Valuing diversity,* however, represents an important divergence from *managing* diversity. The business advantages for diversity are now conceptualized as arising not just from the presence of diverse individuals, but through the "inclusion" of all individuals into a workplace culture. In the *valuing diversity* approach, inclusion is about integrating employees into an organization because it is the *moral* thing to do (Mor Barak 2000; Pless and Maak 2004; Roberson 2006; Chavez and Weisinger 2008). From a *valuing diversity* approach, it becomes important to make sure not just that employees are present and heard in the workplace, but that they also feel respected and recognized (Pless and Maak 2004). Essential to this perspective is that all employees feel comfortable bringing their unique characteristics, cultures, and backgrounds into an organization, with the purpose of having their full skill set and advantage to the organization on display (Roberson 2006; Chavez and Weisinger 2008; Stewart et al 2008).

Valuing diversity still sees diversity in the organization as important for productivity and relationships with colleagues and clients, but from a moral rather than bottom-line view. Thus

the outcomes—productivity and intergroup relations—are the same in the *managing diversity* and *valuing diversity* approaches. The justifications, however, are different, with *valuing diversity* taking a moral approach. The moral standpoint recognizes that oppression has existed in the past so that certain groups have been excluded from opportunities in the workplace. In essence, *valuing diversity* can be seen as infusing the outcomes of *managing diversity* with aspects of social justice (Hays-Thomas 2004; Ahmed 2007). The purpose of *valuing diversity* is to transform a workplace culture so that it accurately and fully incorporates the beliefs and values of employees and diminishes barriers such as individual biases and organizational practices that can hinder an employee's ability to integrate into an organization (Thomas and Ely 1996; Roberson 2006; Chavez and Weisinger 2008). This is a recognition of power that the *managing diversity* approach lacks. Individuals have power based on their group identities, which may allow them to integrate easily into most organizational cultures (Roberson 2006). Including individuals, however, is where the *valuing diversity* approach stops.

Past discrimination has excluded members of certain groups, so including them now will remedy that situation. This mindset is indicative of a post-racial society (Wise 2009). Part of the way that this is accomplished is by recognizing that organizations are not stand alone entities with a distinct organizational culture, but also exist in communities and larger society, which can influence workplace interaction (Mor Barak 2000). Working to *value diversity* can result in greater influence in decision-making, access to information, and job security for underrepresented groups (Pelled et al 1999). *Valuing diversity* is particularly focused on these non-dominant groups, as dominant groups dictate the organizational culture that must be transformed in order to be inclusive in the moral sense. Non-dominant groups must assimilate into this dominant culture in this approach. Organizations are cautioned, though, against

focusing too much on underrepresented groups, as it might portray them as "the other" and actually create the opposite result and promote exclusion in the workplace (Stewart et al 2008). Instead, members of dominant groups can assume the role of an ally with underrepresented group members in an organization that values diversity by actively listening to and validating the experience of these colleagues and supporting them when exclusion is apparent (Kivel 2002).

In the *valuing diversity* approach organizations recognize that aspects of employee's identities and membership in particular groups may have resulted in discrimination or preclusion from entering or advancing in the workplace. In common practice, this has limited the discussion to the categories of race, ethnicity, and gender (Cox 1994; Lorbiecki and Jack 2000; Hays-Thomas 2004); however this definition is applicable to all situations where intergroup relations can result in prejudice and discrimination (Linnehan and Konrad 1999). These problems are considered a thing of the past, which a morally inclusive workplace can fix. Intergroup problems may exist, but in terms of lack of inclusion, past discrimination, or overt racism, rather than ongoing discriminatory practices in institutions that historically excluded members of certain groups. This means that by *valuing diversity*, the diverse workforce can still be conceptualized as a tool for increased productivity, while also attempting to reduce or eliminate power imbalances in the workplace.

The hierarchical nature of the workplace creates a clear power structure based on title and status, but demographic variables such as race and gender are also subject to power dynamics, which can afford privilege and opportunity to make decisions and direct task allocation (Linnehan and Konrad 1999; Ragins 1999). These dynamics are not considered relevant or present in the *valuing diversity* approach. *Valuing diversity* through inclusion may work to create better intergroup relationships and reduce blatant injustices. In fact, some diversity

professionals view the current term "diversity" as evolving directly from the legal terms "equality" and "justice" that typify the affirmative action and EEO discussion. When these terms are no longer acceptable, due to criticism and negativity toward affirmative action or legal mandates for diversity, the conversation must shift (Ahmed 2007). In the post-racial society, *valuing diversity* has emerged as the way to think about changing workplace culture because it is morally just. This creates organizations that think about power and racism in terms of past exclusion and blatant, interpersonal biases. A final approach to diversity takes a critical stance on these issues to argue that racism has become institutionalized; something that post-racial ideology ignores and perpetuates.

Critical Diversity in Post-Racial Society

Supporters of a different approach to diversity believe that diversity must be narrowed to categories such as race, gender, or sexual orientation, which have been and continue to be the target of discrimination, in order to provide a critical view of workplace interactions, policies, and procedures. Proponents of a narrow definition, which can be called the *critical diversity* approach, find the all-encompassing diversity definition, portraying differences based on race, age, personality, appearance, or gender as equivalent, problematic for workplace diversity. Perceiving these differences as equal fails to account for systemic disadvantages rooted in racism and sexism that have created an unequal playing field. Race and gender are both aspects of identity that have been widely studied in relation to workplace culture and opportunity (Acker 1990, 2006; Cox 1994). Organizations must limit the categories considered "diverse," in order to expose the consequences of power and privilege in the workplace (Linnehan and Konrad 1999; Lorbiecki and Jack 2000). The purpose of narrowing is to fight against the idea of a post-

racial society to show that certain dimensions of diversity still affect opportunity. This will become clearer in the next section as the current climate of a racialized workplace is examined.

The *critical diversity* approach draws on the concept of intersectionality. Critical feminist scholars of color have stressed an intersectional approach to scholarship which incorporates the importance of studying how the many different aspects of our identities 'intersect' with one another to influence our overall experience (Crenshaw 1991, 1995; Collins 1998, 2000; Davis 2008). This is a discussion of an employee's personal diversity, as it pertains to advantages and disadvantages that each piece of identity allocates. Most people do not occupy a fully dominant or fully subordinate position in society or the organization. The intersection of different aspects of social identity results in a situation where people are on a continuum of dominance (Tatum 1997). For example, a black male is a member of a dominant gender group, while simultaneously a member of a socially subordinate racial group. Scholarship on intersectionality argues that a *critical diversity* approach, which focuses on power and privilege, is necessary to accurately transform an organization into an egalitarian institution. By focusing on the ways in which individuals are both advantaged and disadvantaged, the *critical diversity* approach offers a way to a develop deeper empathetic understanding of practices of inequality in the workplace.

Within the *critical diversity* approach, diversity becomes a word that allows the perception of inclusion and organizational benefit, while maintaining a semblance of deconstructing the basis for racism, sexism, or other "-isms" in the workplace. Here, inclusion is being used differently than in the *valuing diversity* approach to say that people should not be included simply because it is moral, but because of systemic barriers to opportunity continue to exist and influence organizational chances for individuals, so that inclusion does not mean

assimilation (Mor Barak 2000; Pless and Maak 2004; Roberson 2006; Chavez and Weisinger 2008). Of course, by actively naming bias and discrimination in the workplace, the narrow definition can induce the very backlash against diversity that the managing diversity and valuing diversity approaches attempt to curtail (Comer and Soliman 1996; Lynch 1997; Von Bergen et al 2002; Kalev et al 2006). Alternatively, being presented with challenging information can inspire white males prone to backlash to transform a culture of power and privilege in the workplace (Feagin and Vera 1994; Tatum 1997; Kivel 2002). Thus, the *critical diversity* approach is meant to expose the way that bias becomes institutionalized, while the *valuing diversity* approach concentrates on integrating all dimensions of an employee's personal diversity into the work life at the individual level. Believing that post-racial ideology is increasing, *critical diversity* proponents see the need to expand the social justice goals of *valuing diversity* to include the discussion of institutionalized power and privilege. The goal of the *critical diversity* approach hinges on the notion that society is not, in fact, post-racial.

The Current Climate of a Racialized Workplace

The discussion of post-racial ideology emphasizes the role of racial discourse in understanding the context in which diversity trainings operate and different approaches to diversity develop. The *critical diversity* approach restricts the groups considered 'diverse,' in order to demonstrate that membership in different groups—most often based on race and gender — creates systems of advantage and disadvantage. As the U.S. becomes less and less homogenous, contact with co-workers from a variety of races and ethnicities is unavoidable. The changing racial composition of the country has shifted the climate of race relations from blatant

forms of racism or ethnocentrism in the past to more subtle justifications for disparities in professional success, exemplified by post-racial ideology.

Race and gender are constructs embedded in the workplace institution that affect the outcomes for many employees. A critical examination of the effect that gender and racial differences have on organizational opportunity will inform the possible reactions to distinct diversity training models. White men (and to some degree white women) continue to dominate the managerial ranks of corporate America, despite the commitment to diversity that many companies claim (Kalev et al. 2006). The most recent data from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission show that whites occupy 88% of executive and senior level positions in private industry. Males account for 71% of these same executives and 63% of top level management are both white and male (EEOC 2010). This means that white males hold the most power in modern American industry. Critical race theory provides a more substantial understanding of why such power structures exist by examining the way race affects opportunity in the workplace.

White Privilege, Male Privilege, and the Construction of Inequality in the Workplace

Critical race theory emerged from critical legal studies and has developed over the last few decades to identify and explain the persistence of racial inequality as a product of privilege (Crenshaw et al 1995). Critical race theorists attempt to explain the construction, representation, and reproduction of racial power. In American society there is a white culture of power, meaning whites as a dominant race create and sustain social norms that preserve a racial hierarchy (Wildman and Davis 1996; Mills 1997; Kivel 2002). From this dominant position, issues that people of color face can be justified as natural to their race, trivialized as oversensitivity, or not

addressed at all. Inequality can be reduced to individual dysfunction, rather than any form of discrimination. The same reasoning can be applied to gender dynamics. Males occupy a dominant position in both industry and society that can afford opportunities, which perpetuate a cycle of male power (McIntosh 1988; Connell 2005; Alvesson and Billing 2009). Critical theorists aim to expose how organizational practices can be influenced by privilege and to deconstruct the impact privilege has on gaining power and status in an organization.

Privilege results from being a member of a dominant group and constitutes a set of connections and benefits simply due to that membership (McIntosh 1988; Wildman and Davis 1996; Carbado 2000). Oftentimes, this privilege goes unnoticed and unnamed by the dominant group, while operating subtly to assist dominant group members and reinforce the power of the group (Tatum 1997). Beginning with Peggy McIntosh's (1988) groundbreaking article on the invisible privileges that come from being white, 'privilege lists' have been created to show how men and whites benefit on a daily basis simply due to their gender or race and nothing else (McIntosh 1988; Carbado 2000). In the workplace, privilege affords whites and males a number of added, unearned advantages that can make the workplace easier to navigate. Privilege is three-fold, providing economic, social, and psychological advantages to privileged groups (Wellman 1993; Wise 2008).

For instance, a white and/or male employee attempting to advance in the organization is likely to find that the person in charge of promoting them shares their gender, race, or both (McIntosh 1988; Carbado 2000). This provides a social benefit in having similar lived experiences based on race, a psychological benefit in having the person's own race reflected back at them from a position of authority, and a potential economic advantage if that individual gets the promotion. 'Homosocial reproduction,' or managers hiring and promoting new

managers that are similar to them on dimensions of race and gender, is a real phenomenon in organizations (Kanter 1977; Baldi and McBrier 1997; Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2009). Homosocial reproduction is a form of white and male privilege that provides significant advantages in reaching the managerial ranks, a claim that is substantiated by the EEOC data of who occupies the executive level of corporate America (EEOC 2010). Homosocial reproduction speaks to how racism and sexism become institutionalized, that is, embedded in workplace policies and practices rather than simply interpersonal forms of noticeable discrimination.

Additionally, privilege normalizes the actions of whites and males in the workplace (Wildman and Davis 1996). The white male becomes the standard by which employees are judged and by which the value of work is determined (Acker 1990, 2006; Britton 2000; Connell 2005; Jensen 2005). This can lead to pay inequities as white or male work is seen as more valuable than equal work performed by women and/or people of color (Oliver and Shapiro 1995; Wise 2009). For example, white males on average make nearly 17% more income than an identical black male and when both are college educated, on average black males make only two-thirds that of white males (Wise 2009; US Census Bureau 2011). On average, women make just two-thirds the salary of men, even with a professional or master's level college degree, while across race women receive about equal pay (US Census Bureau 2011). The situation becomes bleaker when looking at wealth as opposed to income, where an average white family enjoys a net worth that is eleven times that of an average black family and eight times that of an average Latino family (Shapiro 2004). Wealth includes things such as a house, car, or property and may be a more accurate representation of a family's financial standing than income.

The standard of the white male worker can also cause women and people of color, who do reach the managerial ranks, to be placed in positions that exemplify gender or racial

assumptions, such as people of color becoming directors of multicultural affairs or consultants on diversity and women being directed towards positions in human resources or public relations, rather than chief executive positions (Collins 1997; Acker 2006). The *managing diversity* and *valuing diversity* approaches may work at reducing blatant stereotyping and problematic intergroup conflict, but ignore race and gender privilege that have become institutionalized and may impact how women and people of color work and advance in the organization (Linnehan and Konrad 1999). This privilege is further masked by the way race is discussed in the corporate world, namely through color-blind discourse.

Frames of Color-Blind Discourse and Masking the Impact of Racial Inequality

Critical race theorists classify color-blind racism as a number of active ways that people diminish the role that race continues to play in determining opportunity (Freeman 1977; Bell 1980; Gotanda 1991; Bonilla-Silva 2001, 2010). As overtly racist acts have decreased in recent decades, color-blind racism has increased, reducing blatant racial discrimination in job opportunity, while reinforcing the power that whites hold in corporations. In addition to color-blind racism, gender-neutral policies support the notion of the ideal worker as a male worker, and detract from success of female employees (Acker 1990; Connell 2005). Bonilla-Silva (2001; 2010) provides one of the clearest representations of how color-blind racism operates. Bonilla-Silva identifies four "central frames" of color blind racism: abstract liberalism, naturalization cultural racism, and minimization (Bonilla- Silva 2010). The central frames can be expanded upon to include gender-neutral dialogue and policies to show how race and gender continue to determine professional outcomes.

Abstract liberalism incorporates liberal ideals of equal opportunity without tackling systemic issues such as racism, sexism, and classism. A critique of liberalism is central to critical race theory (Delgado and Stefancic 2000). An abstract liberal mindset allows people to appear egalitarian on a personal, case-to-case basis, but fails to recognize that opportunity in the racialized and gendered workplace may not be characterized by equal opportunity. An example of abstract liberalism can be found by returning to the discussion of affirmative action. Arguments against affirmative action target the fact that affirmative action policies represent a form of unequal opportunity, where women and people of color receive an unfair advantage to gain access to a variety of institutions, most commonly universities and corporations (Tatum 1997; Ivancevich and Gilbert 2000). To make such an argument disregards a history where people of color and women were (and are) precluded from attaining the best educations or jobs, simply due to race and gender (Bonilla-Silva 2001; 2010; Hanscome and Cervero 2003; Acker 2009)

Part of what promotes an abstract liberal viewpoint is what Alan David Freeman (1977) has termed the "perpetrator perspective." In evaluating a possible experience with racism, one can take the perspective of either the victim or the perpetrator. The victim, having experienced both the consequences and causes of discrimination, is more inclined to understand the conditions of social life that are manifested in racism and sexism. From a perpetrator perspective, discrimination is reduced to individual acts, rather than any historically or socially relevant system of inequality, as the causes or conditions that presuppose racial and gender discrimination are hidden from view. As a result, the focus persists at the individual or group level, where the consequences of discrimination are observable, but forms of institutional or systemic inequality remain invisible. Freeman connects this to legal studies and the argument

that the law is "color-blind," which should result in equal justice regardless of race. This is an abstract liberal frame of mind from the perspective of the perpetrator, as it does not acknowledge that simply attempting to remove race from the equation does little to confront social inequality that results from racial discrimination (Freeman 1977; Gotanda 1991). As these examples show, abstract liberalism permits the justification of inequality in terms of equal opportunity. This can be a fault of the broad definition of diversity, as including all aspects of diversity at an interpersonal level may improve one-on-one interaction, but will have no influence on deconstructing power and privilege that shapes the experience of all employees.

Abstract liberalism explains just one way in which color-blind racism currently functions. Bonilla-Silva's second category is naturalization, which explains the rationalization that racial differences are natural occurrences and driven by dissimilar choices caused by dissimilar races. Naturalization is used to defend certain policies, such as segregation, that could be construed as racist. Naturalization makes segregation about race-based choice to move to areas inhabited by people of your same race and not about creating separate societies marked by unequal treatment. The perception is that people of the same race are drawn to one another and that segregation happens naturally, rather than compelled by racial prejudice (Bonilla-Silva 2001, 2010). Naturalization can be used to explain why people of color and women are directed to certain jobs in an organization. Making a person of color the diversity specialist or having a female manager handle less business-oriented tasks can be justified as capitalizing on unique skills that women and people of color bring to the organization (Collins 1997; Acker 2006). Thus, top managers can claim that they are not forcing women and people of color down a particular career path; it is natural based on their experiences that they would want to do that kind of work.

Cultural racism is the third frame of color-blind racism and expresses the tendency to use common beliefs or stereotypes about different cultures as the basis for inequality. In this frame, more so than the naturalization frame, cultural aspects of people of color or women are blamed for disproportionate opportunities. A similar concept, silent racism, explores the ways that these beliefs and stereotypes often go unspoken, so that they guide thought and behavior, but are not actively expressed as justifications (Trepagnier 2006). The belief that blacks fail to move-up in the workplace because as a group they do not have the drive to succeed or their family dynamics have failed to provide them with the necessary tools for professional success, while Asians are heralded for learning what it takes to advance in the ranks of industry is an example of cultural or silent racism. Cultural racism can work to box members of different races into specific activities or subjects as students, as well as job categories in adulthood (Bonilla-Silva 2001; 2010). Dangerously, a culturally or silent racist/sexist mindset can unsuspectingly affect decisions such as task allocation by managers or promotion decisions, even if the manager making the decisions is attempting to work against inequality (Trepagnier 2006).

The last frame of color-blind racism is minimization. As its name implies, minimization diminishes the effects of discrimination by pointing to the fact that compared to the past racism is not that bad or that other "-isms," such as sexism or classism, are more important to understanding inequality. Taking this perspective discounts stories of racial discrimination from people of color. A person minimizing racism may ask the question: Since acts of racism have become so sparse in contemporary society, what are people of color complaining about? Racist acts are viewed as people of color claiming that race plays a role in everything, or as "pulling the race card," rather than a representation of racial inequality. Minimizing the presence and power of racism and sexism disguises the role that race and gender continue to play in the outcomes for

both whites and people of color, as they attempt to reach the highest ranks of the corporate world (Bonilla-Silva 2001; 2010).

Bonilla-Silva's framework of color-blind racism can be applied to explore the current climate of a racialized workplace. These frames are interconnected, not stand alone entities and provide a background for understanding how conceptualizations of race and gender differences have real consequences in the modern workplace. Color-blind and gender-neutral discourse also elaborates on the *managing diversity, celebrating diversity,* and *valuing diversity* approaches within a post-racial society. The way inclusion and diversity are presented in these paradigms allows for the belief that racism has been eliminated. The *critical diversity* approach, coming out of the critical race studies discussed above, looks to expose how racism and sexism can work at the institutional level, even if an organization is committed to diversity at the interpersonal and intergroup level. Privilege affords psychological, social, and economic advantages to white males (McIntosh 1988; Wellman 1993; Wise 2008). Organizations can be "inclusive" in the moral language of *valuing diversity* without ever acknowledging privilege and how privilege influences the institution (Bell 1992; Gallagher 2008). This can perpetuate color-blind discourse by concentrating on the individual. The ideology of post-racialism looks to the micro-level of individuals and moving beyond what divides us. Still, organizations feel the need to engage in diversity initiatives, such as diversity training, to assist them in diversity efforts. Focusing on individuals, this means that organizations are still struggling with interpersonal problems within the organization. Working on a micro-level, these problems become manifestations of employees' stereotypes, biases, and different levels of racial awareness.

Diversity Issues in Organizations: Stereotypes, Biases, and Racial Awareness

Contemporary diversity trainings would not exist unless organizations are having issues with diversity. The *valuing diversity* approach to diversity initiatives takes a moral stance that previously excluded groups need to have access to the organization and feel respected within the organizational culture in order to reach their full potential (Roberson 2006; Chavez and Weisinger 2008; Stewart et al 2008). That organizations must provide initiatives to promote the moral sense of inclusion means that members of different groups do not integrate easily or organically. Overall, each diversity approach seeks to address stereotypes and biases, but in different ways for different reasons (Paluck and Green 2009). The outline of the racialized workplace exhibits that the level of individual understanding of racial power and privilege may also affect how people react to diversity (Tatum 1997; Trepagnier 2006). The combination of stereotypes, biases, and racial awareness provide a framework for how individuals at the micro-level may think about and respond to diversity initiatives.

Stereotypes and Biases as Threats to Workplace Interaction

Organizational understanding of diversity and implementation of diversity practices has followed a historical trend connecting diversity conceptualization with the prevailing sociopolitical context of a given time period. Diversity is seen as providing advantages if handled properly or that inherently diversity can produce problems. These problems are typically thought of as arising from stereotypes and biases of individuals and groups (Paluck and Green 2009). Looking into stereotypes and interpersonal/intergroup relations allows for insight into what issues surround diversity in the workplace and what initiatives might be taken to counteract these negative effects.

The social psychological literature defines a stereotype as an individual's beliefs, whether positive or negative, about the characteristics of a group of people, which may or may not accurately describe that group (Jones 1997; Moskowitz 2005; Baumeister and Bushman 2008). Stereotypes simplify the world by allowing for the sorting of large groups of people into seemingly predictable categories. The onset and implementation of stereotypes can have serious implications for how different people interact in an organization. Some view stereotypes as unconscious and a natural result of socialization processes (Baumeister and Bushman 2008). Others see stereotypes forming from a need to align with similar others and compete with those different than us in an in-group/out-group dichotomy (Tajfel and Turner 1986). Once these groups form and people come to understand what groups they belong to, in-group identities and out-group animosity can grow and solidify fairly quickly (Sherif and Sherif 1953). By the time people enter the workplace, the social groups to which they belong are fairly clear. This can create strong in-group/out-group tensions in the workplace, especially as organizations become more heterogeneous. From an organizational perspective, then, it becomes more important to look at how negative stereotypes affect the workplace. Discomfort or conflict can evolve out of growing diversity in an organization, stemming from both individual and group identities (Taylor and Brown 1988; Moskowitz 2005).

At the individual level, people desire to have a positive sense of self. They want to believe that they are good and just people and downplay negative aspects of their person, which can hurt personal health and productivity (Taylor and Brown 1988). Organizationally, this means that on an interpersonal level people are unlikely to notice their own biases against members of an out-group. Since stereotypes operate implicitly, people often may not know that they hold a specific stereotype or that they are acting upon this knowledge in their decisions such

as hiring, promoting, or task allocation (Greenwald and Banaji 1995). Additionally, it is not even necessary to believe a stereotype to have it activated upon interacting with someone of a different group (Devine 1989). Individually, then, stereotypes operate predominantly at an unconscious level, categorizing out-group members by their expected characteristics.

Just as individuals desire to see themselves in a positive fashion, so to do individuals desire to positively view their group memberships (Tajfel and Turner 1986; Brewer 1991; Moskowitz 2005). One common way to muster positive beliefs about an in-group is to promote negative beliefs about an out-group. When an out-group does a particular action it can be evaluated negatively, while the in-group performing the same action can be viewed positively (Allport 1954). For instance, this is seen commonly with male and female managers. A male manager who is assertive and decisive is seen as a leader and solid management material, while a female manager adopting the same style can be viewed by males as too strong-willed or ruling with an iron fist (Eagley and Carli 2007). This represents the intersection of gender stereotypes with males denouncing an activity performed by an out-group member, while praising the same action done by one of their own. Clearly, this example is applicable to organizational behavior and decision making. Similar results can occur for members of other underrepresented groups who may receive different feedback or evaluations for performing the same task in the same way as a dominant counterpart.

Stereotypes about different others results in more negative effects as well. Specifically, in-group bias promotes the idea that out-groups are homogenous or made up of entirely similar people (Tajfel and Wilkes 1963; Linville and Jones 1980). In an organization this could mean that it is expected that all Asian-Americans or all people with a disability will respond to a particular decision in a certain way, though whites and those without a disability are expected to

have varying opinions on a policy or project. Such a belief in homogeneity can stifle abilities for out-group members to differentiate themselves from other members of the same group and display a special skill set or creativity that organizations hope to attain through diversity.

Stereotyping has also been shown to increase in times of stress (Sinclair and Kunda 1999). The often overwhelmingly stressful work life that the U.S. worker leads can result in abundant stereotyping, losing the true meaning of inclusion as workers operate under snap judgments of different co-workers rather than genuine concern for their beliefs and values. Additionally, stereotypes and the need for positive group identity can cause in-groups to make out-groups the scapegoats for poor results. In one striking example of making the out-group a scapegoat, it has been determined that the price of cotton in the antebellum southern United States correlates with illegal violence against blacks, specifically as the price of cotton decreased, making southern whites poorer, the blame was shifted to an out-group, blacks, in the form of mob violence and lynching (Hovland and Sears 1940; Hepworth and West 1980). Moving this to the workplace, it is easy to see how poor results on a project or failure to please a client could result in making out-groups a scapegoat.

Looking at organizational culture, underrepresented groups are likely to be these out-groups and the outlet for blame creating serious workplace conflict and tension. Two more impacts of stereotypes function in the workplace: self-fulfilling prophecies and stereotype threat. Self-fulfilling prophecies in relation to stereotypes show that when an individual is aware of stereotypes about them or their group, they can internalize those beliefs and begin to act in stereotypical ways, reinforcing the stereotype for themselves and others (Merton 1948). This relates back to the example of female managers. Female managers who know that they may be judged harshly for acting assertively may consciously or unconsciously act in a compassionate or

caring manner that female gender roles predict. This may create less tension in the workplace, while simultaneously hurting the woman's ability to advance in the organization as she does not display the criteria for being top-management material (Eagley and Carli 2007). Stereotype threat is another intriguing example of the impact of stereotypes. Stereotype threat explains that when a person is aware of a stereotype explaining that members of their group will not perform well on a particular, difficult task, the person fears fulfilling the stereotype, creating anxiety and resulting in the poor performance they attempted to avoid in the first place and perpetuation of the stereotype (Steele and Aronson 1995; Roberson and Kulik 2007). Difficult tasks abound in the workplace. Poor performance due to stereotype threat can hurt an organization, as the task is not completed satisfactorily, and the employee, as trust in their skills can be diminished, damaging advancement capabilities and tainting a reputation. Stereotypes and biases, activated by workforce diversity and multiple in-group/out-group dilemmas have tangible implications for the institution and the individual. Are these stereotypes a lost cause, or can people overcome them to better interact?

Encouragingly, social psychological research has paid attention to the way people can overcome stereotypes and biases. These results, once again, have important workplace correlates. One significant way that stereotypes can be reduced is through goals that supersede intergroup conflicts (Sherif and Sherif 1953). When two competing groups are given a goal to accomplish a task that can only be done together, something extremely common in today's team-oriented workplace, bias and stereotypes can be set aside in completing the assignment. This is good news for organizations afraid that diversity will actually hinder productivity. Also, stereotyping can be overcome by consciously examining the unconscious workings of stereotypes and bias (Greenwald, McGhee and Schwartz 1998). This type of "conscious

override" can occur when people repeatedly see members of a stereotyped group exhibiting behaviors inconsistent with the stereotype (Asch and Zukier 1984; Moscovici 1976; Greenwald, McGhee and Schwartz 1998).

Organizations can provide opportunities for group members to dispel negative stereotypes by taking on difficult tasks or affirming work that would stereotypically be unexpected of a member of a particular group. Diversity trainings can provide a forum for discussing negative stereotypes and providing examples to dismiss the perceived accuracy and generalizability that comes from stereotyping. Lastly, in a more idealistic state, simple, continuous contact with different people can lessen stereotyping (Allport 1954; Dovidio and Gaertner 1999). In this case, however, ideal conditions, such as equal status among in-group and out-group members must be present to reduce stereotyping (Allport 1954). This is unlikely to occur in the hierarchical workplace, but if the ideal state does exist, contact can decrease deliberate avoidance of diverse others and harassment of out-groups (Dovidio and Gaertner 1999).

Racial Awareness, Identity, and Inter-Group Relations

One of the problems that the above section on stereotyping identifies is that, when stereotyping, out-group members are viewed as sharing the same beliefs and values (Tajfel and Wilkes 1963; Linville and Jones 1980). In actuality, in-group members can hold vastly different beliefs about other groups. In the context of post-racial ideology, an individual's racial awareness can greatly impact their dealings with workplace diversity. Individual racial awareness can be a large factor in whether or not someone stereotypes based on race and how they think about racism, in general. Both Beverly Daniel Tatum (1997) and Barbara Trepagnier

(2006) provide solid frameworks for assessing racial identity or awareness (Tatum 1997; Trepagnier 2006). Tatum describes racial identity in terms of stages that people go through (Helms 1990; Cross 1991; Tatum 1997). The term stages can be misleading, as the categories that Tatum outlines are not necessarily linear, but may be described better as fluid, meaning that one can move back and forth between them or incorporate aspects of more than one stage into their identity depending on experience. Trepagnier, instead, discusses racial awareness in terms of a person's overall understanding of race and racism along a continuum (Trepagnier 2006). Though the frameworks use different language and visuals to describe racial identity and awareness, the two cover similar topics, allowing the frameworks to be combined. Trepagnier's continuum of racial awareness (see Figure 1 below), because of its simple breakdown and visual of a continuum, becomes the more functional framework for structuring the conversation about racial awareness and its connection to inter-group relations.

Figure 1—Racial Awareness Continuum (adapted from Trepagnier 2006)

Level of Racial Awareness	Understanding of Racism	Racist/Anti-Racist Behaviors
Low	Only Historical. Racism is rooted in past discrimination that law has fixed or is fixing.	Color-Blind Racism; Post-Racial Ideology; Pervasive Racial Stereotyping; Lack of Support for Diversity Initiatives, such as Affirmative Action
Medium	Historical and Social. Racism happened in the past, and continues because of white privilege.	Acknowledge white privilege but do not know how to act to get rid of it; Whites feel uncomfortable around/disengage with people of color because feel uncomfortable about their privilege; Fear of discriminating or offending causes inaction.
High	Historical, Social, and Personal. Racism happened and continues to matter because of privilege. Simultaneously, individuals have a personal role in the perpetuation of racism. Racism is seen as institutional and individual.	Energized to engage in anti-racist work; Collaborate with people of color to further anti-racist agenda; Focus on institutions, rather than the self.

Racial awareness represents an understanding of racism in three contexts: historical, societal, and personal, each of which relates to different approaches to diversity used throughout history (Trepagnier 2006). Historical racism is indicative of the impetus for the *compliance-based diversity* approach. Racism was something in the past that precipitated a civil rights movement to stop racism and bigotry, which was excluding people of color from all institutions be it the best workplaces, health care facilities, or schools (Kelly and Dobbin 1998; Hays-Thomas 2004; Trepagnier 2006; Anand and Winters 2008). As the *compliance-based diversity* approach showed, people agree that this racism existed in the past, but may not, especially if they are white males, respond positively to programs with the purpose of including people of color now. If a person only understands racism as historical, they have a *low racial awareness* or are in the *contact stage* of identity development. People with low levels of racial awareness are very prone to color-blind racism and seeing racism as something in the past, so that programs such as affirmative action mean that whites are now disadvantaged (Tatum 1997; Bonilla-Silva 2001, 2010; Trepagnier 2006). Low level racial awareness is also closely tied to post-racial ideology and the *celebrating diversity* approach, which equalizes all differences so there is no element of power in diversity (Bell 1992; Thomas 1996; Gallagher 2008). Because of this low level of understanding and an attachment to white norms, people in this level are apt to act on stereotypes rather than personal experiences with other races.

The second context of racial awareness looks at the societal climate around race. The most common way that the societal context appears is through privilege, specifically white privilege (Trepagnier 2006). Above, the economic, social, and psychological advantages granted to whites simply due to race were outlined (McIntosh 1988; Wellman 1993; Wise 2008). People of color endure a lack a similar access to organizations and lack of inclusion into workplace

culture when represented. This follows the moral inclusion arguments of the *valuing diversity* approach, where all people should be included in organizations because it is the right thing to do (Mor Barak 2000; Pless and Maak 2004; Chavez and Weisinger 2008). When people have an intellectual understanding of white privilege, they are considered in the *medium level of racial awareness* or near the *pseudo-independent stage* of racial identity development (Tatum 1997; Trepagnier 2006). This level is marked by an acknowledgement of white privilege without a real understanding of what to do with that knowledge. People will think that it is bad to be racist and so they will look inward to try to avoid individual acts of racism (Trepagnier 2006). This keeps racism at the interpersonal level. White people at this level can feel uncomfortable around people of color because they realize that whites have the privilege in society. Fear of offending a person of color or anger at stereotyping unconsciously can thwart action against racism and engagement with people of color.

The last context of racial awareness is personal. The personal context means understanding one's own implications in racism. It requires recognition of institutional racism and privilege and how that shapes the way race is individually conceptualized (Trepagnier 2006). This third level takes a *critical diversity* approach, where institutional oppression replaces interpersonal experiences, as the most persistent form of racism (Linnehan and Konrad 1999; Lorbiecki and Jack 2000). People who have the historical, societal, and personal understanding of racism are at a *high level of racial awareness* or have reached the *immersion/emersion* or *autonomy stage* of racial identity (Tatum 1997; Trepagnier 2006). The discomfort in the medium level disappears as people are able to engage with different races and look outward at institutions rather than incessantly inward and analyzing the self. People in the high level of

racial awareness are often energized to do anti-racist work and speak out against racism when they see it (Feagin and Vera 1994; Tatum 1997; Kivel 2002; Trepagnier 2006).

It should be apparent that where an employee is on the racial awareness continuum can greatly impact reactions to diverse individuals and the different diversity approaches. Somebody in the low level may be particularly inclined towards the *celebrating diversity* approach because it is post-racial and diminishes the need for equal opportunity legislature. Someone in the high level of racial awareness would react far less favorably to the *celebrating diversity* approach because it fails to account for privilege, power, and institutional racism. Racial awareness, then, becomes a mediating factor in the effectiveness of diversity programs. If stereotypes and different levels of knowledge and experience with dimensions of diversity such as race can create discomfort, conflict, and/or discrimination in the workplace, organizations must take action to preserve diversity goals. The next section will explore the ways that organizations attempt to navigate this complicated situation of variance in individual racial awareness and pervasive stereotyping to promote diversity goals and reap the rewards they expect to see from a diverse workforce.

Assessing Diversity Initiatives and Tools for Change

Hired diversity directors and third-party diversity consultants earn their pay by making suggestions and implementing policies and programs to help organizations reach their diversity goals and benefit from a diverse work environment. Transforming the workplace requires initiatives to target at least three potentially problematic areas: increasing organizational responsibility and representation, reducing social isolation for marginalized groups, and changing workplace culture (Kalev et al 2006).

Increasing Organizational Responsibility and Representation

Organizational responsibility for diversity focuses on engaging leadership, enacting specific policies for hiring, promotion, and retention of diverse employees, and creating structures for dialogue from the bottom-up, as well as the top-down (Allen and Montgomery 2001; Cox 2001; Kalev et al 2006). Engaging leadership involves management setting a plan for how to capitalize on diversity, creating accountability structures to ensure that diversity goals are met, and communicating the warrants of diversity initiatives to staff (Allen and Montgomery 2001; Cox 2001). Executive-level leadership must model commitment to diversity programs to convince staff that the programs have merit. This can be done, in part, by hiring a diversity director or affirming the work of a diversity director already in place. Continuing, revamping, or initiating an affirmative action policy is an important step for hiring, promoting, and retaining diverse employees (Kalev et al 2006). That affirmative action programs can produce negative reactions (Ivancevich and Gilbert 2000) provides greater evidence for the necessity of managerial support. Further support can be found by increasing communication in both directions by creating a diversity council or similar committee to help oversee progress. Increasing organizational responsibility is the most effective tool for increasing the representation of women and people of color in the management ranks of the corporation (Kalev et al 2006). Looking at three decades of EEOC data on representation, the highest number of women and people of color in management positions was found in organizations that had a strong organizational support for diversity in terms of the above leadership and compliance policies (Kalev et al 2006).

Reducing Social Isolation for Marginalized Groups

Individuals considered different can be isolated from the mainstream organizational culture, affecting their ability to advance in the organization or work effectively with others (Thomas 1991, Cox 1993). Reducing isolation involves breaking down barriers to form a new organizational culture (Roberson 2006; Chavez and Weisinger 2008). Two of the main ways this can be accomplished is through mentoring and networking programs, which have produced mixed results. Mentoring programs typically connect women and people of color aspiring to be managers with senior-level employees (Kalev et al 2006). Some studies (Burke and McKeen 1997) found that mentoring provides the knowledge and skills necessary to advance in an organization, while others (Neumark and Gardecki 1996; Thomas 2001) found that mentoring can produce negative effects or no effects at all. Networking programs set aside time during the normal work schedule for women and people of color to attend sessions where they may create contacts that can provide career opportunities and advice. Networking and mentoring are only moderately effective in assisting organizational change to better manage diversity (Kalev et al 2006). The effect of mentoring programs is typically measured in terms of whether or not women and people of color reach a plateau in achievement or are able to reach the same organizational ranks as their white male counterparts (Burke and McKeen 1997; Thomas 2001; Kalev et al 2006). Again, evaluation is primarily focused on representation.

Changing Workplace Culture

A major focus of change in organizations is reducing bias and stereotyping that may create conflict or influence managerial decisions. As explained, stereotypes and bias function on many levels in individuals and groups to promote the self and one's in-groups, while possibly

denigrating out-groups in a way that harms both individuals and the organization as a whole. Including diversity goals in managerial performance evaluations and instituting diversity education for managers and staff are two major tools used for reducing these biases (Allen and Montgomery 2001; Cox 2001; Kalev et al 2006; Paluck 2006). The performance evaluation technique attaches a reward structure to managerial decisions on diversity. This may include loss of pay or bonus time, if managers do not adhere to the organizations policies for diversity (Cox 1993). Adding a diversity component to these evaluations produces a modest effect to increase representation and promote diversity at an organization (Kalev et al 2006). Diversity training is the most widely used program enacted to work towards diversity goals (Pless and Maak 2004; Agars and Kottke 2006). Some estimates show that over two-thirds of corporations have some form of diversity training in place (Society for Human Resource Management 2010). With such widespread use, it may come as a surprise that the effects of diversity trainings on employee attitudes and behaviors are largely unknown. Research has been inconclusive in proving the merit of these programs and by some accounts diversity trainings may actually harm an organization's efforts to increase diversity or reach diversity goals (Day 1995; Kochan et al 2003; Kidder et al 2004; Kalev et al 2006; Paluck 2006; Paluck and Green 2009). These puzzling results require a deeper examination into what occurs in diversity trainings and why they may be deemed ineffective. It also raises the question of how effective diversity trainings can be in deconstructing power and privilege in organizations.

Diversity Training: The Content and Consequences of Exposing Difference

"Diversity training" is an umbrella term used to describe education seminars aimed at addressing one of many possible issues relating to a diverse workforce. As a result, diversity

trainings differ greatly in the content covered and the methods of delivering this content. A seminar labeled a diversity training at one company may look completely different in both content and presentation than a training at a different company. Instrumental in promoting this variability in training topics and procedures is the approach to diversity that an organization adheres to and the mindset of the trainer that delivers the workshop (Day 1995; Paluck 2006; Paluck and Green 2009). Though basic techniques tend to appear in many types of diversity trainings, the stance on diversity affects the delivery of the information. The approach to diversity used in a training is something that studies on the effectiveness of diversity trainings have failed to take into account.

The Typical Diversity Training

Before examining the differences in trainings based on diversity perspectives and diversity goals, there are some commonalities that appear in diversity trainings, independent of the organizational definition of diversity. Overwhelmingly, diversity trainings are facilitated by one or many live diversity trainer(s) (Kalev et al 2006), though companies are beginning to experiment with "webinars" or computer-based training modules (Anand and Winters 2008). Most trainings last about one workday, however there is no universalized criteria for the length of a training, so that some trainings can be as short as an hour or two, or as long as multiple weeks with training occurring each day (Day 1995; Paluck 2006). Generally, trainings will include a discussion of legal requirements such as EEO law or harassment policies, but the legal risk associated with diversity will not necessarily be a justification for the training itself (Kidder et al 2004; Paluck 2006). Additionally, the bulk of diversity trainings are instructional in nature, aiming to provide information through lecture-style teaching about diversity in an interactive

classroom setting by using factsheets, activities, or videos, among other things. Less commonly, diversity trainers may take training attendees outside of the workplace to visit neighborhoods where the residents come from different economic or ethnic backgrounds than the training attendees, so that the experience of being in a new, unfamiliar place can be used as a teaching point about diversity in the workplace (Paluck 2006).

As mentioned, despite the many ways that the majority of diversity trainings may be similar, the content of diversity trainings can differ depending on the organizational definition of diversity and goals for the training session. Organizations adhering to a broad definition of diversity in the *managing diversity, valuing diversity,* or *celebrating diversity* approaches include specific content in diversity trainings to promote this understanding. While the particular activities and examples used in this training will differ depending on both the company and the trainer, the message about workplace diversity remains fairly consistent. Since this broader definition is the more commonly used definition (Hays-Thomas 2004), it does not come as a surprise that the elements of these trainings are found in most diversity training curricula and thus, are the most studied form of diversity training. Diversity trainings from this line of thought tend to be designed to change people's attitudes and counteract biases and stereotypes (Hood et al 2001; Kalev et al 2006). The goal, which comes from the *valuing diversity* approach, is to explore ways that each person's individuality and differences can be valued to create an inclusive workplace, where stereotypes and biases do not affect outcomes for members of different groups or create intergroup conflict (Hood et al 2001; Paluck 2006).

Intergroup conflict is presented as detrimental to workplace productivity and these diversity trainings frequently include sections that attempt to build skills for proper interaction. These skills range from leadership training to promoting effective communication and replacing

destructive conflict with constructive dialogue that can lead to stronger intergroup relationships and better ideas overall (Kochan et al 2003; Anand and Winters 2008). Essentially, these trainings attempt to provide employees with the ways to overcome stereotypes, such as raising consciousness and awareness (Allport 1954; Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz 1998). Ideally, this will change the workplace culture, creating a better work environment for all employees, regardless of differences that may exist.

Diversity trainings that promote the differences of employees along many dimensions, then, become a potential tool that organizations can use to move to an inclusive workplace that *values or celebrates diversity*, while maintaining the business imperative from *managing diversity*. Consequentially, diversity trainings that value differences will often cover the business advantages to diversity as a means for gaining managerial and staff support for diversity initiatives (Kochan et al 2003; Paluck 2006; Anand and Winters 2008). The bottom-line benefits generated from valuing and integrating diverse individuals, mixed with the social justice aspect of moral inclusion, arises as the predominant justification for increasing organizational diversity and promoting initiatives like the diversity training, while legal requirements, such as affirmative action, or historical preclusion from opportunity from the *compliance-based diversity* perspective are less significant elements of the model (Gilbert et al 1999; Kochan et al 2003; Kidder et al 2004; Anand and Winters 2008). This mirrors the historical shift of discussing diversity, where the climate has changed from one of legal compliance, to business advantage, to post-racial valuing of diversity.

Evaluating the Impact of Diversity Trainings

Just as the specific examples and activities used in diversity trainings differ by company and trainer, the methods for evaluating the effectiveness of the training varies by the organization and facilitator in charge of delivering the diversity training. One popular form of evaluation is a self-report survey administered to training attendees shortly after the completion of a diversity training (Day 1995; Hood et al 2001; Paluck 2006). These self-reports cover a wide range of questions hoping to determine how much trainees enjoyed the training material, what attendees learned from the training, and how the training may have reinforced or changed the way attendees will think about and approach diversity in the future (Paluck 2006).

Attempting to understand the effectiveness of breaking down stereotypes, some post-training surveys will ask attendees to rate their feelings about certain groups such as different ethnicities, LGBT staff, women, and people of color (Hood et al 2001; Paluck 2006; Paluck and Green 2009). Still other survey techniques concentrate on organizational culture, asking training attendees to rate how included they feel in the organization and how committed the top executives in the organization are to the information presented in the diversity training (Anand and Winters 2008). Overall, the results of these self-report surveys are positive, showing that employees think diversity training is important, that training resulted in a deeper understanding of diversity, and that training worked to change attitudes, shown by employees feeling both personally included and positively about members of other groups (Agars and Kottke 2004). Because of these results, training is considered effective. Evaluation of self-report surveys, though, relies entirely on the words of training participants. The aggregate of participant responses on paper or a computer dictate whether or not the training is considered effective in changing understandings and attitudes, though these changes and behaviors are not

systematically observed (Agars and Kottke 2004; Paluck 2006; Anand and Winters 2008; Paluck and Green 2009.

Though these are encouraging results, the validity of these surveys can be questioned. Self-report surveys cannot rule out the threat of bias coming from an employee's desire to maintain a positive sense of self when thinking about their own feelings about diversity, and not wanting to diminish the efforts of the diversity trainer, who may either be a colleague or someone on which the company has spent considerable money to come and deliver the training (Taylor and Brown 1988; Paluck 2006). Each of these biases in self-reporting attitudes after a diversity training can skew the data to a more positive explanation for the effectiveness of a diversity training seminar. Additionally, the term effectiveness is difficult to define and measure. Self-report surveys may speak to how employees think about diversity after a training, but this does not necessarily translate to managerial action or impact on the workplace. Similarly, it is extremely uncommon for companies to use a control group (a group of employees who do not attend diversity training, but partake in the self-report surveys to provide comparative data), when assessing the effectiveness of the training, making it difficult to name diversity training as the cause for positive attitudes toward diversity (Agars and Kottke 2004; Paluck 2006). Although in one attempt at using a control group for a managerial diversity training, those who went through training did report more positive attitudes toward diversity than those who had received no training, giving some credence to the evidence from self-report surveys (Hanover and Cellar 1998). Measuring more positive attitudes in training participants is used as the basis for deeming diversity training effective in this particular case.

Aside from self-report surveys, companies have used various other methods to measure the impact of their diversity trainings. One way to do so is to concentrate on representation of

different groups of people in managerial positions. Looking at decades of data on managerial representation for white and black, men and women, the presence of diversity training at an organization was correlated with a slight decrease for the number of white men in managerial positions, a slight increase for black men, no real effect for white women, and a significant decrease for black women (Kalev et al 2006; Dobbin et al 2007). This data suggests that, based on representation, diversity trainings may not be effective, and in fact may be detrimental, as in the case of managerial opportunities for black females. Another suggestion, arising from the business advantage argument for diversity, is that the success of the training will be reflected in increased sales and profits and better productivity on group tasks, but data for this argument show inconclusive bottom-line benefits to diversity initiatives (Day 1995; Kochan et al 2003). If profits increase following a diversity training, the training is considered effective. It is difficult, however, to maintain that an increase in profit will be a direct cause of instituting diversity training and not some other factor.

More directly tied to diversity, average ratings on performance evaluations or bonus allocation based on race or gender can be used to measure if a discrepancy exists in that some groups receive higher ratings and more bonuses and if diversity initiatives may eliminate that discrepancy. In fact, no significant difference across race or gender in bonuses or performance evaluation rating was found in a sample of organizations that adhere to a *managing* or *valuing diversity* approach, lending evidence for the potential effectiveness of this training (Kochan et al 2003). Lastly, some measurements rely entirely on a company's own interpretations of training effectiveness, evaluating the company as having an "ethos of equality" and "good intergroup interaction," or subjectively labeling hiring and promotion practices as fair (Day 1995; Dobbin et

al 2007). In these cases, top management is assuming that the diversity training has created a better work environment without a systematic attempt to validate this claim.

This leads to an overall point that can be made about many of these diversity trainings. If companies do not have clear goals for diversity and diversity training, there cannot be accurate evaluation (Day 1995; Paluck 2006). Without an expectation for what will result from the diversity training, it is problematic for companies to attempt to measure diversity training outcomes. Diversity training has become something that most organizations are implementing, without a clear consensus of what the training will accomplish and how to best evaluate if the training has succeeded in achieving these goals. A way to better evaluate the impact of these trainings is to employ a longer term assessment. A long term evaluation of diversity training includes the immediate reactions and knowledge of respondents from self-report surveys, but moves beyond that to analyze how the training information is applied by attendees, whether or not business advantages do come from the training, and if the level of productivity and inclusion does increase post-training (Corporate Leadership Council (CLC) 2004; Chavez and Weisinger 2008; Turnbull et al 2010). Doing such a comprehensive evaluation can ensure that diversity goals are met by a training, or provide avenues for changing a program, if goals are left incomplete. A company taking the long-term, application-based approach to evaluation is able to provide quantifiable evidence, such as retention rates and savings in costs, for the success of a training (CLC 2004). Too often, organizations stop at the basic level of evaluation, focusing on immediate self-reports, which cannot explain very much about the impact of diversity training on workplace culture.

Diversity Training in the Critical Diversity Approach

The specifics of the training described above concentrate on organizations that take a *managing diversity or valuing diversity* approach to diversity initiatives, including training. A far less researched diversity training is that which adopts the *critical diversity* approach, which moves beyond valuing difference to show how certain differences are connected to opportunity in the workplace (Linnehan and Konrad 1999; Ahmed 2007). In format and presentation, a training that takes a *critical diversity* approach may look very similar to the *managing* or *valuing diversity* training. Handouts, videos, and activities are all used to engage the attendees and deliver information (Paluck 2006). Similarly, these trainings may cover topics of intergroup communication, conflict, and stereotypes and biases. Where the *critical diversity* training diverges is that the workshop includes a discussion of how power dynamics and privilege operate in an organization to affect the opportunities that women and people of color may be granted or denied and how this works at an institutional, rather than interpersonal level (Fine 1996; Monaghan 2010). As addressed, the white, male culture of power that pervades organizations creates an atmosphere where women and people of color may not have the same opportunities as their white male counterparts and may have their work judged on different standards simply due to their group affiliation. The *critical diversity* training attempts to expose how a culture where race and gender privilege exists, when combined with underlying beliefs about women and people of color, can create an unequal workplace, even if unintentionally.

Even though the *critical diversity* training has not been the subject to a large amount of research, there is some indication as to how effective this training may be in producing a workplace that is more open to diversity, while also attacking the persistence of racism and sexism in industry. Opponents of the critical diversity training point back to the potential for

white male backlash that can occur when white men feel attacked or threatened in diversity trainings (Comer and Soliman 1996; Lynch 1997; Von Bergen et al 2002; Kalev et al 2006). If white men tend to occupy top managerial positions, and top support has been shown to be important for the success of diversity initiatives (Allen and Montgomery 2001; Cox 2001; Kalev et al 2006), turning white men away from diversity is a risk of using the a *critical diversity* training that exposes power and privilege based on race and gender. This danger, in fact, is one of the main reasons that the broad definition of diversity has become so common (Thomas 1990, 1991; Gilbert et al 1999; Ivancevich and Gilbert 2000).

From another perspective, it is not a foregone conclusion that white men will respond negatively to challenging information about racism. For instance, the delivery of the information matters. Critical diversity trainers can borrow the business justifications for diversity from their counterparts. When deconstructing the obstacles for women and people of color to advance in the organization is linked to the potential for business success, whites respond more positively to training information than if the issue is framed in terms of affirmative action or legal requirements in a *compliance-based* approach (Kidder et al 2004). The training does not need to present the critical definition in an "in-your-face" manner, as *compliance-based diversity* trainers may have done, but can subtly address how power and privilege can hurt not only the prospects of women and people of color, but the potential of the company as a whole, by not tapping full employee potential. Taking a step further, it may be the case, as proponents of *critical diversity* explain, that being confronted with white male power and privilege may initially cause guilt, anger, and/or backlash, but may upon further reflection, induce action on the part of managers because they have a new understanding of an injustice that was invisible to them before the training (Feagin and Vera 1994; Tatum 1997; Kivel 2002). Exposure to privilege can be make a

diversity training effective, when it causes attendees to become aware of how wider social problems can affect the workplace, how their own unconscious biases and unnoticed privileges —or lack thereof—can change their work outcomes, and how they can fight against the influence that power dynamics and hidden racial and gender privilege may have at their organization (Case 2007).

Backlash results from higher power group members perceiving "reverse discrimination," or a loss of opportunity because a lower status group has received some form of preferential treatment (Ivancevich and Gilbert 200; Von Bergen et al 2002; Kidder et al 2004). *Critical diversity* training allows a diversity trainer to present programs that may assist women and people of color, such as mentoring or networking, not as a preferential treatment, but as treatment that white men may already have, by nature of being white men. A training that takes a critical lens can create real change in an organization by creating a high racial awareness for white men that negates the anger and guilt inherent to backlash and welcomes white men into the movement towards a truly equal workplace (Tatum 1997).

Though this is the potential of *critical diversity* trainings, evaluation techniques are subject to the same methodological problems as the other approaches to diversity. Part of the problem in understanding the impact of diversity trainings is the fact that diversity training has become an "umbrella term" for a number of different styles of training. To make the claim that diversity training reaches goals, has no effect, or is detrimental to an organization homogenizes diversity trainings in the same way that in-groups homogenize out-groups. In actuality, diversity trainings take on various forms depending on the approach to diversity that an organization adheres to, the approach to diversity that a trainer adheres to, employee awareness of diversity-related issues, and the goals the organization has for the training. This creates vastly different

curricula and diversity training models, making it unfair and inaccurate to lump all workshops under the term diversity training. Additionally, as the racial awareness literature explains, how attendees understand diversity and the merit of diversity (or lack thereof) in the workplace is going to influence the measured effectiveness of a training (Tatum 1997; Trepagnier 2006). Attendees do not come into a training as a *tabula rasa*, but bring with them years of education, socialization, and experience around stereotypes, identity, and interpersonal/intergroup dynamics. So far, attempts to determine the impact of diversity training have ignored these important features.

This study will attempt to expand upon claims about how effective diversity training can be for an organization. To do so, it first must become clear how a trainer approaches diversity, what approach(es) they use, and how they set up and deliver a training within that approach. Second, it is necessary to examine how managers in those trainings reflect and react to the information presented in the context of their own racial awareness. Doing so can provide a comprehension of how particular approaches to diversity—be they *compliance-based, managing, celebrating, valuing, or critical*— impact the actions and thought processes of individuals in the training. This allows for an analysis of the impact of various different diversity trainings, expanding the conversation from a monolithic view of the diversity training field to portray diversity training as an industry subject to as much difference as today's heterogeneous, global workforce.

CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN

Most research on the efficacy of diversity trainings has relied on attendees' self-report post-training surveys assessing satisfaction of the training seminar or measuring existence of stereotypes and biases; or large data sets enumerating the representation of historically underrepresented groups in managerial positions (Kalev et al. 2006; Paluck and Green 2009). While these studies are informative, they fail to explain the direct effect that diversity trainings have on managerial thought processes about the impact of diversity in the workplace and their own decision making processes involving actions such as assigning tasks, recruitment, hiring, and promotion. In-depth interviews, a qualitative method, can further the understanding of how managers are applying diversity information or why managers may not be applying information from a diversity training. These interviews can also explain how diversity trainings are perceived at the managerial level and give insight into how trainings are received by all employees. In-depth interviews, then, were the best method for exploring managerial reactions to diversity training material.

Moreover, the variety of different approaches to diversity training are key in understanding how managers receive and process this information. Careful attention must be granted to the trainer's views on diversity and other factors that may influence the training model. This inductive, qualitative study employed a multi-method technique to data collection of interviewing and content analysis to investigate two primary questions: 1. How (and if) are power and privilege defined and presented in diversity training seminars? and 2. How do managers attending these seminars interpret this information in relation to their managerial duties? This study was inductive in that I did not enter my research with an hypothesis, but used the data to identify themes and develop theory. This section will lay out the methodological

design of the study. Sampling proved particularly difficult, so I will grant special attention to the methods employed to develop a valid sample.

Sampling

The specific design of this project has moved through various stages, mainly due to difficulty with developing a sample. This study has taught me that research is a process and that a researcher must be willing and able to adjust the design of a study in response to unforeseen challenges. Naturally, sampling for this study began with the ideal study design. In the ideal design, I would have solicited trainers willing to take part in an interview and allow me to view their training curriculum. I would then observe a few of their trainings and use my presence in these trainings to solicit managers who would be willing to be interviewed about their reactions to the training and experiences as a manager. Unfortunately, I learned that observation would not be feasible. Those diversity trainers who responded to my requests offered one of two explanations.

First, people in organizations were worried that having a researcher in the room would stifle conversation. Diversity trainings are meant to be workshops where employees can discuss difficult issues about working with people who are 'different' and the dangers of biases and discrimination in the workplace. It is understandable that organizations would feel this way, though it is not necessarily a correct assumption. In the one training I did observe, participants spoke candidly about their experiences, as if I was not present in the room. The second factor contributing to my inability to observe also regards the difficult discussions that happen in diversity trainings. Corporations were worried that I may hear something in the training that alludes to an act of prejudice that someone experienced or problems that the institution was having regarding diversity. Though I ensured confidentiality and anonymity, the thought of

having an undergraduate researcher writing about such events seemed too risky for the organization, as many companies have been fined or sanctioned by the EEOC for violations of policy. This speaks to the fact that many corporations are still struggling with diversity work and forced a shift in the focus of the research.

Access and Recruitment

The literature on diversity trainings implied that nearly all corporations were partaking in diversity trainings. As such, I expected it to be easy to find companies doing this form of diversity work. Since companies rarely list that they are currently doing diversity training, finding diversity trainers, rather than companies, seemed to be a better route to take to solicit participants for the study. Additionally, I expected that diversity trainers, by the fact that they make their living doing diversity work, would be open to or interested in my study. Thus, I focused on finding diversity trainers who act as outside consultants, who could work on my behalf to gain access into the corporations and organizations in which they train.

Sampling for diversity trainers was non-probability, purposive sampling. An internet search of diversity trainers in the greater Boston area yielded a website containing twenty-eight possible participants for the trainer portion of the study. I also conducted a search for trainers near my hometown in Pennsylvania, which yielded just one possibility. Of these trainers, eighteen were contacted based on some general initial criteria: the ability to find contact information and a claim that they were involved in diversity training at a corporation. Initially, the study design aimed to include two different types of diversity trainers: one that included a discussion of power and privilege in their training and one that did not. Power, anti-racism, and bias reduction were key words in identifying consultants or consulting companies that would fit

in the study sample criteria as well. As the study progressed and I learned more about the various diversity training models, my criteria evolved to include a more diverse array of trainers.

E-mails were sent to all eighteen consulting companies or trainers explaining the study and the opportunity to participate. Of the eighteen, I received nine responses, for a 50% response rate. A common theme amongst respondents was that they were unable to help me themselves, but were willing to provide me with contact information for colleagues. Oftentimes these respondents were not currently training. This set in motion a period of snowball sampling resulting in phone and e-mail correspondence with fifteen new contacts.

In addition to the internet search, I used previous contacts that I received while working in a diversity office to procure participants. This added five new possibilities, none of which were both currently training and able to gain me access to observe. I also attempted to use university contacts to assist in sampling for trainers. Professors provided me with applicable employees at organizations, mostly in human resources departments, who may be able to help. Similarly, I contacted and visited university offices that focus on diversity or socially-conscious business practices. Unfortunately, these offices were unable to provide me with any potential contacts for this study. The professor recommendations, much like many of the diversity consultants, were unable to personally help me, but provided me with multiple contacts to try. These contacts generated no opportunities to observe trainings. In a last effort, the university's alumni database was used to 'cold-call' former students who now work in corporate settings. E-mails were sent to alumni working in corporations in the Boston area in either human resources departments or in executive or top managerial positions. Human resource employees would have close connection to scheduling and designing the diversity trainings and those in top managerial positions would have the power to put me in contact with the right people in their organization.

These e-mails went predominantly unanswered. Of the two alumni that did respond, one was no longer working in the Boston area. The other put me in contact with the head of his corporation's diversity office, who spoke with me, but refused observation at their organization. In total, in this first attempt at sampling over a three month period, I contacted nearly one hundred individuals or companies by phone or e-mail.

The second population essential to this study was managers who participated in diversity trainings with the trainers that agreed to interviews. After interviewing trainers, I asked them to put me in contact with people at organizations where they had recently trained. In some cases, trainers gave me the e-mail address or phone number of the person and I made the initial contact. In other cases, trainers wanted to first make certain that a person would be willing to take part in the study and then gave that person my information, so the potential participant could contact me. Initially, I attempted to utilize purposive sampling and request contacts for white, male managers working in the corporate sector. However, the corporate world proved a difficult one to enter. People at corporations did not respond to me, did not respond to the trainer's request, or responded to the trainer that they would not be willing to be in contact with me. In some cases, I attempted to find managers on my own, by going to trainer's websites, looking at their past clients, and attempting to contact people via e-mail and phone in human resources or diversity offices at corporations listed. When this yielded no responses, sampling switched to mainly a convenience method. Due to time constraints, it became necessary to interview any willing manager, regardless of industry, organization, race, or gender, in order to evaluate the trainings that the diversity trainers described to me.

Sample composition

In total there were five diversity trainers— one male and four females; three whites and two people of color. I interviewed eight willing managers—seven males and one female; seven whites and one person of color. The specific breakdown of the race and gender of diversity trainers and the race, gender, and industry of managers can be seen in Table 1 and Table 2. Each of these managers met my criteria of having a supervisory role, which included direct contact with employees who were lower in the organizational hierarchy. Even though I did not talk exclusively to white males, as originally planned, the managers in this study provided relevant information because of their positions in their organizations and the spectrum of racial discourse, which will be discussed later.

Table 1—Diversity Trainer Demographics

Race		Gender	
White	Black	Male	Female
3	2	1	4

Table 2—Manager Demographics

Race		Gender		Industry				
White	Black	Male	Female	Housing	Government	Education	Youth Services	Religious Organization
7	1	7	1	1	2	2	2	1

Data Collection

The primary method of data collection was semi-structured, in-depth interviews with five diversity trainers and eight managers who participated in diversity programs with these trainers.

The secondary method was content analysis of training materials in order to add breadth and depth to the analysis of the diversity training models.

Allowing trainers to talk at length about the features of diversity that they find significant, and how they formulate a training program from those beliefs, highlights distinct differences in training programs that are lost when previous research discusses "diversity training" as a monolith. Trainer interviews were semi-structured and on average lasted forty-five to sixty minutes. Though I had an interview guide developed with themes from the literature review, such as the predominant racial discourse in the training and methods for evaluating training effectiveness (see Appendix A), I allowed the trainers' experiences and beliefs to guide the conversation. This ensured that trainers were able to elucidate their personal thoughts on diversity and diversity training in as much detail as they desired. This method of conducting interviews resulted in greater insights into the construction of diversity training models.

All trainer interviews occurred face-to-face, either at the trainer's office, a local coffee shop, or other agreed upon location and were recorded on a digital recorder for later analysis. To triangulate data from these interviews, I attempted to procure the training curriculum from each trainer, since observation was not an option. One trainer allowed me to use their curriculum. I was unable to collect curricula from other trainers because, in some cases, trainers did not have a curriculum in a format that can easily be transferred or trainers did not want their curriculum circulated for proprietary reasons. In the training analysis chapter that follows, I describe the activities that each trainer includes with a strong sensitivity for what trainers wanted and did not want shared about their curriculum. The four trainers that did not share their curriculum did, however, have websites. Websites were visited as a secondary method for collecting information about the services provided by trainers, how they define diversity and the way that power and

privilege may influence those conversations and designs. All websites had basic information on the topics that trainings cover and what each training was supposed to address. Two websites had excerpts from training videos which provided valuable information and training examples. Website text and/or video, along with interview notes and transcripts provide the unit of analysis for the trainers. I discuss the analysis in the data analysis section below.

Like the trainer interviews, for manager interviews I had an interview guide developed with themes from the literature review, such as racial awareness and individual change around stereotyping to determine managerial thoughts on diversity and reactions to training material (see Appendix A). Once again, this guide allowed for different avenues of conversation, but managers dictated the course of the conversation, so that their beliefs, rather than my thoughts, were highlighted in the interviews.

For managers, due to time constraints and location of participants, three interviews had to be completed over the phone, while five occurred face-to-face. Face-to-face interviews lasted on average sixty minutes while the telephone interviews were slightly shorter due to less pauses and digressions. These interviews took place at the managers' offices in the greater Boston area and were recorded on a digital recorder for later analysis. Phone interviews presented some issues, but I believe did not threaten validity of the data. Instead it required me to undertake more aggressive probing as interviewees spent less time mulling over questions on the phone and less time answering questions. Though less probing questions needed to be asked in the face-to-face interviews, managers on the phone elaborated on their reactions at the same depth as those in the face-to-face. Additionally, the three managers in the phone interviews all attended trainings with the same trainer and agreed to be contacted for clarification if any of their answers necessitated elaboration.

Positionality

My positionality as a white male conducting this research may have affected interview data collection and analysis; however I feel I did my best to practice reflexivity through the entire process. First, since I am a white male, the white males in this study may have been more willing to be honest about their beliefs about diversity. The commonality of whiteness can alleviate some of the tensions that cause politically correct speech so that participants could speak candidly about their experiences without worrying that they would offend me due to my race (Gallagher 2008). Additionally, entering into the interviews I already had experienced moving through stages of racial awareness as a white male, so I had an idea of how white males can be resistant to this information. This experiential knowledge allowed me to be unusually aware of when interviewees felt uncomfortable in our discussion. Consequentially, I was able to ask probing questions to explore this discomfort when it was warranted or move the conversation in a different direction to relieve a participant's unease.

It is a possibility that the black male and white female managers that I interviewed would feel uncomfortable speaking to a white male about their experiences, however these participants were actually two of the most forthright participants in this study, demonstrating that they felt quite comfortable during our conversation.

Data Analysis

Trainer Interview Data

As the purpose of the trainer interviews was to provide the background information on different diversity training models for the manager interviews as opposed to generating theory, I used a qualitative form of content analysis (Neuman 2006). In the interest of time, I listened to

the interviews and took notes on the recordings rather than transcribing the interviews verbatim. I analyzed the notations to develop a continuum of diversity training models by accentuating the areas where trainers compared and contrasted with one another. Often I revisited certain areas of the interview notes where I felt a particular theme emerged around the idea of power and privilege and transcribed portions on the interview for further analysis. Essentially, trainer interviews were analyzed to allow trainers to explain for themselves the decisions that they make when approaching diversity training, what they expect their training to accomplish and how that factors into the design. Some of the questions that I asked of the data were: How are organizational power and privilege defined and presented? What approach to diversity is used in this training? and How does the trainer's goals for the training match what the trainer explains the organization's goals to be?

Website Data

If the analysis of the interviews is meant to outline what a trainer professes to do in a training, the content of the website can bolster or undermine the positions on diversity that trainers claimed to take during interviews. A latent form of content analysis was used to understand the content of these data. In latent coding, a researcher reads text or watches a video and determines whether underlying themes or meanings exist in the words being said (Neuman 2006). This type of coding is necessary for this research because it allows for the context of the conversation to be accounted for. Website data was used as a way to validate the interpretations of interviews and add more breadth and depth to the interview material. Because diversity trainings take place within an organizational culture and a larger sociopolitical context, latent coding must be used to accurately analyze what a trainer was attempting to describe in a

particular portion of an interview. Latent coding delineated the different forms of diversity training that each trainer employed and the decisions required to choose that approach to training. One of the downfalls of this analysis is that it can show how a person specifically designed a unit of analysis such as a diversity training, but cannot make any claims about how people make sense of their choices and beliefs (Neuman 2006). For this reason, trainer interviews and website data are not the extent of this research, but are used to provide the setting for analysis of managerial interviews.

Manager Interview Data

Manager interviews required a deeper level of analysis to make sense of the reactions that managers had to diversity trainings and interpret implications of such reactions and reflections within the context of the training's approach and the manager's personal beliefs before and after the training. Thus, analysis for manager interviews moved closer to a grounded theory approach. It was not traditional grounded theory because these interviews were one-time occurrences, not prolonged contact with participants (Charmaz 2003). Grounded theory is a qualitative technique that allows theories to emerge through themes that are rooted in the data (Neuman 2006). It is a flexible practice that allows the data to shape the outcomes of the research, rather than an overarching hypothesis or research question (Neuman 2006). Analyzing manager interviews this way allowed for conclusions to be drawn about the meaning and process of managerial reactions to different training approaches, how these reactions affect workplace culture, and what that means for the impact of particular training approaches. To analyze manager interviews this way, all interviews were fully transcribed. Transcriptions were coded using an open coding system and the moving towards a more focused coding system to develop relevant themes (Charmaz

2003). Some important questions I asked of the data were: What does this concept imply about managerial reactions to diversity trainings? What are managers saying about how diversity training affects their work? and What factors are mediating why managers responding similarly and differently? Significant features of the interviews were compared amongst managers who participated in trainings with the same trainer. They were also analyzed across training approaches to determine if similarities or stark differences existed depending on the trainer's approach to diversity. Analysis of manager interviews, grounded in the data and filtered through the literature provided the major themes that enhance an understanding of the impact of diversity trainings. In this analysis, I attempted to build a theory that reveals the factors that influence the use of diversity training models and how these models are able to impact managerial interpretations of diversity in the workplace.

Ethical Considerations

The connection of dimensions of diversity to the workplace can be an emotionally charged topic for people. Chances are that many people have been involved in some form of prejudice or bias during their careers. Recounting such instances may elicit strong emotions and memories. Moreover, an employee's involvement in blatant workplace prejudice or bias, if revealed, may lead to them losing responsibilities, promotional opportunities, or in the worst case scenario, their jobs. In many cases, diversity issues are connected to the law, so that problems with diversity can lead to not only poor intergroup relations or productivity, but also lawsuits, fines, or sanctions for an entire organization, not just those involved. Because of the potential institutional and personal consequences surrounding diversity, research ethics was extremely important for this study. Additionally, for trainers, diversity training is their career and source of

income. Confidentiality is of the utmost importance to ensure that personal accounts of training experience are not tied to the trainer or the company, to maintain the integrity of the trainers in their work. Ethics involved rigorous informed consent procedures and assuring confidentiality throughout the study.

Informed consent ensures that participants in the study know exactly what will be expected of them and the procedures involved. Every participant received an informed consent form (see Appendix B) explaining that participation was completely voluntary, that they had the right to refuse to answer any questions, and that they could discontinue an interview at any time. It also provided contact information for me, my academic advisor, and the university's Institutional Review Board, which oversees the ethics of the research. Throughout the interview process I encouraged participants to ask me questions and reminded them of the voluntary nature of their participation. Each participant signed a copy of the informed consent form before the interview started and they were given a copy for their own records. Informed consent also included a statement on confidentiality.

Confidentiality guarantees that in no way will participants be identifiable at any portion of the study. In this writing, every trainer and manager is referred to solely by pseudonym. Other identifying characteristics, such as company or organization name will remain unreported and indistinguishable. Interview recordings, notes, and transcripts were uploaded to a password protected, personal computer that only I have access to. They were backed-up on an external hard drive, which only I have access to. Printed copies of transcripts or notes used for data analysis were kept in a locked drawer in my apartment that only I had access to. If participants in this study worked at the same organization, which happened occasionally, I did not reveal who the other participants from that organization were. I also provided options to conduct interviews

outside of the organization, such as at a coffee shop or over lunch, so that the person would not feel uncomfortable discussing issues of workplace diversity inside their organization and to prevent previous participants from seeing me enter the organization again, but with a new person, identifying that person as a participant in the study.

These ethical considerations should guarantee that individuals remain anonymous in this study and that they were at no risk throughout their participation in the study and the following writing of data analysis.

CHAPTER III: ALL DIVERSITY TRAININGS ARE NOT CREATED EQUAL

One of the things that I feel good about bringing to the table is that I can speak all of those languages… So schools talk about multicultural education, healthcare is starting to talk about culturally competent teaching, business talks about the managing diversity language and community activists talk about social transformation, but at the core level, everyone's struggling with the same stuff, it's around in-groups and out-groups; around historical oppression. Ya know, not all of those organizations would use that language, so the techniques and the way to get into those places takes a different road.
     —Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

The literature on the impact of diversity trainings in the workplace presents these trainings as homogenous when making claims about efficacy. To a certain extent, it is to be expected that some training material would appear time and time again regardless of the training approach. As the quote from Linda at the beginning of the chapter shows, even though different industries may *talk about diversity* in different ways, at the core diversity trainings are attacking many of the same issues. Every organization is prone to in-groups and out-groups; to stereotypes, biases, and discrimination. Therefore the aim of diversity training should be to deconstruct and leave behind these detrimental aspects of workplace interaction, policies, and practices and create egalitarian, inclusive workplaces.

This research found that where diversity trainers begin to diverge is in the justifications for why bias should be deconstructed and what diversity means for an organization. In this respect, diversity trainers presented a far different picture of the spectrum of diversity training than the literature presupposes. Each trainer interviewed designed and delivered the training differently. Though various features were similar across trainers, each trainer clearly differentiated themselves from the others in significant ways. These differences were centered on trainers' approaches to and goals for diversity, their beliefs in the best diversity training model for achieving their goals, and the potential for organizational constraints on diversity

training materials. The result was five distinct models of diversity training, each with the opportunity to impact an organization in different ways.

An important distinction to make is the difference between approaches to diversity and diversity training models. Approaches to diversity represent historical trends to conceptualize diversity in a particular way, while diversity training models are used to deliver diversity information that a diversity trainer or organization deems relevant for staff. The literature outlines five historical approaches to diversity that have followed a linear progression: *compliance-based diversity, managing diversity, celebrating diversity, valuing diversity, and critical diversity.* On some levels, the following models derived from this research mirror these approaches to diversity. More often, diversity training models represent a combination of the historical approaches to diversity. Interestingly, the data from these trainers suggest that approaches to diversity do not follow a linear, chronological pathway, but are adapted and incorporated, so that each approach to diversity is still found in contemporary diversity trainings. Drawing from the trainer interviews and the content of their websites or curriculum, I first outline the specific models of diversity training that often incorporate various approaches. Next I highlight several common themes that emerged from the trainer interviews and discuss how trainers address each in their approach to diversity training.

Delineating the Diversity Training Models

Similar to the approaches to diversity, diversity training models fall on a continuum of how power and privilege is, or is not, discussed in the training. Some diversity training models always include the power and privilege discussion, other models never include this discussion, and still other models sometimes included power and privilege or include power and privilege,

but in an incomplete way. Figure 2 below outlines each diversity training model based on how

the power and privilege discussion is incorporated (or not) into the training. This section is

organized in terms of where each model falls on this continuum, beginning with a model that

does not include a discussion of power and privilege and moving toward a model that always

includes this discussion.

Figure 2—Power and Privilege, Approaches to Diversity, and Goals in Training Models

DIVERSITY TRAINING MODEL	PRESENCE OF POWER/PRIVILEGE	APPROACH(ES) TO DIVERSITY USED	MAIN TRAINING GOAL
Celebrating Diversity	No discussion of power and privilege as everyone is capable of stereotyping and using power.	Celebrating Diversity	Address interpersonal conflict by raising individual self-awareness
Ensuring Representation	Power and privilege presented as historical remnants of past discrimination and shaping current that affect assimilation of people of color into an organization.	Compliance-Based Diversity and some Valuing Diversity	Ensure legal compliance by stressing representation of protected groups
Managing and Valuing Diversity	Power and privilege discussion often linked to role within organization that can affect productivity.	Managing Diversity and Valuing Diversity	Provide knowledge and skills so an organization can reach it's full business potential
Caring Confrontation	Power and privilege always discussed in both historical and contemporary terms. Uses stages process to achieve understanding.	Critical Diversity, Valuing Diversity, and Managing Diversity	Present an analysis of various forms of oppression to create individual, institutional, and social transformation
Anti-Racist Curriculum	Power and privilege always discussed in both historical and contemporary terms in a direct manner.	Critical Diversity	Present an analysis of racism to create individual, institutional, and social transformation

Celebrating Diversity through Individual Differences

The first diversity training model, which arises more or less out of the literature, is a

celebrating diversity model. The *celebrating diversity* model draws on a very broad position of

diversity and responds to the idea of a post-racial society. Each and every way that people differ

in the workplace becomes a source of organizational diversity (Thomas 1996). As Jane, an Asian-American woman who utilizes the celebrating diversity model puts it:

> *Diversity is all of humanity. Over 6 billion people on the planet earth, that's diversity. That's it (she laughs). It's all of humanity. Diversity means that anybody from this planet earth, you can deal with. Sit down, talk, have a conversation and respect them, respect them as a human being.*
> — Jane, Asian Female, Diversity Trainer, "Celebrating Diversity"

Additionally, on her website Jane states that "Individuals have countless ways that they are different from each other." This way that Jane conceptualizes diversity focuses on respecting individuals regardless of the many ways that they differ. This might include being a smoker or not, someone's race or gender, or someone's musical taste. All of these things need to be taken into consideration when talking about diversity. Jane is certainly following the celebrating diversity approach, where all individual differences matter to the same degree, without much connection to the workplace.

The diversity as all of humanity argument closely mimics the post-racial rhetoric of planetary humanism, where people are viewed simply as humans with many different cultures and beliefs, all of which are to be celebrated (Nayak 2006). This model downplays institutional power and privilege in favor of focusing on celebrating individual diversity. The conversation must shift from one where differences get in the way of interaction to a conversation where people move beyond race, gender, sexual orientation, and other dividing factors in order to see the commonality people share as humans. This is a point that Jane makes quite clear in a training video on her company website and in the training I was lucky to observe. For example, Jane often starts a training by having people list a number of the ways that they differ from one another. After a few minutes of writing down these differences, she makes the point that human beings can discriminate based on any of these differences, equating all dimensions of diversity.

In her training video, Jane goes further to explain that differences might stop us from "seeing who is this person in front of us? What's underneath all the differences? What might stop us from seeing what this person has to offer us?" Jane's activities, then, are meant to show difference as a hindrance to interaction, which must be overcome. The hallmark, then, of the *celebrating diversity* model is getting past differences to respect humans at the interpersonal level. Concentrating on the interpersonal and equalized aspects of diversity shows that the *celebrating diversity* model lacks a discussion of power and privilege, which will become clearer later in this section.

Addressing interpersonal conflict is truly the focus of the celebrating diversity model. The countless differences that divide people inside and outside of the workplace affect interaction with people who are different. The major result of these divisions stems from a feeling of discomfort with difference, which can impede communication. As the following excerpt from my conversation with Jane explains, encountering differences for the first time, such as upon entering a heterogeneous workplace, can lead to feelings of unease, but not necessarily conflict:

> Jane: *Well, in the workplace there's all kinds of diversity…so if you're an individual who has always lived in a community where everybody was the same color, same religion, same class, same economic status, than you didn't really have to engage with that much diversity…And now all of a sudden you're in a workplace with someone who's a different color skin, different religion, speaks with an accent, a different sexual orientation and you've never had to deal with all of this in one person, let alone if there's a team of people. That's a lot of diversity to manage and feel okay with and comfortable with if you're not used to it. And obviously if you're used to it than you won't have as many issues as somebody who is not used to it.*
>
> David: *So is the idea that because of people's differences it can create some sort of conflict in dealing with other people?*
>
> Jane: *I mean, it could. It really depends on the individual…They could frame it as conflict or they could frame it as 'I'm feeling uncomfortable, what is this about?' Instead of 'oh there's something wrong with you because you're the one who is different, not*

me.' It really depends on how the person frames it, how the person processes what he or she is experiencing.
        — Jane, Asian Female, Diversity Trainer, "Celebrating Diversity"

An individual's reactions to differences in others relies not only on their personal experiences with people different than them, but also on the way they conceptualize the feelings of discomfort that Jane believes accompany these encounters. Consequentially, in the *celebrating diversity* model, the diversity training must concentrate on effective ways to interact with people who are different and effective ways to interpret the feelings of discomfort that are to be expected.

Diversity trainings in the *celebrating diversity* model go to great lengths to make people more self-aware of their own biases in order to help them communicate better with the diversity that they will inevitably be confronted with in the workplace. One example that Jane uses in her training is an analogy to being an alcoholic. Jane used this analogy in the training I observed and elaborated on it in our interview:

> *For example if I was an alcoholic and my good friend David tried to help me see it, but I just keep telling him 'no I'm not, I'm not. I just like to drink.' He can talk to me until he's blue in the face, but until I'm willing to acknowledge it, I'm not going to do anything. I'm just going to keep drinking until I have a car accident then maybe I'll wake up. So that example is to make people see this is what we are talking about—self-awareness. It's about being willing to say to yourself 'I guess I do have some problems here.' And only you can acknowledge it.*
>   — Jane, Asian Female, Diversity Trainer, "Celebrating Diversity"

The example of the alcoholic shows that discomfort caused by diversity in the workplace can impede interaction, if people are unwilling to recognize their biases. Jane uses this example in her trainings to show how detrimental being unaware can be. Just like the alcoholic continues to practice destructive behavior, the person who is not self-aware continues to have deficient relationships with people who are different than them. Thus, the individual is presumed to be the

greatest beneficiary of the training. *Celebrating diversity* in a training setting takes on the major topic of self-awareness, which enhances communication and listening. Self-awareness allows a person to reflect on their feelings of discomfort to attempt to understand why they may feel a certain sense of unease toward another individual. In this model, individuals are able to name the immediate cause of discomfort, but do not take the analysis farther to understand where and how these thoughts are created.

Biases, and more importantly the inability to get over biases, can hold a person back in the business world. For proponents of the *celebrating diversity* model, such as Jane, self-awareness is the way to prevent biases from impeding success. Diversity training should provide examples that assist managers and staff in understanding the connection of biases to achievement.

> *It's all about engaging them with questions and helping them see. Asking them a simple question like well how many of you want to get a promotion? Maybe be a team leader some day? Be a manager? Well, do you think, if you want to be a manager you can say to your boss, 'I want to manage people, but only people who look like me. I can't manage people who are of a different race.' Or, how many people want a job, get hired somewhere? Well, I hate to tell you this, but in the interview you can't say, "can you tell me the race of all the people who work here, the sexual orientation, the religion of all the people, because I can only work in a place where people are of the same religion as me."*
> — Jane, Asian Female, Diversity Trainer, "Celebrating Diversity"

This example of a tool that Jane uses shows that the *celebrating diversity* model concentrates solely on the individual and self-awareness, clarifying her earlier point about the individual being the biggest beneficiary of the training. Talking about self-awareness naturally leads to the two other main features of this training: communication and listening. Biases are a hindrance to communication and listening. If engaging with a person who is different constantly evokes discomfort, people are not going to be able to effectively communicate or listen to one another. In any interaction, especially an interaction that affects job performance, communication and

listening are indispensible skills. Self-awareness about personal biases frees a person from the discomfort and allows them to communicate and listen to different colleagues without problems. Thus, increasing individual self-awareness, through raising employee consciousness about how differences can hurt interactions and opportunities at the individual and interpersonal level is the major goal of diversity trainings in the *celebrating diversity* model. For instance, in the training Jane often asks participants to write a few sentences down describing her. As she explains, this exercise shows that everyone perceives others in different ways, which can be a tool for understanding how differences can be problematic:

> *I like to use an exercise where I ask people to describe me, like write down what you see. And then I have them exchange it and I ask them to read what somebody else wrote and if they wrote the same thing you did, then stand up. And nobody stands up. That to me is powerful. Because you demonstrated right in front of them that this is what we're talking about. No people see each other the same exact way and here it is. There's one of me and there's 35 of you and all I asked you do was write in two lines or less what you see and no two people wrote the same thing…this is what goes on—people's perception. This is their perception and they think that their perception is the same as someone else's. That was a perfect example. I couldn't have asked for a better example of that.*
> — Jane, Asian Female, Diversity Trainer, "Celebrating Diversity"

When people realize that their perception of a situation can be drastically different than someone else's, they begin to notice how differences can hinder communication. With this knowledge, participants should be able to identify when difference may hamper communication and task completion. The self-awareness gained by acknowledging the barrier should aid interaction.

Jane explores some of the strengths of this diversity training model, while also exposing some of the problems as she explains ways to evaluate if goals have been met or if more diversity training is necessary:

> *Until you are willing to sit with yourself and say "Yes, I do [have an issue with this person]", nothing's going to change. And you could stay the way you are, but, ya know, a good question to ask people is to say, 'Listen, do you like the results you're getting?' If you do, then don't change anything. Just keep being the way you are, but if you don't like the results you are getting then maybe there's something you might want to change about*

yourself. So if every team you work on, you keep running into problems with everyone on the team, it can't be everyone on the teams' fault. Right?...Anyone who says: 'oh no everything's perfect.' Like, great well then they should get up and teach the rest of the world how to embrace diversity.
— Jane, Asian Female, Diversity Trainer, "Celebrating Diversity"

Focusing on the individual, Jane argues that her trainings have the potential to enhance interpersonal relations. If people become better listeners and communicators, especially with people that they normally feel uncomfortable with, diversity will no longer be a barrier to conversations or work projects, or cause that sense of unease between different individuals. The *celebrating diversity* model, then, is applicable beyond the workplace. It may be beneficial for all groups such as sports teams or religious groups to experience such a training to enhance their abilities to communicate and understand each other. Absent in this training, though, is inequality. Her analysis that if "everything's perfect" in an organization then you have "embrace[d] diversity" is a dangerous leap to make. For example, an organization that is completely homogenous and made up of dominant groups, may not have any problems with feeling uncomfortable or struggling with communication because everyone in the organization has had similar life experiences. The organization may have gotten to this level of comfort inside the organization because of discriminatory hiring or recruiting practices. This highlights that issues of power and privilege in organizations are noticeably missing from the *celebrating diversity* model.

Additionally, by seeing diversity as all human differences, somebody's political affiliation or diet is equated with other dimensions of diversity such as race or gender. While each of these has the opportunity to create uncomfortable feelings between individuals, historical and systemic discrimination create additional barriers in the workplace for groups such as women, the disabled, or people of color. That Jane does not concentrate on these more

institutional problems does not mean that she is unaware of these issues. In fact, she talks about how embracing diversity requires putting aside one's ego and power, displaying a very basic understanding of how power and systemic oppression may operate. With that said, in the *celebrating diversity* model, the focus needs to be on individuals. Since the most important goal is to raise self-awareness in the individual, trainers must concentrate on individuals, not systems. Thus, personal beliefs about the discomfort that comes from diversity and a very broad definition of diversity creates a diversity training model that focuses exclusively on individual self-awareness of biases and discomfort, which "requires humility, honesty, and emotional courage" so that communication and listening skills can flourish. The *celebrating diversity* model is fully immersed in the post-racial discourse, showing that Jane is someone with a low racial awareness. She believes that differences exist in the workplace, but race no longer creates additional barriers to success, so that discussing racial power and privilege in a diversity training is unnecessary. All differences can cause discomfort to an equivalent degree and training must be used to thwart the detrimental effects of uneasy feelings about different groups.

Ensuring Representation through Compliance and Stereotype Reduction

While the *celebrating diversity* model draws on post-racial discourse, the *ensuring representation* model focuses on how diversity affects opportunity in the workplace that may be restricted due to historical racism. This diversity training model makes a concerted attempt to connect diversity to the law. From the basic conceptualization of diversity in the *ensuring representation* model, it is clear that the compliance-based diversity approach is present. As one trainer explains it:

> *I mean we… have a base diversity curriculum and… it really talks about how in this world our workforce is diverse by everything from race to gender to economic status and*

so just really fleshing out what does diversity mean to you and just hear from everyone in the room what their perspective is and then connecting that to what are protected groups based on the law…which basically focuses on race, genetics, gender, sex, disability, and really focusing on that and connecting the overall diversity of an agency to these specifics groups the law had to protect based on the history.
— Christine, Black Female, Diversity Trainer, "Ensuring Representation"

Individuals in this type of training are encouraged to explore what diversity means to them on a personal level, but it is Christine's task as a trainer to ensure that employees leave a training knowing that certain dimensions of diversity are attached to EEO law. In doing so, the *ensuring representation* model acknowledges a history of oppression that has yet to be remedied. This acknowledgement provides the major diversity goal for this kind of training, namely representation. Representation means that people in these "protected groups" should be present in all levels of an organization and that opportunities for advancement should not be closed off to members of any particular group. Christine discussed this goal for the training and ways to assess an organization in terms of diversity:

Coming into the workforce, ya know, you want to make sure that you are not discriminating in that manner. You want to have everything kind of open and accessible and then just really have people just kind of look at the workplace from the top to the bottom. I often find that to be helpful, in terms of who's at the top of the agency and then where are the women, where are the people of color in the agency and then going all the way down to who comes in to clean the agency.
— Christine, Black Female, Diversity Trainer, "Ensuring Representation"

Christine begins her training by explaining that the reason for the training, first and foremost, is a government mandate to provide training to employees about the legality surrounding diversity. This is connected to a mission to "hire, promote, and retain women and men from different racial, cultural, economic, and ethnic backgrounds regardless of their sexual orientation or disability status." This immediately links diversity to mandatory workplace practices. Diversity training is considered a way to ensure compliance with EEO law, so that discrimination does not

inhibit the representation of protected groups throughout the organizational hierarchy. The *ensuring representation* model also borrows from the valuing diversity approach to show how lack of engagement with diversity can be a moral issue. Mainly, this is seen through stereotyping. In her training, one way Christine addresses stereotyping is by showing the video "A Class Divided," which documents an exercise created by Jane Elliott (Peters 1985). This video shows Elliott's famous exercise where she divided her classroom into students with blue eyes and students with brown eyes and continued to give privileges to those with blue eyes, which was meant to signify white privilege in the United States. Using stereotypes, Elliott praises the blue-eyed students and chastises the brown-eyed students, which actually leads to real consequences, such as poorer academic results for the brown-eyed students. This activity and subsequent discussion is intended to make people in the training think about how they stereotype members of protected groups and how this might affect workplace practices. In some cases, it leads to managers realizing how their stereotypes influenced their decisions.

Christine described a story that a manager recounted during one of the training sessions regarding stereotypes. This manager did not give important writing assignments to a woman who spoke with an accent. While the woman had clearly proven her ability to write by making it to her professional position, the manager's stereotype caused him to pass her over for these opportunities. It was a hindrance both to the woman because she was unable to practice her craft and build a résumé of important contributions to her field, and for the organization because a valuable resource, the woman's writing prowess, remained untapped because of the manager's stereotype. The consequences of the stereotype border on discrimination based on the woman's accent, which could be seen as a violation of EEO law under the woman's status in a protected group. It also hints at representation as the woman's lack of experience with important writing

assignments may hurt her ability to gain promotions. If this stereotyping is widespread, members of groups that speak with accents, which are typically attached to a racial or ethnic group, may falter at certain levels of an organization and be unable to advance. This example shows that in the *ensuring representation* model compliance-based diversity and valuing diversity are intertwined, with more focus placed on compliance-based diversity and the law. Still, Christine recognizes that stereotypes and lack of discussion about diversity are major obstacles to representation:

> *I think I see [discrimination] play out more in terms of stereotypes. People bring their stereotypes with them and certainly diversity training is a great way to get at these stereotypes... I think it [diversity training] is critical in organizations because...we generally talk about these issues... behind closed doors, but we very seldom talk about it openly with one another. And I think it's still perceived as almost like a bad word and the fact that diversity exists in a workforce means we should talk about it and it shouldn't be taboo... But being conscious about making sure everyone has promotional opportunities, that starts with the conversation rather than people keeping things in their head and maybe relying on stereotypes or one experience with a member of that group and I think diversity training allows different perspectives to hear from other staff or managers about their experiences. So I think that conversation helps to open up people minds, that's the goal and to get them to shift a little.*
> — Christine, Black Female, Diversity Trainer, "Ensuring Representation"

Shifting the mindset can result from talking about diversity and stereotypes and learning ways to act without relying first and foremost on preconceived notions about individuals based on group membership. The blend of stereotyping and EEO law provides the backbone of diversity trainings from the *ensuring representation* model.

The *ensuring representation* model shows the beginnings of an analysis of power and privilege by connecting diversity to historically oppressed groups that the law now protects. This is evident in a case study video that Christine currently uses in her trainings about diversity and promotional opportunities.

It's basically a man that's African-American. He's a partner in a firm. His colleagues are white, the managing partners are white, and there's a promotional opportunity. When he says he's ready for it, the manager says 'well I never thought about you.' And he's just shocked because there was no feedback and I think that happens a lot… where people are afraid to give open and honest feedback for fear that the person of color may accuse them of being racist… So I think that to avoid that labeling, you just maybe not really supervise a person or give them all great marks or ya know. But then when an opportunity comes you feel like you can't put this person in this position because they're not really prepared. But they haven't been prepared and it's just this cycle. And so I instituted that so they could have a real conversation because I think it's a bout fairness and inequality.
— Christine, Black Female, Diversity Trainer, "Ensuring Representation"

In this case study, a partner in a firm is unable to receive a promotion because he has not been supervised adequately. The video puts forth the idea that the reason the person did not receive adequate feedback is because a white supervisor was unwilling to give negative feedback—which may have helped the man improve his abilities and become eligible for the promotion—because of fear that the man, who is black, would perceive the negativity as racism. Race is a protected category under the law and in this example race presumably factored into a promotional opportunity where whites had the power to make promotional decisions and by-passed a black man. This shows a white privilege to receive constructive feedback, which can assist people in advancing their careers. It is still, however, intimately tied to compliance and fairness in terms of promotion and evaluation.

Christine's personal experiences as a person of color working as an advocate for many years have moved her to a high racial awareness that motivates her to work for racial equality. Using only legal aspects and representation does not, though, show the full extent of how power and privilege continue to operate at the institutional level of organizations. *Ensuring representation* trainings provide the venue for an open discussion about diversity and stereotypes and prompts organizations to look at their representation throughout the organization. They may not, however, examine the inclusion of members of protected groups into the workplace culture,

even if they are represented at all different levels of the organization. *Ensuring representation* trainings are reminiscent of compliance-based approaches in the Civil Rights era, with the addition of stereotyping and the disadvantages to productivity that come from workplace bias. The task for trainers like Christine is to design a way to deliver legal requirements, while keeping participants engaged in a conversation about diversity and its workplace correlates.

Managing and Valuing Diversity through the Business Case for Diversity

The third diversity training model offers one of the clearest examples of combining approaches to diversity into a training. The *managing and valuing diversity* model marries the business case for diversity and the moralistic view of inclusion. Diversity is conceptualized as important to increasing revenue and marketability of a company in a society that is becoming increasingly heterogeneous and global. Diversity training is a way to work towards these economic benefits, while also making a concerted effort at inclusion of all employees in a workplace culture, regardless of differences. In the valuing diversity approach, inclusion is often a process of assimilation as the dominant group dictates the organizational culture. Natalie fleshes out what it means for someone to use this diversity model:

> *It's really looking at the bot[tom line], so it's not just the right thing to do, but really this is important to our business strategy for these reasons and we aren't going to continue to grow or be successful, as a company or organization if we are not able to be really effective around diversity and inclusion… well we talk about diversity and inclusion. So diversity are all of those commonalities and differences that people bring with them into the workplace and really inclusion is how you kind of create a culture in an organization …that allows people to bring their whole selves into the workplace and to contribute to the organizational goals. So it's really, if people feel that they are not fully accepted or that they have to leave part of their identity at the door then they're not going to be as motivated, as innovative, as creative.*
> — Natalie, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

As Natalie's words clarify, the business strategy of managing diversity becomes the predominant reason for training in the *managing and valuing diversity* model. Valuing diversity becomes more apparent in her discussion of "the right thing to do." While not the only reason for diversity training, people need to feel included in the workplace to reach their full potential. Her point about leaving a piece of identity at the door connects directly to respecting differences because it is moral and just. Still this model wavers back to managing diversity, as inclusion is linked to motivation and creativity, which are clearly business goals. Natalie's organization makes this clear on their website where they state that their "diversity model illustrates [their] comprehensive approach to building inclusive and high-performing organizations." In Natalie's training, case studies are often integral to understanding how to manage and value diversity in an organization. Her organization's website contains a video laying out possible dialogues between colleagues for training participants to learn how to respond to diversity in the workplace from the managing diversity approach. One such dialogue proceeds in this manner:

> *A [white male] manager has just been told that he and his staff members have to attend diversity training over the next six months. 'This is a waste of my time,' he says. 'I have more important work to get done. Diversity is just the flavor of the month.'*

A few of his colleagues respond to the manager in this manner:

> *"The workforce is changing and there aren't enough trained people to meet the demand. Unless the company makes a concerted effort to hire people from groups that it may have traditionally overlooked, it won't be able to keep up with the competition."*

> *"Diversified business is really important! I think our company should expand its lines beyond cosmetics into clothing and soft drinks."*

This first response is meant to show participants how someone thinking from a managing diversity approach would respond to the manager's comments. The second response shows someone who does not understand what the business case for diversity is and needs the training to recognize how human diversity relates to business. Case studies like this, which allow

participants to evaluate people's responses to diversity material, while learning what it means to view diversity from a managing diversity approach are common in Natalie's trainings.

Natalie's decision to take a *managing and valuing diversity* model shows the evolution of her own understanding of diversity. As a self-proclaimed "lawyer in recovery," Natalie has always had an affinity for legal issues around diversity. Still, through a poignant experience advocating for black students being expelled from public schools at a high rate, she discovered that creating equality was going to "take more than law." This induced an interest in the training field. In light of her experiences and beliefs, it is understandable that Natalie would forego a compliance-based model and move to a different conceptualization, which focuses on inclusion, while using attractive justifications, such as increased profit. Interestingly, Natalie has followed the historical pathway of viewing diversity as rooted in the law to something that can be capitalized on in the workplace. Her evolution, though, is noticeably different than that of diversity discourse in society. While the diversity discourse shifted because legal issues such as affirmative action were viewed as no longer necessary, Natalie's belief was that the law should remain, but could not be the only tool for creating equality.

This explains that in Natalie's own personal life she has had experiences where racial power and privilege have been very salient. She most likely has moderate racial awareness, as she does not completely connect this personal understanding with the focus of her training model. The *managing and valuing diversity* model takes a broad definition of diversity. As Natalie mentioned earlier, it includes commonalities and differences in the workplace. She elaborates on this point to show how diversity is presented in this model:

> *[Diversity] starts with personality… then primary ones [categories] like race, gender, sexual orientation, age, physical ability or disability, then there's external ones: religions, family situation, your military status, then all those kind of other things that we can think of, then on the outer rings would be where you are in the organization are you*

a manager or not, what's your functional role? Ya know so we see all of these things as things that both shape how you see the world, but also how people see you and interact with you.
— Natalie, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

To show how personal diversity shapes how employees "see the world," Natalie's training includes a section on how unconscious biases affect workplace interaction. She focuses part of this discussion on exercises that explore micro-inequities and micro-affirmations, which can be tricky for managers. Micro-inequities are small gestures or comments towards a co-worker that may or may not be intentional, but are perceived by that co-worker to represent a bias against the co-worker's identity. Natalie explained how she trains around these instances where the problems between individuals may be vague or ill-defined, but still impede productivity:

Natalie: We'll teach you about micro-inequities and how you substitute micro-affirmations, so a number of different tools.

David: What exactly are the micro-affirmations and micro-inequities?...

Natalie: Right, so you know they could be something really small like just interrupting someone, or… not including someone in a conversation, or making some comment about ya know asking someone who's Asian-American, where are you from? So things like that. Things that may be small that people may not even be aware of, may not understand where its coming from in themselves. And then talking about ways to really replace those with more supportive kinds of comments or really more genuinely listening kinds of things, rather than you know…Some of the skills are not really that different than some of the skills that may be taught in other courses like active listening skills, or coaching skills, or how do you develop people. What we find is that sometimes people may have these skills with certain people, but not with other people because of their own discomfort or biases, so that's where we try to kind of work.
— Natalie, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

In her discussion of micro-inequities, Natalie is talking about training people to recognize their subtle tendencies to exclude members of a certain group or treat members of a certain group differently than others. She gives tools to replace these micro-inequities by telling participants that they can change these thoughts and actions to be more supportive of one another. Once

again the focus is on creating a more productive workplace. Natalie returns the conversation to the business case for diversity by showing how these skills are just like any other job skills that people would use to better "develop people" and keep the organization strong.

The *managing and valuing diversity* model does not explicitly talk about power and privilege, which is indicative of a managing diversity frame of mind, where these issues are overshadowed by a focus on the bottom line. This is a normal training in the *managing and valuing diversity* model, but the combination of the two approaches to diversity provides for flexibility in the training so that diversity training curricula can adapt to the organizational culture of the company where the training takes place. The combination provides room so that training's specific features can be modified to reach different goals for different companies, so that power and privilege can be included if the client wants that information in the training. There are, however, purposes for the training that span across company settings; something that Natalie discussed in our interview:

> *Well, I think the training really can raise awareness and give people some skills about how to deal with situations that are challenging for them or so they don't just operate out of default mode. Our feeling, I mean, is that most people, at this point, are well intentioned, I mean there are always some who aren't, but we have a lot of unconscious biases and assumptions that we make about people that we may not even be aware of and can influence how we interact with them, so we try to make people more aware of this, give people the tools to establish more authentic relationships with people, to have difficult conversations, so if somebody feels that they've been disrespected in some way. I think that can really give people more tools to use and give people a comfort level so they are able to engage with those issues better instead of falling back.*
> — Natalie, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

The training, if successful, will have assisted people to recognize their own biases and stereotypes. At first, this appears to mimic the *celebrating diversity* model of diversity training. Important to keep in mind is that at the basic level each model attempts to attack these biases and stereotypes. What becomes important is understanding *why* these biases and stereotypes need to

be named and avoided. The *celebrating diversity* model focuses on interpersonal interaction for the person's own individual benefit, so that they feel more comfortable and can engage with different people. The *managing and valuing diversity* model sees increasing comfort as significant, but significant first and foremost because it leads to increased profits and the moral inclusion of employees. So while the individual change may be similar, the proposed outcomes of that change are drastically different, showing the contrasting styles of these two models.

To this point, none of the three models has explicitly discussed power and privilege on a regular basis. The flexibility of the *managing and valuing diversity* model allows for the inclusion of this discussion, if an organization wants that conversation, but power and privilege are inherently absent in the business case for diversity. Though talking about inclusion provides some semblance of the power discussion, inclusion in this model is more about the moral aspects of respecting everyone, so that differences are still seen as equivalent, each of which deserves respect. Natalie's organization makes this point on their website when they mention that once an organization is diverse, the next "question arises—are we all comfortable bringing our differences into the workplace? Do we feel included?" Everyone should be comfortable bringing all of their differences to the workplace from a moral standpoint because it is the right thing to do and from the business standpoint to gain a competitive edge in global markets. From a different standpoint, inclusion can be conceptualized as a way to fully integrate people of all groups into all levels of an organization to balance the extent to which one group has the power to guide the course of an organization or company. Understanding inclusion in this manner is essential to the next two trainings which employ different techniques to advance the critical diversity approach.

Critical Diversity through Caring Confrontation

The next two models reveal another important feature of diversity trainings: the delivery. In all trainings it is not just the material that is important, but how that material is presented. Nothing can make this point clearer than two models that employ the same approach to diversity, but present the information in vastly different ways. The approach to diversity in question is the critical diversity approach, which makes the determined appeal that power and privilege function interpersonally and institutionally to continue to affect outcomes and opportunities for individuals. Delivering this information to participants requires a strategically planned model. The *critical diversity through caring confrontation* model is very strategic and uses various other approaches to diversity to bolster the predominant approach of critical diversity.

In the critical diversity approach, power and privilege are always part of the discussion. Any talk about diversity cannot be separated from how power and privilege operate. Linda, who opened this chapter with her words on different strategies in diversity training, employs the *caring confrontation* model to further the discussion on power and privilege and break down the grounds for "—isms" in the workplace and society at large:

> *The institutional "ism" analysis is much more powerful and much more life changing… We're doing this because there've been large-scale social inequalities. That's what's driving this work. So I think we need to own that…who you are does give you some perks and it also gives you some liabilities. And so trying to talk from a place that lifts people up, but also holds people really responsible. Sort of called a caring confrontation.*
> — Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

This "caring confrontation" as Linda puts it, is a powerful, yet non-threatening way to get people to a place where they understand how power and privilege operate. Linda's website explains that the *caring confrontation* model has pieces of the valuing diversity approach, but always remains critical:

At the same time, we believe that valuing diversity is not sufficient to address the continuing inequalities and exclusion in the United States and abroad. Therefore, our approach includes an analysis of the role of power in interpersonal relationships and institutional systems. By addressing these two key elements together - valuing differences and challenging "isms" (such as racism, sexism, heterosexism, etc.)- we offer a comprehensive perspective that guides effective personal, organizational, and societal change.
— Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

From Linda's perspective, you need multiple pieces, not just the critical diversity approach to further a critical agenda. Present in Linda's belief in the need for this model of diversity training is that people can respond angrily or defensively when power and privilege are exposed. This is indicative of the backlash that opponents of the critical definition expect to occur in diversity trainings (Comer and Soliman 1996; Lynch 1997; Von Bergen et al 2002; Kalev et al 2006). The *caring confrontation* model, however, is all about strategically addressing power and privilege, so that participants recognize that power and privilege have impacts for members of all groups in an organization, but do not respond with the negativity that opponents of critical diversity fear. This is done primarily by how information is presented.

Linda uses strategies to caringly confront participants about power and privilege as it relates to dimensions of diversity. As mentioned, one of these strategies involves connecting critical diversity to other approaches. In our conversation, Linda discussed how the managing diversity approach also comes into the *caring confrontation* model:

So what I try to advocate now is take the best from all of those models. So the managing diversity model is all about business. Well, yeah, there are some real business things around this. It's not just a legal issue or a moral issue. There's a real business reason and we should make that case, but ...if that's the only case you make well you give people permission that if they can make more money, ya know, being oppressive then you've told them that's okay too.
— Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

Linda has an acute awareness of how many other people conduct diversity training and the models they employ. As a result, she is able to infuse the critical *caring confrontation* with

examples from other approaches. This gains her legitimacy with participants and allows her to train in a number of different industries and settings. Things such as business imperatives are actually used to advance the discussion of power and privilege, which is absent in other models that use the business case. The fusion of these models, while maintaining the message of power and privilege comes through in the way she presents diversity to participants:

> *It's about individual identities and social group identities…sometimes the valuing thing can be everything's about diversity so like 'I ordered decaf and you ordered caffeine, isn't that diversity?' and yeah, it is, but that's not like the fault line of American history. So sometimes I talk about diversity with a small 'd' and diversity with a large 'D'. To tease it out for folks…I ask people what does diversity mean? And people say: differences. And I say cool. So what kind of human differences and they start calling out everything. Some of them I put in the center circle. There are six things I put in there: race, gender, age, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and ability. The second tier has to do with more geography, job, education, by and large things in the center I call the core identities or the American Express identities 'you can't leave home without em' that are tied to our bodies in some ways. They are just carried and coded in us. Even though race is socially constructed, once society decides what it means the consequences are real, you can't leave it at home. And the 2nd things are things you have more access or choice or lack thereof and then the 3rd circle is about your organization. So I find that as a way to build for folks…and I talk about how we all walk on all sides of the line so race isn't just about people of color, gender isn't just about women. If you're a man, that's an experience too. If you're white, that's an experience too.*
> — Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

Linda differentiates between "diversity" or the definition that managing and valuing diversity approaches use and "Diversity," which is directly tied to power and privilege in the critical diversity approach. While the focus of the training shifts to the critical discourse, the dimensions of diversity found in the small "d" definition are given attention in the training. Both the large "D" and small "d" definitions are explored in an exercise that Linda frequently uses:

> *Start with doing activities that explore our own identity….so I say 'I want you to pick out three identities. One from the center circle that you can't change, especially from a dominant side' ya know we all know when we've been messed over. We can talk about that until the cows come home. I want you to think about, so you may be black and female, but you're also heterosexual and Christian. I want you to talk about that heterosexual and Christian part for a little moment just to try that on. And so for white guys to try the privilege pieces you haven't thought about as well. So have them take*

something from the center, the middle, and the organizational and talk about how that may have affected your experience here on the job. Both positively how that might have helped you and also how that might have presented different challenges around building relationships. So I think trying to personalize that around their experiences and get them to share is what's important.
  — Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

Linda starts out her trainings with something that everyone can talk about—themselves. This gets people thinking about privilege in simple terms that reflect interpersonal relationships and moving through an organization on a few different levels, not just those that are directly tied to historical oppression. At the same time, privilege is a key part of this exercise as Linda challenges participants to look at their dominant identities, which can often go unnoticed because they have become so normalized.

Linda's belief that power and privilege must always be talked about in diversity trainings stems from intellectual pursuits. Her studies in college led her to change her thinking about racism and other forms of oppression from interpersonal prejudices to institutional, systemic discrimination. As such, Linda exemplifies high racial awareness, where she feels positive about her whiteness and recognizes the need to, as a white person, be proactive in deconstructing institutionalized oppression. Her trainings attempt to create other proactive men and women who alter their thinking to begin to view "—isms" as institutional rather than only interpersonal. The expectation is that this new analysis will foster an organizational culture that not only values individuals, but ensures that members of all groups have the power to direct the course of a company or agency and that privilege does not dictate opportunity for assignments or advancement. This identifies the *caring confrontation* model as having the critical diversity approach, rather than a managing diversity or valuing diversity approach, because inclusion is about transformational organizational culture and power dynamics, rather than moral

assimilation so that everyone feels welcome and can be productive. The *caring confrontation*

truly comes out in this model, when Linda attempts to show oppression as institutional.

> *At the same time, [an institutional analysis] is less personally damning… this says:*
> *you're not a bad person, but this is what happens to good people in bad systems and that*
> *even with all of your good efforts the system will do the dirty work for you because it's*
> *structured that way….I usually start, as a way in so people can't say no, I'll talk about*
> *abilities. So I'll say 'okay when you came into training today, let's say if the elevator or*
> *escalator didn't work, what did you do?' And they'll say 'oh I walked up the stairs.'*
> *Okay that's because you have the option to walk up the stairs. So you might not have*
> *noticed if the elevator wasn't working. So that's an able-bodied privilege. You just go*
> *about your life and don't have to think about it. Would you admit that that's sort of a*
> *perk? 'Yeh. ..' So once you kind of get that, because nobody argues with that stuff and*
> *you make those analogies with other '–isms' and ask when are you in the in-group and*
> *when are you in the out-group and how might that affect your experience.*
> — Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

Tactfully, the caring confrontation is played out in a way that Linda can build an argument for an

institutional power and privilege analysis that seems logical and convincing. An activity called

"concentric circles" can be used to build this analysis:

> *An activity I like a lot is something you may have heard called 'concentric circles'…*
> *people sit in two circles and you go through a series of questions. So you sit with a*
> *partner, I read you a question, you have three minutes to talk about it, and then you*
> *rotate partners, get a new question and you keep going around. So that's one that can be*
> *very superficial or you can work it. and I like to work it. So I give people progressively*
> *more challenging questions and then the main part is when we do the debrief. And for me*
> *the content of the questions are important, but what's important is the process of how*
> *people feel. So they can start to see what do they censor out, what are they afraid to say*
> *out loud, what do you learn from that.*
> — Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

In Linda's version of 'concentric circles' a lead-off question will involve talking about

something positive about one's own racial, ethnic, or religious background, or discussing

something that they want to learn about a different group. As time elapses, questions get more

difficult so that people discuss how they came to learn that people are treated differently based

on race, gender, or class, what are stereotypes about their in-groups and how does it feel to be

stereotyped in that way, and what are biases about out-groups. These questions allow people to get to a deeper understanding of privilege. Able-bodied privilege is something that, as she puts it, "nobody argues with," but racial privilege is something that people become defensive about. In this framework, analogies can be drawn between types of privilege that people easily accept and those that are more emotionally charged such as white, male, and heterosexual privilege. When this challenging information is presented in this way, people are able to actually reflect on what this means for them in the organization, while not blaming them for their group identities.

This reflects the idea of "overlapping approximations" (Trepagnier 2006), where people can come to an awareness of something such as racism by having a personal experience or understanding of other forms of oppression. Easing people into an understanding of privilege opens the door for challenging information. Linda's final goal is get people to an understanding of power and privilege as not just in interpersonal relations, but also, and more importantly, in institutional practices. To do so, she commonly uses videos, which represent historical and continuous preclusion from opportunities for non-dominant groups. One video she commonly uses is excerpts from "Race: The Power of an Illusion," which traces the way that race has been socially constructed and a major determinant in various laws and practices throughout American history, most notably housing law (Adelman and Cheng 2003). This video provides the institutionalized framework for how oppression becomes institutionalized. It creates a responsibility structure that is not based in past discrimination, such as the compliance-based approach might call for, but based in the continuation of power and privilege because of institutionalization. The *critical diversity through caring confrontation* model is unique in the way that it combines different forms of oppression and different approaches to diversity in order to further a critical diversity approach. The *caring confrontation* model distinguishes itself from

another critical model, which chooses to focus primarily on race and racism as institutionalized oppression.

Critical Diversity through an Anti-Racist Curriculum

The *caring confrontation* model can be viewed as moving from an "easy" discussion, such as able-bodied privilege, to more difficult discussions such as white privilege or heterosexual privilege in order to show how oppression works in many forms. The *critical diversity through an anti-racist curriculum* model understands that many forms of oppression exist (Crenshaw 1991, 1995; Collins 1998, 2000; Davis 2008), but focuses on race as a dimension of diversity where power and privilege are particularly prevalent in the workplace and in society. Therefore, overlapping approximations do not work in the *anti-racist curriculum* model. Race and racism are the sole concentration of the training and the critical diversity approach is exclusively used. The caring confrontation is not needed in these trainings because the model makes it explicitly clear what is going to be addressed. Fred, who uses the *anti-racist* model, explains how he and his colleagues justify a racial focus:

> *Our particular focus is racism and we're very clear that we aren't talking about racism at the expense of any other oppression, but that we're going to focus on racism and my experience is that in predominantly white institutions, which are most institutions, if you don't start with racism, people try to find ways to move away from talking about racism. So we need to talk about class, and we do need to talk about those things, but today we are going to talk about racism…people come to us because they know the work we do… the way we understand racism as systemic, racial prejudice plus systemic power is the same way that I would define sexism, gender prejudice plus systemic power, so the analysis doesn't mean that if you get one you get the other one, but the basic underlying analysis is similar… And the other thing is we understand systemic racism as impacting us internally, interpersonally, institutionally and culturally.*
> — Fred, White Male, Diversity Trainer, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Fred is quick to note that, when given the option, people will shy away from racial discussions. For Fred and his colleagues, this means that race needs to be talked about exclusively. Though the way that racism operates may be similar to other "—isms," to make any progress in terms of people's knowledge of racism, discussing other "—isms" must be reserved for a different training. Also present in Fred's belief of training in this model is the institutional analysis that comes from the critical diversity approach. Simply recognizing racial prejudice is not enough to fully understand racism. Systemic power is crucial to any discussion of racism, so that racism is seen as operating on multiple levels, some that look at individuals and some that look at systems. Fred's decision to use this model also comes from intellectual pursuits.

> *I had also gone through a few workshops and had my eyes opened in terms of understanding race and racism as something that's structural and systemic as opposed to something that individuals do…It was that powerful transformation for me in seeing racism as a system and seeing racism and white supremacy as foundational to this country, that it's not just something on the side, it's part of the fabric of who we are.*
> — Fred, White Male, Diversity Trainer, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Fred's journey to adhering to the anti-racist model established his own racial identity, as he moved to a position of high racial awareness. He described how he began to see racism differently and engrained in society, rather than indicative of individual biases or interpersonal discrimination based on race. This same transformation is what the *anti-racist* model is supposed to cause for participants in the training. The model provides a framework for understanding racism on different levels.

> *First of all, getting people to see that there's all four [levels of racism]. There's a lot of power in the model and just seeing. Ya know my experience in coming into this was that I had all of these thoughts about race and racism, but I had no framework to lay them on and so the model created a framework for me and that framework shifted my lens… Most people understand racism as internal and interpersonal and don't even have a sense of the institutional and cultural levels, so we spend a little more time there, but if you're going to transform an organization you have to pay attention to all four of those*

dimensions... Ya know we abolished slavery but we haven't abolished white supremacy. So it's a matter of changing both people's behaviors and attitudes.
— Fred, White Male, Diversity Trainer, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

On Fred's organization's website there is a lay out the different levels of racism that Fred is talking about:

- **Internal**: within the individual
- **Interpersonal**: within relationships individuals have with each other
- **Institutional**: within the organizations created to structure society
- **Cultural**: within the values, norms, belief systems, behavioral patterns, etc. of groups of people

In the *anti-racist* model, the process of the training, which begins with a discussion of internal and interpersonal racism, will hopefully shift participants' lenses to recognize the institutional connection between racism, power, and privilege. In Fred's training he begins this process of shifting the way people view racism with a simple, yet powerful exercise involving perspective:

Start…with a person standing in the front of the room and a person standing in the back of the room. And we ask them to describe the room. And then after they've done that— and clearly the person in the front of the room has a much more limited perspective than the person in the back of the room—they both then read a series of statements that would be the view of history from the person in the front of the room and the person in the back of the room. And we talk about the fact that if we really want to understand the room, while for both people what they are saying is true, but if we really want to see the whole room we have to hear from both people. Still, we know that it's the people in the front of the room who are in power and making the decisions in shaping the culture. So we frame that right away from that perspective.
— Fred, White Male, Diversity Trainer, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

In this activity, people are describing the same room, but in different ways. At first, this may resemble Jane's activity from the *celebrating diversity* model, where she had participants describe her and then showed how no one described her in the exact same way, even though they were talking about the same person. Fred's exercise is different, though, because it involves power. In Jane's example everyone is on equal footing. For Fred, one person has way more understanding of the whole room than the other so that they can provide the big picture analysis,

but may not see the fine details that the person in front can describe. Additionally, the person in the front, with the limited perspective, is presented as the one with the most power to make decisions. Fred's exercise, then, is really about how those in power throughout the history of the United States have had a limited view of how racism operates, so they need to broaden their perspective to see all levels of racism.

All levels are necessary in order to make change. The internal and interpersonal levels focus on changing individuals, while the institutional and cultural levels look at the organization as a place where power and privilege can be justified and reinforced. Fred and his colleagues believe very strongly in the strength of their model and their time-tested process. If successful, the process should provide participants with a new lens to see racism in a different way and should energize participants to make change around racism in their organizations. Once this new lens is developed, participants are given a chance to apply it. Showing a commonality between critical diversity training models, Fred also uses the video "Race: The Power of an Illusion" that Linda uses (Adelman and Cheng 2003):

> *So the first part of the workshop is in a lot of interactive ways giving them that lens. Then giving them a chance to practice that lens so sometimes we'll use the film Race: The Power of an Illusion Part III...which for most people usually just blows them away. That's the one on housing policy.*
> — Fred, White Male, Diversity Trainer, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

With an understanding of racism on multiple levels, participants can understand historical housing discrimination in a new way that tends to shock them. In order to show how privilege is more than just historical, Fred and his colleagues may incorporate an exercise known as a "privilege walk" into the *anti-racist curriculum* training. In a privilege walk, participants stand in a line, while a series of statements based on racial privilege are read aloud. These statements are often adapted from privilege lists, such as the famous white privilege list created by Peggy

McIntosh (McIntosh 1988). If the statement reflects a person's life experience, they take a step forward. The purpose of such walks are to show how race contributes to a number of different life outcomes. Common statements include: "You grew up in a house that your parents owned," "You are not followed when you enter a store," and "I can turn on the television or open to the front page of the paper and see people of my race widely represented." Privilege walks stratify participants based on their race so that privilege is exposed in visual form with whites ending up at the front of the room, with people of color scattered in the middle and the back.

As the last two models have shown, the delivery of information can be just as important as the content. In the two models using a critical diversity approach, different delivery systems emerge. Both view "—isms" as products of prejudice in the context of power, so that the prejudice has become systemic and institutionalized. The *caring confrontation* model attempts to deconstruct systems of oppression by strategically building an argument that will not be refuted. The argument exposes power and privilege in "safer" dimensions of diversity and works up to racism as an ending point using overlapping approximations. In the *anti-racist curriculum* model, racism is the starting point of a discussion of oppression and inequality. Without talking about race first, it can get lost in the fray of other dimensions of diversity. So a lens to view racism on four levels is provided that exposes the historical and contemporary existence of racial power and privilege. In both cases, the goal is the same: to dismantle injustices based on race and other group memberships by showing how "—isms" work at various levels.

All five models of diversity training present similar, yet different material based on different approaches to diversity and beliefs about effective methods to reach a training's goal. Apparent across the different models are various themes, which are greatly affected by the model

a diversity trainer chooses to employ. Each trainer raised similar themes, but addressed them differently, showing the variation in the training models.

Comparing and Contrasting Diversity Training Models

Even in such vastly different models of diversity training, similar issues arise for each of the diversity trainers. In some ways, this works to further separate the models, as the model of diversity training acts as a way to produce different outcomes, though the concern is the same. Conversely, the similar issues that diversity trainers face can be a unifying factor, signifying the particular importance of one aspect of diversity training. In all cases, the themes that cut across diversity training models largely serve to display the context in which diversity trainings occur and decisions that trainers must make when designing and delivering diversity trainings.

Organizational Restraint and Authenticity

The model that a diversity trainer uses for a workshop represents the combination of a few influences. Choosing to be a professional diversity trainer represents a certain affinity for diversity and diversity work. This means that trainers have spent time developing their own views on diversity and how diversity work should be handled. While this can evolve into adhering to a specific model for diversity training, it is not a forgone conclusion. Organizations often bring in diversity trainers to address particular issues, which may or may not be directly associated with the trainer's own views on diversity. This necessitates a discussion of how trainers remain *authentic* in their trainings in light of organizational goals.

For some trainers, staying true to one's beliefs is rarely a problem. The *celebrating diversity* model hardly ever runs into conflicts with organizational goals. Because the training is

really about interpersonal relations, it can be used in pretty much any setting. Organizations that hire trainers from this model know what to expect.

> *It's not really a question of selling your services or selling them on the issue, it's more whether they're open to outside resources and outside consultants and outside diversity training ...I've never had any department say 'oh no we'll change this, change that.' Most of them have always accepted my proposal.*
> — Jane, Asian Female, Diversity Trainer, "Celebrating Diversity"

Jane never has to worry about remaining authentic in her training. She always trains in the basics of *celebrating diversity* and organizations would not ask her to train, unless they agreed with her point of view. A similar situation exists for trainers in the *anti-racist curriculum* model.

The *anti-racist* model is a fairly specific niche of training. Trainers that use this model have clear goals focusing on anti-racist work and exposing power and privilege through shifting analysis. Organizations looking to do a training would not bring in an anti-racist trainer, unless this was the identifiable goal of the training. Fred explains this as "*People come to us because they know what we do.*" Thus, the reputation of Fred and his colleagues attracts clients looking to do an *anti-racist* training. Anti-racist trainers do not really have to deal with questions of authenticity. This does not mean, though, that they do not think about remaining authentic in their work.

> *And we're not doing this just to make money. So we have some integrity, I like to think we have some integrity around the work, so we're not just going in and doing what some corporation wants us to do. We're pretty clear about where we're coming from and why we do what we do.*
> — Fred, White Male, Diversity Trainer, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

If an organization came to Fred and his colleagues with different goals, chances are they would pass up the opportunity for the work. This shows how deeply entrenched anti-racist trainers can be in their work, especially once they have reached a high level of racial awareness, like Fred, where whites feel empowered and energized to work against racism.

The *caring confrontation* model shares a similar empowerment to do anti-oppression work, but with blurrier lines about what work should be done. Because the *caring confrontation* model targets many forms of oppression and infuses other models into the presentation, a variety of organizations and corporations are willing to train from this approach. This can cause trouble for remaining authentic because the trainer may not completely agree with the work that the corporation does. Linda eloquently discussed the cognitive struggle that can occur as one tries to decide how to remain true to their beliefs in this difficult situation.

> *Some of the feedback I get about my work is that I have a way of getting people to talk about things that they normally wouldn't; difficult challenging topics. That said…there are definitely companies where I chose not to work with. Like the corporate work can present a lot of contradictions. So I know the way I've reconciled it, which I hope isn't too much of a rationalization, is that I won't work for a company that either I wouldn't purchase their product or I wouldn't support somebody else purchasing their product. So for me personally, that means I won't work for gun manufactures. I don't want them to do their jobs better. I want them to go out of business. All right?...but it's a really hard thing because the part of me feels like anybody who works in any company should have the right to an equal and just and fair and comfortable workplace for those who choose to work there, but yet do I really like what they're doing? Do I really want to be a part of that?... And there are other bottom lines, so if there's a company that says 'oh we want to deal with issues of race and gender, but we can't talk about homophobia' then I'm not the one. I'm very clear that all of these issues are related.*
> — Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

For Linda, the issue becomes less about whether or not her model gets changed—it's apparent that she will not abandon her beliefs about what a training should include—and becomes more about whether or not her values align with the products a company produces and the values that those products connote. The *caring confrontation* model opens up more opportunities to train in the corporate world than the *anti-racist* model, which brings more questions about how to stay authentic. Linda has spent time creating guidelines to ensure that she remains genuine to her anti-oppression mission. Linda, Fred, and Jane are fairly certain that their beliefs about the right model for diversity training will dictate where and when then train, rather than an organizational

pressure to train a certain way. Organizations gain more power in the *ensuring representation* and *managing and valuing diversity* models.

The *ensuring representation* model uses compliance as a major driver for promoting representation in an agency. The organization where this model was presented is very important to understanding why compliance has taken such a large role. Christine, who delivered this training model, was under the supervision of a government agency, when planning and implementing the training. Being connected to government, EEO law had to be a prominent feature of the training. On one side, this can put a constraint on the trainer, as the focus on compliance must always be an essential part of the training. On the other side, trainers can find ways to remain true to their own beliefs, while still delivering the training that an organization is looking for. Christine, for example, always makes sure that a diversity training curriculum is aligned with her basic personal views. In some cases, this may mean lessening the extent to which personal beliefs are present in the training material to adhere to organizational goals.

> *I mean…as new to the agency… when I delivered the training I really did it in as safe a way as possible to come up with different activities to kind of promote things that have worked instead of kind of going into the negative; some fun activities and I think by midway point of the ride I'll say I could see how people were like: "ok I'm not getting beat up on, I'm not being made to feel guilt or ashamed." And so that was really my goal… I think overall people have accepted it.*
> — Christine, Black Female, Diversity Trainer, "Ensuring Representation"

The idea of a delivering training in "as safe a way as possible," points to the idea that in Christine's mind the training could be taken further. She reconciles this by making certain to remain authentic in the delivery of information, including a strong belief in the need for dialogue. A different form of reconciliation with competing beliefs arises out of the *managing and valuing diversity* model.

The *managing and valuing diversity* model is always closely connected to the business case for diversity. As a result, organizations come to trainers in this model with a variety of different requests relating to business imperatives. The wide range of requests that come from organizations and the flexibility that this model creates a number of situations where a diversity trainer must train for a specific goal. Natalie explains some of the reasons that organizations come to her company for diversity work:

> *Sometimes it's a reaction to something that's happened that they're concerned about. I think with a lot of big companies now, it's just seen as the thing to do…let's do it and check off the box, but also there are a lot of people in these companies who happen to really believe in this… they've looked at changing workforce, they've looked at the changing customer base, they've looked at the benefits… of getting the best talent and being able to retain them, they look at more innovation and all of that. Or may they may be global…or when women are always admitted to a certain point and then just stuck right below the top level…So a lot of time it's that. People feel like they've been working on this for years and women and people of color just still haven't broken through to senior leadership. Sometimes they feel that people just are working as well together as they should. They have a higher turnover rate. People of color are finding issues, or like the boomers and gen x-ers or gen y-ers are really having trouble working together.*
> — Natalie, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

Organizations may come to Natalie and her colleagues looking for trainings in any of these many different areas. The expectation is that the trainers will adapt the training to fit the organizations' needs. Natalie, who thinks of diversity in terms of the business case, does not see changing a training to fit an organization as a problem of authenticity. One particular example about recent work with a global client shows how Natalie is able to forego personal beliefs to adhere to an organization's requirements:

> *We always include sexual orientation as a key piece of how we talk about diversity. And you know they [the global client] are working in countries where… homosexuality is illegal. And so they just didn't want that to be a big piece of this tool, because they felt it just wouldn't work in many of the places around the globe where they do their work. So that's one example. And it wasn't a huge conflict, but it's just understanding sometimes you have to meet the client where they are at.*
> — Natalie, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

Sexual orientation is downplayed in the training, even though Natalie's personal beliefs and her company's normal training always includes this as a central piece of diversity. This is not a problem for Natalie because of her adherence to the managing diversity approach. In the business case, diversity is meant to increase productivity. If a company considers a discussion of sexual orientation to have a potentially negative impact on employees, then it should be removed for the sake of economic outcomes. The business case, then, takes precedent over personal values or beliefs about diversity, even though Natalie identifies herself as more aligned with organizations that have a social justice mission.

Organizational goals can create conflict between a trainer's personal beliefs, as exemplified by their diversity training model and what an organization wants them to present. The critical diversity models and the *celebrating diversity* model work through this conflict to ensure that trainers are always true to their beliefs. The *ensuring responsibility* model can be a product of the organization itself, such as a government agency, so that the trainer must find other ways to remain authentic, such as through the delivery of material. The *managing and valuing diversity* model is always in tune with the business case for diversity, which can overshadow trainers' personal beliefs about dimensions of diversity. Interestingly, this does not create a cognitive struggle, since trainers in this model show an affinity for the business context in the first place. The purpose of their training is to help the business, not further a larger social agenda, such as the critical models attempt. If this is the purpose of diversity training, then it is not an issue of authenticity because the trainers are conscious and willing to adhere to this aspect of business culture, which they see as removed from their own agenda. Natalie's final words about having to meet an organization "where they are at" addresses another issue that trainers must navigate in a training. Trainers have specific goals for how they want participants in

diversity training to change during the workshop. Reaching these goals contributes to the success of the diversity training model.

<u>*Meeting People "Where They're At" and Getting People "There"*</u>

The above outline of different diversity training models shows that in each model there are specific goals that the trainer hopes to accomplish. Sometimes this involves providing participants with new skills and tools to create a better workplace. A common theme in the trainer interviews identifies that a major goal of all trainings is to move training participants to a new level of analysis or understanding around diversity. A hope is that participants will experience an epiphany of sorts as their eyes are opened to something they have never thought about before and can now incorporate into their attitudes and behaviors. The language that the different models use is often the same. Frequently, the trainers talked about meeting people "where they're at," when setting up the training. Organizations may be at very different places depending on what they want to get out of diversity training and what diversity work they have done in the past. Similarly, trainers discuss a desire to get people "there." In this case, "there" refers to participants being in a position to use the new information that the training presents. Expectedly, where "there" is depends on the key features of the diversity training model the trainer employs.

In the *celebrating diversity* model, "there" is all about self-awareness of biases and discomfort. Going into the training, people are unaware of their biases and the effects these biases have on their interactions with different people. The epiphany needs to occur so that discomfort can go away.

> *And as they think about it, the light bulb will hopefully go off in their head. I mean they*
> *don't have to sit there and say to me, 'Oh I just realized I am a racist.' And it's a rare*

person who will do that and I don't expect that they would say that. However, as long as I present them with the information that will help them come to some self-realization than that is a great accomplishment from the workshop.
— Jane, Asian Female, Diversity Trainer, "Celebrating Diversity"

The image of the light bulb elicits the feeling of the dramatic shift that is expected in the training. As Jane explains, people do not necessarily have to analyze the full extent of their biases for the training to be a success. The *celebrating diversity* model expects that just becoming aware of individual biases can reduce discomfort, enhancing communication and listening skills. Thus, it is not increasingly difficult for trainers like Jane to get their participants "there." Most people are able to recognize biases, when asked to evaluate themselves and their feelings (Moscovici 1976; Asch and Zukier 1984; Greenwald, McGhee and Schwartz 1998). Getting people "there" can be more difficult if the focus is on representation or compliance.

Diversity trainings that concentrate on legality or representation can produce negative results in diversity trainings (Ivancevich and Gilbert 2000). Consequentially, the *ensuring representation* model has an added difficulty in getting people to move to a desired mindset. Because people can respond negatively to this type of training, getting "there" requires participants understanding not only the legal issues surrounding diversity, but also realizing the overall merit of the training. Similar to previous results, this has proven difficult for trainers in this model. Christine discusses this difficulty when recounting her experience trying to justify the training in terms of institutional problems rather than individual:

So it just ended into the group defending [norms]…rather than a conversation to say, 'ya know I never thought about it [discrimination] like that.' Because I know when I first discovered that, I never thought about it like that. It never even crossed my mind. And then I was like 'wow!' And it let me know that these are not individual things in terms of how we all got to be and think about these things. It's kind of more programmed into us. But people just got incredibly defensive… Everybody's different in terms of how they think about it, but I think many people, certainly not all because some people are already "there", but most people are like gearing up, like ready to attack.
— Christine, Black Female, Diversity Trainer, "Ensuring Representation"

Christine is explaining her own personal epiphany and coming to see issues of representation in terms of institutional prejudice. She hoped that in her training other participants would reach this same analysis. The animosity surrounding the training represents a huge barrier to getting participants "there," through the training process. This is part of the reason why the compliance-based diversity approach of the Civil Rights era has largely been abandoned. This approach gave way to the business case for diversity—the norm in the *managing and valuing diversity* model.

The *managing and valuing diversity* model, as a flexible model, has various different end points depending on the organization where the training takes place. This model grew out of the compliance-based approach to make diversity work more palatable for all employees by marketing diversity (Thomas 1990). As a result, participants tend to react better to these trainings and trainers can set broader guidelines for where participants should get to by the end of the training. Where "there" should be is not set in stone in this model. The overall flexibility of this model and getting "there" is explained by Natalie:

> *I think for a lot of people they're kind of pleasantly surprised by the training because I think it's so loaded for people around political correctness and they don't know what to expect and is it going to be very didactic? Or preachy? Or uncomfortable? And I think that the way that we present it is that we are all kind of on this journey and nobody's gotten "there" yet and so I think we try to open up dialogue and hopefully by having that experience in the training they can continue to talk about the issues.*
> — Natalie, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

In this passage, Natalie does not actually commit to what "getting there" means other than continuing to talk about diversity after the training. Instead, an understanding of diversity is thought of as a personal journey that training can help, but will not necessarily accomplish. This can be seen as a product of the broad definition of diversity that this model presents. Keeping everyone involved is a necessity of the *managing and valuing diversity* model. As mentioned,

though, this model is closely connected to organizational goals. Specifics of where "there" should be are affected by each organization, but the broad view is common in this model.

From the critical diversity approach, there is certainly a distinct conceptualization of where "there" should be. Because the goals are so closely related, the position of where participants should be after a training in the *caring confrontation* and *anti-racist curriculum* models can be discussed together. As exemplified by the discussion of the models above, both models try to move participants to a new analysis of racism as institutional in addition to the more common view of racism as individual discrimination. Trainers in each model discussed how they hope their participant's mindsets will change.

> *Moving [participants] from what I would say is a world is flat analysis to a world is round analysis. And I use that as an analogy around diversity because I think it's a helpful visual for folks. A flat map is cool, but it can only get you so far. Eventually you need something else. And around those issues, the flat map was like a prejudice analysis as opposed to moving to one around institutional racism, "isms" and oppression.*
> — Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

> *I personally would say I want people to leave the workshop with their world rocked in the sense that for some people they're viewing racism in a different way. For other people I want them to feel that the stuff that they've been seeing is real and that this validates it and that the people who have been denying that can now see it a little better. So I hope that that kind of a shift happens. We want to meet people where they are. We don't preach to people. And I know, I can't beat racism into people or anti-racism into somebody, they need to come to it in their own way and see it in their own way.*
> — Fred, White Male, Diversity Trainer, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Though their models may differ in the way that they attempt to get people to this new analysis, getting "there" has the same goal in the critical diversity approach. A completely new analysis about oppression is needed to further the trainer's goals for the training. The training will not be viewed as a success unless participants "get there" and use a new lens to think about racism and other forms of oppression.

These trainer's words show that each training model hopes to change participant's mindsets around diversity in different ways. The model that a trainer uses influences where trainers want their participants to be at the end of the training and how they go about creating that change. Though only the *anti-racist curriculum* model focuses particularly on race, trainers continue to talk about how race and racism are the most difficult topics to discuss in diversity trainings. Race can become a hindrance to getting participants "there" and impact the accomplishment of training goals.

Racial Discourse and Complications in Diversity Trainings

Each of these trainers brought up a discussion of race organically in our conversations, showing just how important they see this dimension of diversity to be and necessitating further analysis into why race is such a challenging topic and how they dealt with it in their respective training. In the *celebrating diversity* model, race is not seen as a problematic discussion as it is just one of many 'differences' that we must consider in our every day interactions. It is no surprise that critical diversity trainers, like Fred and Linda, are acutely aware of the importance of discussing race and the way that racial discourse can impede conversation and impact diversity trainings. However, they approach the discussion of power and privilege in very different ways.

The *anti-racist* model takes a clear stance that racism still exists and it operates at multiple levels to influence people interpersonally and institutionally. Since racism is the topic of the training, anti-racist trainers cannot compare talking about race with other dimensions of diversity. Fred did, however, provide a striking comment about some of the conflicts that

trainers in this model may face as they continue to see race matter after many years of doing anti-racist trainings.

> *And in all of this work I haven't seen any institutions really change. In some smalls ways, but systemic racism isn't going away. So there's a frustration in that. Sometimes ya know we have to ask: What are we doing? What are we doing?*
> — Fred, White Male, Diversity Trainer, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Because of the systemic nature of racism, training cannot directly deconstruct the way that racism connects to power and privilege in organizations, meaning that institutional racism is difficult to get rid of. Linda is able to provide a similar insight and her experience training to dismantle many forms of oppression gives her the opportunity to compare dimensions of diversity.

> *Linda: I think there are things that are less emotionally challenging for people…race and homophobia are generally the most intense push back. So I wouldn't call it a hierarchy, but I think there are reasons to start with that trigger stuff for folks.*
>
> *David: What are the reasons?*
>
> *Linda: Oh sure, ya know for race a history of colonization, genocide, and oppression for our countries entire history…and I think the thing that gets into that which is different than when people used to do this in the 60s and 70s is that now the social culture is that people know it's wrong to be racist, so no one wants to admit, whereas old school would be like 'yah I'm a white supremacist and proud of it,' now people don't want to say that so people find ways, white people, find ways to have racialized conversations without naming race. So they want to hold the mindset of being open-minded yet still hold perks of whiteness. So you have to peel that apart in a way. And that's more emotionally challenging.*
> — Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

Linda elaborates on why race continues to be such an emotionally charged subject by connecting the current climate of racial discourse to a history of white privilege and power. She invokes the abstract liberal ideas of color-blind racism that have taken over for the overt racism of old as the predominant way that whites talk about race (Bonilla-Silva 2001, 2010). In order to get people to talk about race, Fred makes it the one and only topic in his *anti-racist curriculum* training.

Linda differs in delivery and uses the overlapping approximations of talking about easier forms

of oppression such as ableism or ageism and using that discussion of power and privilege to

move to a harder discussion about race. Linda continued on this train of thought to expand on

the presence of color-blind discourse in her trainings, while also touching on Fred's points about

the persistence of systemic racism.

> *I mean the depressing part for me is that in many ways having the same conversation I feel like we had 20 or 30 years ago. I mean I feel like we should be beyond that. And I've seen some changes. This is sort of a paradox that people say 'ohh it must be easier with a lot of younger people.' Not necessarily. Well it's odd because at one level…I do think that young folks have more multiracial friendships…I mean compared to those who grew up in a different time, there's much more multiculturalism and multi-racialism around people in a social setting so people have some interpersonal relationships to draw on a little bit, that's good news. The bad news is that it creates the illusions that everything else has changed and that access is fine, everything's the same and we're just buddies and blah blah blah, or even worse, that folks who have been excluded actually have more advantages than the dominant when the data just doesn't support it, it's just not reality. So I think that's makes it more complicated, it's a different kind of conversation than the old way we had to have the conversation where inclusion and exclusion was clear.*
> — Linda, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Caring Confrontation"

That blatant instances of racism have diminished actually works to obscure how race continues

to matter at a systemic level. Interpersonally, the younger generation may be doing better in

terms of cross-racial interaction, but that does little to deconstruct systemic advantage.

Dangerously this can minimize claims of discrimination by people of color and even give the

impression of "reverse discrimination," where whites are now at a disadvantage for opportunities

than people of color because of programs such as affirmative action (Ivancevich and Gilbert

2000; Bonilla-Silva 2001, 2010; Von Bergen et al 2002; Kidder et al 2004). Worries about the

difficulty of talking about race are echoed by trainers in the *managing and valuing diversity* and

ensuring representation models, as well.

> *I definitely think it [race] is difficult for people to talk openly about because I think, and particularly I think white people still have a preconceived notion that if they identify people based on race that like that is a bad thing. Which I always say there is nothing*

wrong with that. It's really the action behind it... for many white people...it's just horrible to be called racist or bigoted... and once that negative attaches to you, it's hard to get rid of it both personally or professionally, even if you've found that it's not true... I could talk about gender all day long and we could all sing 'Kumbaya' at the end of it, but definitely not with race. And also the fact that if you have a person of color delivering it, I think there's an implied message that I'm trying to ram this down your throat even without knowing me... sometimes it's like a double-edged sword that if the trainer is a person of color you may even get another double-dose of people being hostile.
— Christine, Black Female, Diversity Trainer, "Ensuring Responsibility"

Christine corroborates Linda's points about how race becomes the most difficult issue to discuss. She provides a nuanced view of how whites can fear being labeled as a racist and how this can create pushback in diversity trainings when race is presented. Additionally, Christine adds another dimension by saying that, since she is a person of color, people can sometimes label her as trying to push a diversity agenda or only working for people of color, which creates a hostile environment. Sometimes to avoid this hostile environment, Christine shies away from discussing race at all except in terms of legality, or at least not pushing the conversation if it seems that people are responding negatively. Natalie also sees the struggle of integrating the difficult discussion of race into her trainings:

Natalie: So typically race is one of the biggest challenges...and when we do work around race, we often talk about white privilege and how that has been created and what that means and have people read and talk about that and so I think people like to talk about it once they realize it's safe

David: Specifically with the white privilege as well? You see...

Natalie: mmhm mmhm mmhm

David: So, I mean some of the literature will say that that should point to backlash, but...

Natalie: Right, it depends on the setting. I wouldn't necessarily talk about that in a corporate setting... Because we do a lot of work with these, ya know, schools and they've all talked about it already and studied it, so I think it's really different depending on the who the audience is and where they're at.
— Natalie, White Female, Diversity Trainer, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

Natalie advances the point that race is a challenging subject, but also provides an interesting insight into the discussion about white privilege. White privilege is a subject that can be breached in the right setting, even from a business case standpoint. The wrong setting might be a corporation, while Natalie exemplifies the right setting as an institution such as a school. Again, this key phrase of "where they're at" emerges. The corporate world may not be "at" the right place to discuss race, while schools have this capacity. Present throughout this is that individuals in these different settings have different knowledge bases about race. From the trainer perspective, how people think about race, or more concretely, where a participant is in their racial identity development can affect the material that a trainer presents within their diversity training model. More importantly for understanding the impact of diversity trainings, a participant's racial awareness can also affect the way that they react to and reflect on this very same material.

CHAPTER IV: ARE WE "THERE" YET?

Diversity trainers' personal beliefs, the diversity training models they use, and the organizational goals they serve dictate the content, delivery and outcomes of diversity trainings. As the previous chapter demonstrated, this content and delivery is charged with getting participants "there," to a place where they have a new understanding of issues surrounding diversity. In each training model, "there" is exemplified by distinct characteristics of participants' beliefs and actions. While this is important, it does not account for the full picture of the diversity training dynamic or the potential for the training to have an impact. Managers, supervisors, and rank-and-file staff in organizations represent the participants in these trainings. Just as trainers choose models based on some combination of personal beliefs and organizational goals, so to do participants' beliefs and experiences influence their experiences with a diversity training. Managers do not walk into diversity trainings as blank slates, but carry with them varying degrees of knowledge, interest, and socialization about the topics to be discussed, all shaped by living in a society that increasingly adheres to a post-racial ideology. Hence the way that managers view diversity before a training can impact the way they reflect upon and apply diversity training material after the training. Ultimately, managerial pre-training beliefs about diversity can influence how effective a training can be in achieving goals of getting an individual participant "there."

As the diversity trainers attended to, race and racism are significant features of diversity that need to be addressed. Race and racism are also, however, two of the most difficult things for trainers to discuss. Therefore, racial awareness (Trepagnier 2006) and racial identity development (Tatum 1997) are strong indicators of where an individual manager may be "at" when entering a training and may have an impact on how that training gets managers to a new

understanding of race and racism and move them along the awareness continuum. A manager's racial awareness entering a training may also be a factor in explaining why some people "get there" and why some people do not and may shape the manager's personal beliefs about what "getting there" means. Examining managers through the lens of racial awareness provides an analysis of the different perspectives that managers bring into a training and the changes in understanding that each training model may precipitate.

This chapter provides an introduction to the managers featured in this study and addresses reactions to diversity training models. In the first section, managers give insight into their personal beliefs about diversity and where they were "at" before going through diversity training in the various diversity training models. This leads to a discussion of how each workplace establishes policies and practices around diversity and how individual managers evaluate such practices. The second section addresses how managers reacted to diversity training. Did they "get there?" Why or why not and what level of "there" did they reach? Managers explain their own responses to diversity trainings, which are analyzed through shifts in their racial awareness and an evaluation of how the manager's racial awareness connected to the diversity training model employed. Managers also reflect on workplace practices and what may have facilitated or impeded organizational change.

Meeting the Managers: Who Are They?

Managers in this study come from various different industries and backgrounds. They cover a range of job titles and duties, but all possess a supervisory role of some sort. Consequentially, their decisions and behaviors in the workplace affect more than just themselves. They have the power and opportunity to influence the experiences of employees at work through

task allocation, performance evaluations, and at times hiring and promotion. In order to understand how these managers react to diversity training, it is necessary to acknowledge what their jobs entail and how they think about diversity. It is also important to recognize what stage of racial identity awareness they are in to identify the knowledge they had upon entering a training.

This section introduces the various managers in this study and evaluates them based on their racial awareness and beliefs about diversity. The purpose is to establish where each trainer was "at" before entering diversity training, in order to measure changes that my have occurred after the diversity training session. Recognizing whether or not a manager has gotten "there" is contingent upon knowing where they were in the first place. This section categorizes the eight trainers by their diversity training model beginning with *celebrating diversity*.

Name: Gary
Industry: Housing
Training Model: *Celebrating Diversity*
Pre-Training Racial Awareness: Low

Gary is a black male who works as a regional manager for a housing management company. As a small company, Gary is one of eight partners in the organization, giving him considerable power to make decisions. He is also very well connected to both staff and residents giving him influence in determining opportunities and resources for everyone involved with the company. Gary talks about the many hats that he must wear as part of his job as a regional manager:

> *I am responsible for the majority of the development in managers that work at [our] properties. Making sure that the paperwork that is tied to the [public housing] program is processed correctly, dealing with other federal agencies, and just trying to kind of keep the ship running, so to speak. I work closely with our director of maintenance in ensuring*

that our maintenance department is working efficiently. And also try to spend a lot of time addressing any concerns that the residents may have. Getting input from them so that we're not just thinking we know what the residents would like us to do. We're actually getting feedback from them.
— Gary, Black Male, Housing Manager, "Celebrating Diversity"

Gary truly is connected to everyone from staff to residents and does the best he can to make sure that everyone's needs are met. He recognizes that diversity, especially racial and ethnic diversity, can sometimes be a hindrance to trying to meet these needs.

You could have someone from Colombia living next to someone from Cambodia living next to someone from Haiti living next to someone who's from Alabama. And it's very interesting, but I do notice that somehow it's needed for the resident population as well. Because especially, most of our developments… tend to be lower income and based on that I think there are certain tendencies that people may have in terms of trusting each other…they tend to be for the most part, pretty private in terms of what they want to share with other residents in their building. So instead of having a building with 6 people and I say 'David oh you didn't get home until 6. I just wanted to make sure everything is okay' or something like that,…everybody just kind of goes to their apartment and that's it. and you know when you get complaints, what's interesting is usually you can tell when there's a complaint that's valid or possibly a complaint that could be valid, but is based on cultural differences. So you know what's not uncommon is that one of the managers will get a call that 'the tenant in apartment 5 is playing loud music and I can't take it anymore, you've got to do something about it. blah blah blah.' Fine. But what tends to happens is 'ya know the tenant in apartment 5 is playing <u>that type of music</u> and I just don't understand what they're saying' or something like that, so it's something else. Ya know the person is actually not so much probably being aggravated by the music, but based on the fact that it's a cultural difference. [His emphasis]
— Gary, Black Male, Housing Manager, "Celebrating Diversity"

A difficult task for people in a position like Gary's is understanding what complaints are based on tangible problems between residents and what complaints represent a cultural bias. This is not cultural racism in the color-blind sense, where stereotypes about others' cultures are the basis for inequality (Bonilla-Silva 2001, 2010). Gary is simply recognizing that his tenants tend to keep to themselves and are wary of creating bonds with people who are culturally different than them. As such, diversity training is considered a way to better understand how to engage with the different cultures that staff will interact with on the job based on a very racially and

ethnically diverse client base. The clients become the central focus of diversity, so that the staff-resident relationship takes precedent over any staff-staff relationship. Gary justifies this decision by pointing to a family-like atmosphere that he believes is exemplary of his company's organizational culture:

> *I think that the staff here—we're a pretty small company—so the staff here is pretty close and I think that we have a director of Human Resources in [names her] who's very good in terms of bringing up various activities or cultural things and I think that we kind of, by default, look at all of the employees as family, be they Asian, Hispanic, African-American, West Indian. Whatever it is, we really don't see that. So in terms of diversity it would be harder for it to have an impact for our staff because I don't think that we really look at it that way.*
> — Gary, Black Male, Housing Manager, "Celebrating Diversity"

Gary, then, sees his company as somewhat immune internally to the issues of diversity that can arise when dealing with the residents externally. While he connects this to a close-knit group of people, his words also connect to color-blind ideals and post-racial discourse as he says above, "we really don't see that." In his company, they have moved beyond the dividing factors of race and ethnicity. Racial differences do not cause problems for them, so they do not even need to be discussed or addressed. Gary's color-blindness masks institutional racism, so that racism becomes entirely about individual prejudice and interpersonal interaction. This links directly to the *celebrating diversity* model of diversity training, which happens to be the model of training that Gary participated in. Everyone differs on a whole host of levels. The goal is to target the areas where people feel discomfort. If there is no discomfort apparent, there won't be any issues. This also ties in to the organizational goals for diversity training. Gary's organization is very client-based and they needed a diversity training to help them better interact with their clients.

> *I think for us to really try to expand, we have to be aware that we are dealing with different populations. In our field, housing, where there's so strict fair housing laws and you really have to be careful with what you say and how you treat people because it's the perception that you're not treating me as fairly as this other person. And it happens all the time. You have someone call. Say their refrigerator breaks down, we send someone*

out. Our appliance guy can't fix it. We get a new refrigerator. Now the person next door is calling 'why does she get a new refrigerator?' So this is how I know I'm doing a good job is that I've been accused of favoring Hispanics, favoring Haitians, favoring African-Americans, favoring almost every ethnic group we have. So I know I'm consistent (both laugh). And it is just that, that's the problem, as soon as something happens it's gotta be because someone's against me or my race. It's not because I didn't do what I'm supposed to do or because my apartment was just painted 2 years ago and this person's apartment was painted 10 years ago and so it's important for us to train our staff.
— Gary, Black Male, Housing Manager, "Celebrating Diversity"

In Gary's industry, interaction with tenants is the most important focus. Interpersonal relations between tenants and between staff and tenants can create friction, especially when tenants are so likely to attach a perceived injustice to their race or ethnicity. Gary and his colleagues needed a training that provided information on why tenants may perceive decisions as injustices and how staff can control their own biases in decisions to ensure fairness. The *celebrating diversity* model of diversity training is designed to raise this exact awareness, but also perpetuates the idea of a post-racial society.

Gary's own racial awareness is indicative of the beliefs of the *celebrating diversity model*. Gary has had experiences as a person of color that have caused him to recognize interpersonal racism. His reflection on such experiences show that he has a low racial awareness exemplified by individual instances, rather than systemic inequalities

So I'm not saying it's okay if someone looks at me and says 'that's a black person, let me hold my purse' or something like that. But maybe we can get them to the point where they understand that maybe that's a person who would help you if you were in trouble rather than someone who is going to harm you.
— Gary, Black Male, Housing Manager, "Celebrating Diversity"

Gary, in reflecting on the way someone may clutch their purse upon seeing a black man walking down the street, recognizes that there is a racial bias present. This bias, though, is never connected to anything larger than an individual issue. The person who holds their purse tighter needs to change their personal thinking, so as to not discriminate. He does not address how that

person's biases may be influenced by the society they live in or a systemic form of racism. In fact, Gary believes that issues around race are "getting better" and that "surely things have improved," which points to his conceptualization that race and racism are waning in their impact. Gary, then, is a black male regional manager who has a low racial awareness highlighted by his ideas about post-racialism.

Name: Mark
Industry: Government
Training Model: *Ensuring Representation*
Pre-Training Racial Awareness: Low

Mark is a white male with many years of service at a government agency. Because of his skill and length of service, Mark moved through the agency to reach a level where he oversees a whole program; a position that brings a number of responsibilities including task allocation and staff supervision. This is a role that Mark takes very seriously:

> *I have a staff here in Boston, it used to be 60 or 70 people but we've lost a bunch and I indirectly supervise staff in each region…at least from a policy perspective…so I'm on the policy side, but I do get involved in a lot of specific cases as well…I have 5 or 6 direct reports to me…I do a lot of working on writing and reviewing regulation and reports. I counsel staff when there are staff issues. Often they come to me…so I try to set the tone for the way that I want my part of the organization run and how I want them to behave and act.*
> — Mark, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

Mark sees his supervisory role not only as allocating tasks and completing projects, but also modeling appropriate workplace behavior to his staff of a few dozen men and women. He is a very cooperative manager and believes in the power of team projects. As a result, he has to think about diversity in his work group.

> *I think to me diversity has a lot of different pieces to it. There's obviously racial diversity, but then there's religious diversity, personal style diversity, 'ways of thinking' diversity and in general the more diverse the people are in terms of whatever project you're working on, the better the project is going to come out. Because what we need is, we*

work in a lot of teaming here and you need different points of view. Points of view from a lot of different perspectives—social, economic, political. Religion, per se, doesn't come in, we're a public agency so we don't talk about religion a lot, but you know that people with different religious backgrounds bring different values and nuances to things and the same with racial/economic backgrounds. So I take a pretty broad view of diversity.
— Mark, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

Mark is really making the business case for diversity in his conceptualization. Having varying different perspectives is good for productivity because it provides for varied experiences and points of view, which can spark ingenuity and motivation. He does expand upon his understanding to add a second piece of diversity:

Another piece is that… we're public servants so we ought to reflect the public.
— Mark, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

He adds this afterthought to elaborate on the fact that as an agency that works with the public, they should reflect the diversity of the public, so as to relate better with them. This touches more on representation of different groups in the organization. Talking with Mark shows that he most likely has a low racial awareness. While he recognizes that racial diversity is part of diversity, he thinks of race and racism very much in terms of compliance in hiring practices due to past problems, rather than something like white privilege that shapes his interactions with diverse staff. Mark also realizes that his agency is not very diverse racially, something that he wishes he could change. This indicates the beginnings of thought about racism in terms of underrepresentation of people of color, but he sees the problem as out of his hands, leading him to withdrawal to focusing on interpersonal relationships.

Part of the problem is we haven't hired anybody for years. Even if I had [diversity] goals there's nothing I could do about them, so frankly I don't think about them a lot. If I were doing a lot of hiring, it would be a goal to make sure we didn't discriminate and make sure we had racial/sexual parity so to speak. I think women have come a long way. We've had several women [in top management positions], so I think sexual parity is pretty good here. Racial—not so good…. I do not see a lot of challenges. I think either implicitly and explicitly I expect my staff to act professionally and to participate and to work well together. And at least in my view, not my view, in my presence, they do…And

right now, frankly, we have a fairly, I don't think we have a great deal of racial diversity at the moment. At least not in my staff.
    — Mark, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

Since Mark does not deal with people from many different races on a daily basis, he does not really think about race and racism in the organization. Also, the lack of hiring has somewhat personally detached him from making decisions that could reflect any sort of racial bias. Mark does not have an understanding of institutional racism. He is concentrated on interpersonal racism, something he rarely encounters because of the lack of racial diversity in his organization. Mark does not "see a lot of challenges" with people who are different working together in his organization. Though he does not have a lot of racial diversity on his staff, Mark suggests that having a more racially diverse staff would not interfere with how well people work together in his department.

Mark participated in an *ensuring representation* training model. For Mark, the purpose for this training is strongly tied to compliance.

> *Well as far as I can tell, it was to make us aware in [names state] of the protected groups. There are certain legally protected groups and to I think raise awareness of how to handle certain conflicts… This was something 'okay the Governor says you have to do this every so often.' And that's fine. But are we doing just to get it done or is there a particular issue within this organization?*
> — Mark, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

In this particular training there is a sort of "double-dose" of compliance. From one side the training is focused on how managers must comply with equal opportunity law regarding protected groups in their particular state. From the other side, the training itself is rooted in compliance as it appears that the governor has mandated this sort of training for government agencies like Mark's. It appears that this addition of the governor's mandate can further detach the specifics of the training from what Mark believes the organization actually needs to be more

productive. So, from a representation standpoint, this model relates to Mark's connection of racial diversity to hiring practices, but does not incorporate his ideas about the business case for a broad definition of diversity.

Name: Don
Industry: Government
Training Model: *Ensuring Representation*
Pre-Training Racial Awareness: Low

Don is a white male with nearly three decades experience working with the same group in state government. Don has continuously risen in the government agency and now occupies a position where he concentrates on the functioning of a whole program.

> *I used to be in charge of a number of different sites and be the project manager or site manager or whatever. As a manager…you can't really get involved with those specific projects and manage them yourself because they take too much time. You have to look at the overall program. So you have to make sure that the different functions of the program are allocated to the right people and staffed with the right people… my job is to make sure that the different functions operate smoothly and that there's communication in between.*
> — Don, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

Don is the definition of a manager in the sense that his day-to-day work concentrates on managing a large operation with what he calls a "fairly large staff" to make sure that the agency does not run into trouble and that any problems are addressed in a timely and effective manner.

Like Mark, as a government employee Don is keenly aware of the way that the organization is perceived by the public that it serves. While this is an afterthought for Mark, it is Don's basis for their understanding of diversity.

> *Well I like the idea of a lot of different government organizations reflecting the community that they service … I think the biggest advantage is that when you go into a community and they see that your agency is [reflective of their community]…it's more, it's kind of like a comfort level…I think sometimes people feel comfortable with people who look like them and sound like them and act like them and so if you have people go in*

to help a community and you're not like them in any way then they treat you as a stranger maybe… We want them to trust us. It's not essential or something you have to have because sometimes people just, nowadays in particular, may have a distrust of government. We still need to work with them and we still need to inform them of what we're doing and how we're doing it. But I think in general if there is some measure of trust then things go smoother.
— Don, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

For Don, diversity in a government organization is focused on reflecting the community that one serves. This creates a connection between the community and government employees that fosters a trust and makes interaction smoother. Interestingly, Don does not view this trust as essential to his work. It is a luxury that can make a necessary project easier. Intimately linked to the idea of reflecting the community is the idea of representation. His longevity at the agency has allowed him to take a look at how the agency has changed in terms of representation throughout his time there.

I don't know if affirmative action is the right term, but we've had some Human Resource policies that have encouraged the hiring of minorities and when I started here the agency was mostly male. And that probably reflected historical trends; like most of the titles that we could apply for were engineering titles. And a lot of them were men, so mostly males in our agency. Then over time I think that that has changed quite a bit, especially it's true with the leadership of the agency. We've had a couple of different female commissioners… We've had a woman in charge of [a number of high positions]. So, I think it's good to have that involved, so we're integrated in that way. I'd have to say though that in terms of the minority kind of diversity, I don't think we're at where we reflect the general population. I don't think we're there. And I don't know enough about the statistics or anything, but just in my own observation of who we have here in this office or in the other offices I wouldn't say that we have enough diversity to reflect the general population.
— Don, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

Here, Don is really corroborating Mark's thoughts about representation in the organization. Representation of women in the agency has been fairly successful in Don's opinion as they have made it to a number of high positions in the organization. For people of color, however, the situation has been bleak. In this way, then, Don thinks about diversity as related to representation and reflecting the community. When the organization does not reflect the

community, there can be some distrust, which impedes productivity. Don is really thinking about diversity in terms of the *managing diversity* approach. His organization needs racially and ethnically diverse individuals so that projects in the community can be completed faster. He is not necessarily concerned with integrating the ideas of the community into the project, but is more interested in completing the task. This shows that Don has a low racial awareness and is most likely in the contact stage of racial identity development. He tends not to make any connections between what he sees in terms of lack of racial diversity and how his organization works as a whole, removing any analysis of institutional racism from his conceptualization. Much of his discussion about diversity in the workplace centers on being a genuinely nice person, so as to not offend anyone, while not truly changing beliefs or behaviors either. One particular illustration can be found in how Don discusses working in cubicles and telling jokes:

> *So if you're saying something to one person and you think it's funny or it's just between the two of you, you gotta realize that other people can hear you that might be offended. So it's a good reminder and it also I think can raise examples of things that I think the average person would not think of as harassment or as offensive to somebody that might be in a minority group or what have you.*
> — Don, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

In this illustration, Don is implying that if you can tell the potentially offensive joke in a private place, then there is no issue with it because the person that will be offended is not going to hear it. This will not do much to change a workplace culture of white privilege. For one thing, simply refraining from telling an offensive joke will not change any personal prejudice that may be behind the joke. This unconscious prejudice can manifest itself in hiring or promotional opportunities, such as in the case of homosocial reproduction (Kanter 1977; Baldi and McBrier 1997; Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2009). Additionally, even if personal prejudice is diminished, behaving in this way does not reduce institutional biases. Don identifies that whiteness is normalized in his workplace culture by talking about the "average person" and

contrasting that person with a member of a "minority group." Offensive jokes or comments are viewed as a problem that people of color have to face in the organization. Behaving as Don describes above is likely to produce a politically correct atmosphere, where people do not talk about differences rather than one where people respect each other's differences. Diversity trainings are considered a tool for managers to learn what might be considered offensive speech or actions.

> *Well is [diversity training] is just a reminder, in a general sense, that we support*
> *diversity and that nobody should feel discriminated against because of any reason*
> — Don, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

Don thinks that people should not feel discriminated against in the workplace and that the purpose of diversity trainings is to reiterate that point. Don works in the same organization as Mark and attended the *ensuring representation* training focused on compliance and protected groups. For Don, this training reminded him of the protected groups and that overt interpersonal prejudice toward anyone in these groups is unacceptable behavior.

Name: Tony
Industry: Education
Training Model: *Managing and Valuing Diversity*
Pre-Training Racial Awareness: Medium

Tony is a white male who has worked at an all-boys independent boarding and day school for over thirty years in various roles. For many of these years he has functioned as both a teacher and an administrator including being the assistant to the headmaster of the school and more recently working on diversity-related programs. Tony's school is unique in that it is very global. Students from all fifty states and multiple continents are enrolled at the school, creating stark examples of geographic and cultural diversity. Currently, Tony is working through what

diversity means for people at his school. He and his colleagues have not settled on a specific

definition per se, but Tony sees it moving in a distinct direction:

> *But I see it really, oddly enough, attaching to our school's mission and the mission of the school really does refer specifically to the diverse population we have and the multi-layered task of developing academic, artistic, community and excellence among our students. And so when we're talking about diversity, we're talking about all of those things coming together really under the stated values of the school: honesty, compassion, respect for every member of the community. I can see right now that our definition is really leaning toward and reflecting the values of the school that have always been there, but more specifically about how that feels to every person that comes in.*
> — Tony, White Male, Teacher/Administrator, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

Tony and his colleagues are really moving to a valuing diversity understanding of moral

inclusion. Respecting every member of the school is the right thing to do and the school should

go to great lengths to ensure this inclusion. Recently, Tony has begun to think about diversity

more in terms of race, especially when it comes to practices surrounding diversity.

> *We've for years been attending job fairs specifically for people of color. I go every year…trying to recruit and entice faculty of color to come teach when we have an opening… Probably the main recent development is that we've instituted an internship program….It's an opportunity for young teachers to come in and…[t]hey actually take on some classroom teaching duties, they coach, they live in dormitories….and our initial fellows have been African-American and Latino because that's really been the designated area of interest. We're really actively seeking young teachers of color to be in the school.*
> — Tony, White Male, Teacher/Administrator, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

Tony has a clear understanding as an administrator that there needs to be more racial diversity in

his faculty. While he talks about moral inclusion from the valuing diversity approach earlier,

Tony also includes the reflecting the client argument that Mark and Don made. In this case, the

clients are the students enrolled in the school.

> *Why do it? The main one that is usually cited is that if your population is not reflected in the faculty than that's not the best situation for all of the students. And not just the black kids need to see black faces as teachers because that's really important to them, but it's really important for our students who are white to have the same experience. To see that there's a multi-racial, very varied population of teachers here too. And we're working toward that because that's the real world…there's also a benefit just in the fact that*

when you are trying to create an accurate curriculum…so we need varied perspectives on the faculty so that things that might not be noticed as missing. And this is true for years and years I think that black history was sort of a mini-piece of American history. But when you have more people of color and people whose perspective actually looks carefully at those things because it's their experience they are trying to reflect, that's a benefit to everybody.
— Tony, White Male, Teacher/Administrator, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

Tony invokes the idea of representation and reflecting the students in the spirit of the business case for diversity with a touch of moral inclusion. Having a racially diverse faculty makes the entire school better. From a moral standpoint, it allows people of color entrance into faculty positions that they have not always had the opportunity to achieve and it gives students of color the chance to see people like them in leadership positions, something that is not often the case in a white dominated society. It also compels whites to acknowledge the perspectives of other races and not capitulate to white norms. From a productivity standpoint, it enhances the learning experience because multiple perspectives bring in more accurate knowledge about the world so that students leave more informed. Tony's evaluation of racial diversity at his school reflects his racial awareness.

Before training, Tony was likely at a medium level of racial awareness. As he mentioned, he has worked for years to attract teachers of color. His reasons for doing so, rooted in exclusion of teachers of color from independent schools and broadening students' perspectives, show an understanding of racism intellectually and, to a certain extent, knowledge of some ways to avoid exclusionary practices. This points to a basic understanding of privilege in terms of access to institutions. Still, Tony did not fully grasp his own whiteness and privilege and needed people of color to aid him in his understanding. This is apparent in a recent decision that led to the diversity training that he and his staff would participate in:

We were experiencing, because of a program that we initiated at the beginning of last year, some really negative feedback from some of our families of color that said 'that's

not right you can't do that.' And we agreed that it was not a good program, however it was kind of set up with very good intentions. And we sort of recognized that it's not always the best intentions that are successful or appropriate in terms of addressing issues of difference. So we said we need some help doing this…It was a new program. That was one of the reasons we felt that we really just stubbed our toe…but the interesting thing about it was that not all families of color disliked it. Some families were very supportive and liked it. Others were saying 'you can't do that because you are singling out kids of color and they shouldn't feel like they are being treated that way.' So it was a really good point. Valid points on all sides. Which made it complicated, really complicated. So we said 'gosh, let's not do this again. Let's not initiate another program and not understand what it is that we really need to consider before moving forward.'
— Tony, White Male, Teacher/Administrator, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

Tony was reluctant to talk about the specifics of this mistake in training that caused these negative feelings for families of color, but it appears that students of color may have been singled out to tell what it is like to be a person of color at their school. This may have evoked some powerful emotions that some families saw as detrimental to their children and other students, while other parents thought it was good for white students to see what it is like at the school from the perspective of a person of color. At any rate, Tony realized that he did not have the right tools to navigate a very complicated situation and issue. He and his colleagues decided that a relationship needed to be fostered with a diversity consulting company. From the way that Tony conceptualizes diversity above, it may not come as a surprise that his school brought in a trainer that uses the *managing and valuing diversity* model.

Name: Dana
Industry: Education
Training Model: *Caring Confrontation*
Pre-Training Racial Awareness: Low

Dana is a white female with a decade or two experience working in higher education at various universities. Her current position places her in a supervisory role where she actively and regularly engages with her staff to ensure that they are completing tasks and are accountable for

their actions. In addition to supervising, her specific duties concentrate on assessment and implementation of programs to monitor how other divisions of her department are doing and what students are getting out of programs that are in place.

> *My role is to oversee the assessment efforts within the division. Meaning, are our departments doing what we say we're doing? And are students learning through our programs? So, essentially we're creating trainings and workshops and strategies to help our colleagues build capacity to assess their programs. So that's a primary kind of core part of my job. I'm also working on faculty collaborations and partnerships. Making sure that what students are experiencing in the classroom kind of translates into their out of the class room experiences.*
> — Dana, White Female, Education Administrator, "Caring Confrontation"

Dana is closely connected, like Tony, to both staff and students in her educational setting. She sees diversity working in her organization at both of these levels, which contributes to her overall understanding of diversity in the workplace, which brings both advantages and challenges.

> *I would be hard-pressed to work in [a department] that's homogeneous. I mean you have to have multiple perspectives. You have to have people who say 'well wait what about students who are low-income who can't afford to do this?' Or 'have you thought about this in terms of something that's going on in the Middle East?' Have we thought about how students might respond or react to this? So it's kind of a given these days that workforces will be diverse and not only in terms of race and culture but diversity of thought… we all come from our own cultural perspective and when we're thinking about how we want to assess, let's take for example the climate here….There are those who say 'well we know that there are problems, so we're just gunna go after what the problems are.' And there are others who say 'we really need to approach this in a neutral way, so we're just going to ask broad based questions' and both are right. We know anecdotally and with data that there are problems here with students not feeling comfortable, that are feeling marginalized. So my job is to sort of say let's bring that together and see if we can collect data…on what the student's real experience is. And for us who are conducting whatever research it is, to try not to bring our personal bias into it.*
> — Dana, White Female, Education Administrator, "Caring Confrontation"

Here, Dana is combining the managing diversity approach with the valuing diversity approach. Diversity with staff seems to be focused on creativity and creating the best outcomes from an organizational standpoint. Diversity with students, however, seems to be more about moral inclusion and comfort. Dana even touches slightly here on critical diversity, that some students

are feeling marginalized because of their group membership. This combination of different approaches is consistent with her experiences with diversity in the past. Dana represents an interesting case in this study. Throughout our conversation, Dana chose to touch on the ways she has developed her understanding of diversity throughout many years of diversity trainings, rather than concentrate on one specific training. What she really did was trace her journey through the continuum of racial awareness. In doing so, she mapped out what she believes to be the best type of training, based on the inability of other trainings to reach certain goals. Before her experiences in training, Dana certainly was at a low level of racial awareness, where norms of whiteness dominated her thought.

> *So for me I think that I really look at my own evolution…and my own personal learning. I grew up in an upper-middle class, white, suburban [names city, state] town. So I didn't really experience what we might consider diversity. So when I came to Boston…that was my first experience of not only socioeconomic difference, of gender differences, of sexual orientation, and of course of race and ethnicity. And so it was clunky, I have to say. It was a challenge. Some of the language we use, I wasn't familiar with. And so learning. That was a very urban campus… so it was trial by fire, but in a good way. I mean I was uncomfortable a lot of the time and I see now that that sense of being uncomfortable with yourself in a situation is actually the best way to learn about another culture.*
> — Dana, White Female, Education Administrator, "Caring Confrontation"

Without moving to Boston, Dana may have stayed in this low level. Moving to Boston and experiencing/learning about diversity for the first time was a confrontation with diversity that caused discomfort. She began attending diversity trainings and getting involved in different initiatives, which combined can be considered a *caring confrontation* model. One particular instance in a diversity training illustrates the caring confrontation mentality:

> *Oh I remember the stupidest thing. So this was maybe 18 years ago… and one of my colleagues was black and we had become good friends and so I remember saying, which is a terrible thing to say, 'one of my friends is black' in the training as if that gave me legitimacy right? So I was just absolutely attacked for saying that and I didn't understand why? Like 'what do you mean I don't know the entire black culture because I have one black friend?' That was sort of the assumption that I made. And at first it was horrible…I felt horrible. And someone pulled me aside afterward and said you were*

unfairly attacked for saying that and this is why. And so they sort of pulled me aside and educated me and had I not had that side conversation I probably would have said I'm never going to a diversity training again. Why would I put myself through that? Here I am trying and all of a sudden I'm getting attacked. It was a great educational moment for me.
— Dana, White Female, Education Administrator, "Caring Confrontation"

Examples like this one show what Dana believes is effective and ineffective confrontation. Her experiences have led Dana to an understanding where the *caring confrontation* model is the preferred form of diversity training. Because Dana chose to focus on the combination of many trainings, instead of particular training, it is difficult to establish a particular pre-training racial awareness. It is clear, however, the she has a keen understanding of beginning her journey of racial awareness engulfed in white culture with very low racial awareness. From that point, a combination of events (moving to an urban setting, having her racism confronted in a training, participating in various different trainings) acted as her *caring confrontation* training model.

Name: Bill
Industry: Youth Development
Training Model: *Anti-Racist Curriculum*
Pre-Training Racial Awareness: High

Bill is a white male who oversees a youth development initiative, which connects a number of different non-profit organizations working to empower youth. Recently, Bill's group received grant money to focus on three main focus areas.

So then the specific issues that we were to address that were documented by research here in [county's name] that affected the lives of young people were poverty, substance abuse, and discrimination, specifically racial discrimination, racism and other forms of discrimination…I'd like to see the organizations come together in terms of addressing some of the manifestations of this institutional system of racism and in particular the hyper-incarceration of young black men.
— Bill, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Bill describes the three main focus areas that have become essential to his job as the manager of this group of non-profits. Immediately, this becomes connected to race and Bill's personal understanding of racism. Bill has a long history of studying racism and doing anti-racist work. This means that Bill takes the critical approach to diversity that the *anti-racist curriculum* model uses.

> *My undergraduate work was in African American studies and I have devoted a lot of my career to developing on the academic side to understanding the institutional, structural forms of racism but also on the personal side too. To get in touch with my own personal history as a white man and to understand how that blocks, not only my understanding, but also the people that I work with and our ability to really solve our problems together.*
> — Bill, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Bill attended college over forty years ago and so has spent many years amassing a knowledge-base and plan for action around race and racism. Before attending the *anti-racist* training, Bill had an high racial awareness. He has worked through and accepted his white identity and the privilege it affords and has tried to work against more institutional forms of racial discrimination. Still, Bill recognizes how difficult this work can be, hence the continuation of racial discrimination amongst the youth and the need for training in the *anti-racist* model.

> *I went to college in the 60s and at that time we were very hopeful that we could in fact address issues of racism both overt and covert racism and um it really as I think about it comes as a huge surprise to me that here we are 40 years later still dealing with a lot of the same issues that we thought we had dealt with first in the civil rights movement and then in the 60s and 70s in terms of affirmative actions and multiculturalism, but in fact, we did not deal with those issues and there's been a lot of recent research done to indicate that racism is as pervasive in terms of institutions and in terms of the structure of the whole society than it ever was.*
> — Bill, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Here, Bill is talking about the failure of programs such as affirmative action to eradicate the effects of racism in organizations at both the blatant interpersonal level and the institutional level. This should come as no surprise due to the white male backlash that accompanied and continues to accompany these programs (Ivancevich and Gilbert 2000). If powerful white males

do not support these programs, they are unlikely to make institutional change. Bill identified

lingering aspects of racism in his own organization, specifically around an inability of his white

colleagues to recognize the impact of race in organizations.

> *I think that an area that was identified was denial. The basic getting past, for sort of progressive liberal folk, who tend to be the ones who run non-profit organizations. They would have to be offered opportunities to viscerally experience their racism and white privilege.*
> — Bill, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Bill, as someone with high racial awareness, was able to look into his own organization and

identify areas where an *anti-racist* training model may assist the organization in reaching their

goal of racial equality for the youth under their purview.

Name: John
Industry: Youth Development
Training Model: *Anti-Racist Curriculum*
Pre-Training Racial Awareness: Medium

John is another white male who at the time of his training worked as a director for a non-

profit organization focused on youth development and education. As a director, John saw his

organization continue to expand to reach more youth. In his opinion, it had gone as far as it

could go without switching its agenda.

> *We were continuously growing and I kind of came to the conclusion that we had gone as far as we could go without kind of really exercising social justice to a much greater degree than we ever had before. So based on that, I wanted to do a lot of things. Wanted to kind of recalibrate our work so that we were thinking more through a social justice lens and as part of that really wanted to do some work internally with the staff around an anti-racist agenda.*
> — John, White Male, Youth Services Director, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

John, on his own, saw his organization reaching a point where they would become stagnant if

they did not start actively working against the pressures that their youth faced. Anti-racist work

was something that John realized would be beneficial because of the racism that their youth

faced, but that does not mean that John had a clear understanding of the issues surrounding race and racism. Part of the reason that John and his organization looked for an outside vendor was that internally they were not entirely sure how to attack this topic. John, at this point, was probably at a medium level of racial awareness.

> *Other than kind of believing in social justice and knowing that there were some issues that we had around race and diversity within the organization. I didn't have a clue in terms of exactly what the training should look like or what the issues were that we should tackle.*
> — John, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

John before the training represented the well-meaning white person, committed to social justice and equality but not really sure exactly what can be done around race to deconstruct the basis for racism and oppression in society (Trepagnier 2006). Still, the youth that used the resources at his organization were facing this issue, so John introduced the idea of doing an *anti-racist* model diversity training. Initially, this created some debate about the reasons for doing such a training and also the risks involved with undertaking a new agenda. John explained the controversy this way:

> *Well, I think part of it was about, simply my leadership style, which is I tend to bring things to the table as they occur to me and this was certainly done that way, so there was sort of the reaction that ya know 'where did this come from.' So that was part of it. Sort of slowly working people through why we needed to switch to much more of a social justice agenda.*
> — John, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

When John brought up his idea about moving to a social justice lens, people responded initially with confusion because of the suddenness of the suggestion. John continued to talk more in-depth about how people responded:

> *And then I think after that ya know the whole thing about doing anti-racist or diversity work is something that people find scary…. And just as sort of an anecdote…this one*

person, who was one of my best managers when she was on the management team, basically ended up leaving the organization because she was so worried and not happy about where this was going to go and the risk involved and just the uncertainty… So that sort of shows that I think people of good will who are inclined to buy into it and really help perpetuate such an agenda and a worldview, even they are scared. It's a tough issue in society.
— John, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

In John's organization there was a clear apprehension about doing such a training, showing that many of people at the organization were not at the same level of racial awareness as John, who was not even that far along yet himself. Still he had the foresight to implement such a training, even though he lacked the direct knowledge about what would and should be discussed.

Name: Larry
Industry: Religious Services
Training Model: *Anti-Racist Curriculum*
Pre-Training Racial Awareness: High

Larry is a white member of the clergy and the assistant to a high-ranking religious official for the New England region of a specific denomination. As Larry sees it, this entails a number of administrative duties that are manifested in a variety of different programs. Larry has direct oversight over a number of these programs.

We are sort of the administrative region…for New England. We have 640 churches or so in our area. So I work, specifically, I am the assistant to the [names high-ranking official] and have program responsibilities overseeing a broad range of mission and ministry type programs that we have a part in.
—Larry, White Male, Religious Services Director, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

From this position, Larry has been responsible for setting specific guidelines and goals. Directly immersed in these goals over the last decade have been diversity and anti-racism work.

One part of that is our conference has identified diversity for a long time as a key issue for us to be concerned with and for a long period of time, different people have been working in the area of diversity, anti-racism, so forth. Especially in the last 10 or 12 years we've had some groups that have very intentionally been trying to speak to the

institution around concerns of white privilege and racism. So I've been a part of that effort for a long time. And we had for a while a relationship with a group of folks who did training with us pretty regularly, primarily with our leadership.
—Larry, White Male, Religious Services Director, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Discussions about racism and white privilege have been integral to Larry's organization. People in leadership positions have had these conversations for decades. Though they talk about diversity, Larry and the colleagues that he works closest with have really focused on race as their major objective. As a fairly white organization, Larry sees white privilege and institutional racism as having the potential to be especially harmful in his organization.

The group that I primarily work with has thought of this in terms of anti-racism and white privilege. So when most of us talk about diversity we are predominantly a white institution, a white denomination, in a region that is increasingly diverse in New England even in rural areas, that is racially and ethnically diverse, and so we really think it's important for white folks to do this work…because we're the ones who have the privilege and we're the ones who are racist. Even systemically, the dynamics of racism still inhabit our institution even as we wish individually that they didn't.
—Larry, White Male, Religious Services Director, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Larry is reiterating points made by earlier respondents that relationships with the public or those who benefit from an organization's services are extremely important. For there to be success in programs, people in Larry's organization need to understand how their whiteness may give them advantages and impede their ability to respond in the best way possible to people of color in their programs. Because of the work he has done on issues of race over the last ten years, Larry is fairly far along in the racial awareness continuum. Larry is high in racial awareness, but has not yet reached his full awareness. Larry consciously thinks about his privilege and how it plays out in his organization, but has yet to fully grasp how to actively work against racism, rather than just acknowledge privilege. This is evident in the way that Larry discusses a personal change he has noticed resulting from his understanding of privilege as one of the major aspects of a new understanding about racism:

I also, I can't read the newspaper the same way anymore as I could 10 years ago. I can't read the news or listen to the news on the radio in the same because I think I have a different lens that the analysis and experience of privilege are much more a part of my consciousness.
—Larry, White Male, Religious Services Director, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Larry reflects on something very personal such as evaluating what he hears on the news or reads in a newspaper. His lens of privilege makes him recognize racism when it is apparent, but not in a way that always sparks action, rather than reflection. While Larry has taken some steps, anti-racist work has not been fully integrated into all aspects of his work. Part of this is shown in where their training focus has been. For the last ten years, training has mainly been on internal practices, rather than looking at the outside community that the organization serves.

Well I think it started internally. The first step is really to get to the individual and to help the white individual see that he or she has this privilege and that we are part of this institution that has this institutional racism as a part of it and then ultimately our hope would be to move to how then does this help us interact or look at our communities that are more diverse and so forth
—Larry, White Male, Religious Services Director, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

The focus has very much been on recognition, rather than action. Recently, Larry's organization switched trainers in the *anti-racist* model. The new trainers, one of which happens to be Fred, the white male diversity trainer introduced in the previous chapter, take a slightly different approach to the *anti-racist* model, which may have the potential to move leadership personnel like Larry along and help him "get there".

The managers who are described in the preceding pages have all had different experiences in their respective diversity trainings and different levels of knowledge about white power and privilege, as exemplified by their racial awareness. Moreover, each manager saw a unique reason for if and/or why diversity training should be implemented in the first place. If a significant goal of diversity training is to shift participants' way of thinking and get them to a

new understanding, managers must be assessed to see how much they have changed. The next section will concentrate on this change.

Assessing the Managers: Where Are They Now?

As mentioned multiple times, a significant piece of whether or not a diversity training has succeeded is if the participants have gotten "there". Where "there" is, however, is not a unilaterally new understanding, but can be evaluated on three levels. First, as the previous chapter shows, "getting there" is different depending on what diversity training model is used. The *celebrating diversity* model has a drastically different view of where "there" is than the *anti-racist curriculum* model. Second, each manager in the section above describes his or her own understanding of what "getting there" means as exemplified by their racial awareness and what the goals for diversity and diversity training should be. Lastly, there is a definition of "getting there" that may go beyond the specifics of a training model or individual to evaluate if the person leaves a training with an awareness of individual and institutional racism and the role of privilege in racism and racial power. For an individual in any training model, these three possibilities of "getting there" may be totally similar, totally different, or a represent a combination. For example, the training model's view of "getting there" may match the manager's view of "getting there," but may not be connected to "getting there" in terms of recognizes different forms of racism and understanding privilege.

The following section will outline the interplay of these three levels of "getting there" by analyzing managers after they have been through training in the different models. Have managers changed or "gotten there" on any of these three different levels? How did each of the three levels contribute to this change? Moreover, this section will describe not just personal change, but organizational change as well. The managers will discuss if and how their

organizations have changed and what facilitated that change. The connection of the three levels of "getting there", personal changes, and organizational changes, will allow for an understanding of how training models and individual racial awareness can impact responses to diversity trainings and ultimately provide insight into where institutional racism and privilege factor into these outcomes.

Starting From a Low Level of Racial Awareness

GARY

Gary is a black male housing manager who entered the training with a low-level of racial awareness. His goal in the training was to gain skills to assist him when interacting with residents so that neither personal nor resident biases would negatively impact the interaction. Gary and his colleagues participated in the _celebrating diversity_ model of diversity training, a model with the goal to increase an individual's self-awareness so that interacting with people who are different does not cause discomfort and biases do not impede communication. For Gary, his own goal for "getting there" and the training goal for "getting there" are identical. As one might expect, Gary believes he got a lot out of his diversity training:

> _So dealing with it [biases] starts with needing to understand you're having that thought and the reason you're having that thought. The thought itself could be good or bad, but it's how you react to the situation…So I think that for my end I think that it's helped me to deal with people who I think may have cultural biases and not just immediately get angry and say they're a jerk… that's how it [diversity training] helps you because the more you think about it you understand that it really has nothing to do with you. When someone's mad or wants to call me a derogatory term or whatever they don't even know me. So why should I internalize it and make it about me? It's that person's problem… Diversity training helps to understand why there's breakdown in communication. It's sometimes based in cultural differences._
> — Gary, Black Male, Housing Manager, "Celebrating Diversity"

The *celebrating diversity* model demonstrates everything that Gary is talking about in this passage. Being different than people causes biases and discomfort. To get over this discomfort, people must first realize their personal bias. Once the person becomes self-aware of their own biases, they can effectively communicate with those who are different than them. For Gary, this has also helped him to respond better when he perceives that someone else is biased against him. Clearly the connection between Gary's goals for the training and the *celebrating diversity* model's goals created some personal change in Gary's perspective on diversity, but this personal change did nothing to change his low racial awareness. He elaborates on this change by explaining what he learned about being a manager from the diversity training:

> *It's important for us to make the managers, make the staff understand you have to see everybody the same. Everybody's the same. And you can't make judgments based on a few instances.*
> — Gary, Black Male, Housing Manager, "Celebrating Diversity"

Since everyone is meant to be seen as equivalent, *celebrating diversity* can help staff in their interpersonal interactions. This training cannot get Gary "there" in the final sense of understanding institutional racism and privilege. The training is so focused on abstract liberal, color-blind discourse such as "you have to see everybody the same" that systemic inequality or oppression never enters the conversation. Gary's personal views and the training model's content speak to the post-racial society, a perspective that hinges on the understanding that racism is over, not persistent and institutionalized. On the personal level, then, Gary is sure that he has "gotten there" from the training model and personal perspectives. Gary is not so sure that his organization has changed as a whole:

> *So what I noticed was that the first few days after the training everyone was talking about it and everyone was so excited and they really liked it. They loved the little role playing scenarios and I think that it did what it was supposed to do in terms of open their eyes, but I think that like anything, as time goes on and if we as a company aren't kind of force feeding to a degree that after a while people just kind of forget… So our goal is to*

do something similar to this often. Maybe once a year have her or someone come in and try to do everything we can do as an organization to set the standard because it's like you have a habit of doing things a certain way and you stop but ya know after a while, it's natural, it's a habit so you're more comfortable going back in your shell.
— Gary, Black Male, Housing Manager, "Celebrating Diversity"

Initially, other people in the organization reacted similar to how Gary viewed the training. As time went on, however, Gary kept his understanding of self-awareness, while he saw most other staff members retreating to their old ways. In order to maintain the self-awareness about biases, there needs to be a continuous training to break other employees' habits. An employee's habit to allow their biases to affect their work is a barrier to reaching the personal change that Gary achieved. Still, Gary is concentrating on individuals within the organization rather than the organization as a whole. This is a product of both his personal view and the message of the *celebrating diversity* model that the focus should be in individuals and interpersonal relations. As Gary explained in the previous section, he believes that his own organization is like "family" and that race does not factor into their interactions in any way, so that the organization does not really need to change.

To reach the third level of "getting there" Gary and his colleagues could have benefitted from a *caring confrontation* model that talks about the interpersonal side of bias, but connects it to systems of oppression. This could illuminate how institutional racism may be working within his own organization, in the relationship between his organization and the state, and/or the relationship between staff and the resident population. As noted, since this is not a goal for the trainer or for Gary, understanding racial power and privilege has no place in this training, so that Gary changed slightly in his personal views about dealing with individual bias, but saw no change in racial awareness, leaving him in the low-level.

MARK

Mark is a high-ranking white male manager working in a government agency who entered an *ensuring responsibility* training with a low-level of racial awareness. Mark admits that coming into the training he did not really have goals and would self-categorize as someone who came into the training "with the idea that this was just something they had to go through." Mark did talk about his goals for diversity being linked to productivity, as well as hiring and reflecting the public that he serves, but he does not connect these to his specific training. Mark was in the *ensuring representation* model focusing on legal compliance in workplace policies and procedures. This message was relayed to Mark fairly well so that he had an understanding of the purpose of the training.

> *Well as far as I can tell, it was to make us aware in [name of state] of the protected groups. There are certain legally protected groups and to I think raise awareness of how to handle certain conflicts. And it went into both that and then certain types of sexual harassment and hostile work environment and sort of how that can play out in the workplace.*
> — Mark, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

After the training, Mark is able to recall a major purpose of this type of model: to explain to participants what groups are covered under anti-discriminatory law and what managers can do about possible conflicts on the basis of these groups. Simply understanding the purpose of the training, though, will not change attitudes or behaviors. It is clear after talking to Mark that he did not get much, if anything, out of this training and has not shifted his racial awareness.

> *I would say for the most part, it's something that people have to do. I don't think that people see a whole lot of value to it. Most of the people there have taken this several times now over the last several years and it sort of becomes you don't really learn a whole lot more….Personally I felt this was not very good training. Several people that I asked about it sort of thought 'oh yes, good to be reminded of these things, but I didn't really learn anything.'…And it's also not clear what, in fact, it's not clear at all, what are, if any, the diversity issues within the department? It's sort of an abstract "okay here are the protected groups. Be careful." And okay that's good. In fact I asked at the end:*

how often does this occur? Is this something that's going on out there? As I said I don't hear about it a lot. Is this something that's like out there a lot?... are we doing okay? Or is it something that we really need to be more sensitive to because we're missing something. And I don't know the answer to that. I don't have an answer. So I'm going along my merry way thinking 'well I'm not hearing a lot about this. I don't see fights out there. I don't hear people arguing. It can't be too big of an issue.'
— Mark, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

For Mark, the *ensuring representation* model seemed too abstract to truly make a difference. The talk about protected groups under the law was never integrated into talking about the specifics of the organization. This left Mark and the other colleagues he talked to unfulfilled. Managers felt that they were not learning anything new, but being made to sit through a training anyway. Clearly, this environment is not conducive to moving a manager along in their racial awareness. Mark even hinted to this point when he echoed many of the diversity trainers by saying that this training did not meet people where they were "at."

It was sort of like one-size fits all and they didn't really think about what might interest this audience. When you do this you really have to think about your audience. Where are they at? What kinds of things are they thinking about?
— Mark, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

Mark did not believe that his or the organization's interests were taken into account. The *ensuring representation* training has failed on all three levels of "getting there." Mark may be able to understand the major message of the training, but it is something that he has done so many times that the training appears meaningless. Because Mark came in with this attitude, he did not set goals for himself about what he wanted to learn. There was nowhere specific that he wanted to "get to." He did mention, though, some things that could have been added into the training that may have engaged him more.

There have been many times when I have come to trainings where I've sort of said 'oh I have to do this' but the training sort of got me involved anyways despite my self. It got me into it. In any case if you're going to be there for 3 hours you want to make it interesting for yourself. So you can get intellectually engaged in something, even if it's not something you're particularly excited about. But this was not particularly

engaging…To me what might have been more interesting is go to some current cases. Some new case law…and said here are some decisions that have been made. How do you think you would have done there?…that might have at least for me, engaged me. Because it's current and I'm learning something about a case and about some new policy or standard that's been set.
— Mark, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

Mark is bringing up an interesting point here. Even if a person does not have personal goals for "getting there," the training goals for "getting there" can still be achieved. This can only be done, though, if the participants are engaged. What was missing from this training was something that connects equal opportunity law to contemporary decisions in order to engage participants and give them something new to talk about. Instead Mark disengaged, meaning no personal change or "getting there" on any level, including no understanding of power and privilege.

Mark also identified other barriers to personal and organizational change. For one thing, the training is focusing on representation and fair practices, but the organization has not dealt with hiring and promotion for some time.

Mark: Part of the problem is we haven't hired anybody for years…

David: No hiring, but are there promotional opportunities?

Mark: Haven't been any for 3-4 years because we can't afford it.

Mark and his colleagues are being asked to participate in a training that is looking at law and equal opportunity, but one of the major correlates to this discussion, hiring and promotion, are not even in the equation for the organization. The workplace cannot be changed at all in terms of representation because they cannot bring in or promote any new people.

Lastly, Mark spends some time describing the organizational structure of his agency and how this relates to diversity, which may hurt the ability of any training to get participants to the desired understanding.

> *Well I think that the diversity effort is not very well connected to the rest of the department. The [names a division of the agency], which is where the diversity person sits, tends to be, and I know I'm not the only one who thinks this, tends to be somewhat insular. So there's not a lot of connection between the two. There's a lot of interaction because obviously we have to interact. The example I use is when I want to change a regulation I go out to the people who are going to be affected by that regulation and say 'let's talk about why we're doing this and let's get your input, etc. etc.' and I've often said to the [names the same division] 'you ought to treat the rest of [names agency] like your customers and you ought to have an advisory committee.' They've not done that and that's fine. It's not like they have to do whatever I ask. But I think it would be so much better for them because then they'd have some sense of who their users are and make that connection. Instead, it's like they're there and we're over here and I pay a lot more attention to administrative things than a lot of senior managers do. To me, I recognize the operation can't function without administration… I used the advisory committee, because that's what I'm used to. But there are lots of different ways to have a continuous flow of information back and forth…take a much more proactive approach to that.*
> — Mark, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

Mark is making the point that diversity efforts in general at his agency may flounder because of a lack on connection between diversity and the other work of the agency. Diversity has not been intertwined with the agency's work, so that the message is often lost and diversity is perceived as something detached from the organization. It is understandable that Mark and his colleagues would feel this way because as Mark alluded to earlier, this training appeared to be a "one-size fits all" without taking into account what the organization needed. Mark needed something that told him exactly how the *ensuring representation* content fit into his work in the organization, especially in terms of productivity, rather than compliance. For Mark, the *managing and valuing diversity* approach may have been more effective in shifting his racial awareness and creating some personal and institutional change. Connecting diversity to real agency practices would provide the context Mark needed to engage in the material.

DON

Don is a white, male manager at a government agency, who entered diversity training in the *ensuring representation* model with a low level of racial awareness. Don's goal for the training was to be reminded about how to make sure he is not offensive when interacting with people who are different than him. While he does not respond to the training as harshly as Mark does, Don definitely relates to Mark's reaction to the *ensuring representation* model of diversity training. Don views diversity training more than anything as a reminder about how to act in the workplace.

> *I look at them [diversity training] as a reminder. I suppose there's things—I didn't go back and look at the materials to try to refresh my memory about what my take away was —but I go in thinking that ya know I mean most people would probably go into the training thinking I support diversity, and I'm certainly not into harassment so why do I need this training? But to me I think it's a good reminder and then there are times occasionally when things are brought up that you might not have thought of yourself.*
> — Don, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

From his initial response, Don is implying that he did not really get much from the training at all. Diversity training is supposed to be about conveying knowledge and skills that people can apply in their organizations to reach a diversity goal. Don has trouble recollecting what his take-away from the training was without reviewing his materials, meaning that no change in decision-making has occurred. This means that on the training model level, Don did not "get there." He has not incorporated new ideas about legal compliance into his goals, which is the focal point of the *ensuring representation* model. Don does bring up an interesting point about occasionally hearing people bring up a particular grievance about the organization that he had not heard before or would never have thought of on his own. He recounted one particular instance, which had the potential to get Don "there" on both the personal level and the institutional racism and privilege level.

I think the only thing that I remember off the top of my head is some of the examples of things that people said that they were offended by or that might be discriminatory. For instance, assigning a job to someone who is more physically fit than someone else. It's like well to me that would make sense on one level, but it kind of opened my eyes when someone said 'well if the person doing that job then had more career advancement opportunities because they had that experience, then the person who was denied that experience is discriminated against.' And it was sort of 'I never thought of it from that angle. I was only thinking of it from getting the job done.' I wasn't thinking of it in terms of what else came with doing that kind of work. So it did open my eyes a little bit.
— Don, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

This appeared to be a fairly enlightening insight that Don was sharing, so I pressed him a little to see if he had recognized this sort of bias in task allocation happening in his own managerial actions or decisions. Don was quick, however, to explain this away as an isolated event, rather than something that occurs often. His response spells this out and leads to a better understanding of Don's beliefs in the low level of racial awareness.

I think most of what we do is not like that…it was kind of a one time thing…and so in general that doesn't come up and it was a weird thing that it did in that particular time. I think that pretty much everybody has the same expectations in terms of what there capabilities are…But in terms of everyone else, the other folks that work directly for me, I've got 5 section chiefs and 3 are women and 2 are men and 2 are people of color and so I think that if people looked at the level below me, the 5 of them, I think people if they were to look at those 5 they'd say 'oh gee there's advancement for people of different genders and different minority status.' And I think that's a good thing that people don't look up and see just all the same kinds of people and say 'oh gee if I'm not one of them I can't advance.'
— Don, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

Don's goal in the training is to be reminded about how not to offend people at work. In this case, the training got him "there" in that he has new knowledge about a way that people may feel discriminated against. At the same time, he discounts the extent to which this applies to his personal position. Don's reaction here is really a case of color-blind discourse and exemplifies his position in the low level of racial awareness. People of all different backgrounds can advance to all different levels of the programs that he oversees. This is a laudable achievement and Don should show the pride that he does in this passage. It also shows the connection to

representation that the *ensuring representation* model uses. Representation, though, does not make Don immune to other forms of subtle discrimination. The training has failed to make that clear to Don guaranteeing that his racial awareness does not change.

Directly connected to this is the fact that he will not "get there" in terms of understanding institutional racism and privilege. The example about discriminating based on physical fitness was a novel idea to Don. He integrated it into his ideas about interpersonal discrimination, but had no tools for overcoming his color-blind ideas in order to see how his privilege might affect his decisions. To "get there" at this third level, Don needed a critical diversity approach. The *caring confrontation* model seems most suited to Don's nature. It can begin with subtle ideas about discrimination that Don can connect to his workplace interactions and then move the discussion to a deeper analysis.

Don has expanded his knowledge of potentially offensive actions, but has not changed his racial awareness because of the inability of the *ensuring representation* model to look at institutional racism and privilege. Additionally, Don has not seen much change in his organization.

> *I can't say that I see a direct cause and effect, but I do believe that if there are principles that an organization believes in the organization should make them public and make them clear and reinforce them and remind people and I think that's what's being done in the last particularly last 5 years maybe… It lets staff know what the culture is, what the management principles are, and I think it's a good thing. Although I can't say I see a tangible effect, I think it may be more of a subliminal kind of thing.*
> — Don, White Male, Government Manager, "Ensuring Representation"

Don is unable to connect the training to any concrete change. This may be, as Mark mentioned, because there has been no hiring or promotion during the training period. How can managers implement knowledge about representation and compliance if the power structures in the

organization are frozen in place? It seems again that there is a disconnect between what the organization needs at this time and what the *ensuring representation* model is able to provide.

DANA

Dana is a white female administrator in higher education who entered the *caring confrontation* model with a low level of racial awareness. Dana stated that her goals included recognizing the discomfort that comes from experiencing diversity and learning about how that discomfort can be constructive in learning about other cultures. In her section above, Dana described how she was confronted with diversity after coming to Boston in the low level of racial awareness, when she made a comment in a diversity training about how having a black friend gave her legitimacy to talk about the black experience. This comment incited many people in the training to attack her. Dana admitted that at the time she felt so horrible that she contemplated disengaging from caring about diversity, mimicking the reaction of many white men who felt attacked in the compliance-based diversity of the 1960s (; Comer and Soliman 1996; Lynch 1997; Von Bergen et al 2002; Kalev et al 2006). Fortunately, this also became the moment for her *caring confrontation*, as someone pulled her aside, reassured her that she had been unfairly attacked, and explained the history behind why others reacted to her comments so harshly. In this way, Dana "got there" on one level and began to move toward the other two.

She reached her personal goal of being uncomfortable, but learning as a result of that discomfort. She also started to "get there" from the *caring confrontation* model because her conversation opened her eyes to how much deeper race and racism goes than just interpersonal relations. "Getting there" in the *caring confrontation* model is the same as "getting there" on the third level of understanding institutional racism and privilege. Her experience in the training did

not fully get her "there" on these last two levels, but it triggered an excitement to start working toward diversity in earnest, engaging her in new conversation that would make this change to a high level of racial awareness. One particular project that she worked on made her explicitly think about white privilege.

> *And so in each role I sort of threw myself into those uncomfortable situations… One of the projects I worked on was a white privilege project. At [names university] the committee…I was a member of did videos looking at the student experience from the Muslim perspective, from African-American perspective, just really getting in-depth into a particular cultural or racial issue. And white privilege was one of them and I kind of headed up that video project and so you really get a sense of your own identity when you do a project like that.*
> — Dana, White Female, Education Administrator, "Caring Confrontation"

From that low level, Dana really worked at developing her identity in a conscious manner, seeking out situations where she might feel uncomfortable, but would also learn about herself. Each one of these efforts to learn more about race and racism and her own racial awareness are like mini-caring confrontations, where Dana can admit that she does not know everything, but it is willing to learn from others that do (Tatum 1997). So her *caring confrontation* commenced her movement to a high racial awareness, which she reached by exploring her own privilege by getting involved in additional projects and trainings. The ability to put her new high level of racial awareness to practice was instrumental in her maintaining a conscious awareness of power and privilege. As a consequence of the *caring confrontation* and subsequent diversity work, Dana has "gotten there" on all three levels.

Dana also talked about meeting people where they are "at" and using that knowledge to creatively talk about race and racism. This strategic aspect is key to the *caring confrontation* model.

> *I think kind of acknowledgement that everyone has to come at this from a different place. …One of the things that's true of any diversity training that I've been involved in is that at first people have their backs up, so a little defensive, especially if you're in a majority.*

But the best trainers that I can recall kind of acknowledge that and you spend the first kind of phase of the training talking about that. Then you can kind of get to the heart of the issue, which in the case of working in the university is how are we best serving our students…You know I think that often times when we talk about race or diversity, people immediately go to the "me." So 'okay this is going to be about me, I'm going to feel attacked.' But if you re-focus to let's think about our students and yes, we have to deal with our own baggage. Everyone has it. Everyone has their own prejudice and bias. Saying that you don't is ridiculous I think. And when I hear people say 'I have no prejudice or bias at al'" they lose credibility with me.
— Dana, White Female, Education Administrator, "Caring Confrontation"

This statement, along with her work above to expose white privilege, show how dramatic Dana's understanding of race and racism has shifted since she first encountered racial diversity. Dana is most definitely in at a high level of racial awareness at this point in her career. She openly addresses issues of racism and white privilege when she sees them and has a positive sense of her own white identity. Dana discussed two ways that she has included her higher racial awareness into her work and also began to mention some of the challenges that exist in organizations around issues of institutional racism and privilege.

I'm on the campus diversity committee here and I actually with a faculty member…said we need to celebrate the work that's being done with our students and with our staff and we sort of took a year to create 'diversity awards.' And it just never got done. It just doesn't feel like people care that much. I have a full-time job myself so doing this work sort of felt very; ya know the committee is great, but the committee isn't convened often enough. There's no real purpose to the committee. Every time we get together, one of the other VPs and I convened this diversity committee and said "okay let's give some feedback to [diversity office] about what our purpose is and we did that, we convened the group. It was great. It was an excellent conversation. Again, we don't know what happened to that information…I see my role as, so a couple examples: hiring. So when we have a position open, making sure that everything we do creates a diverse pool of candidates, that we are actively seeking viewpoints that may be missing within our staff, making sure that our student staff represent our student body here, simple things like that. And then in the programs that we support, making sure that we have a wide range of issues or perspectives. So I think it's central to my job, it's always present in my job.
— Dana, White Female, Education Administrator, "Caring Confrontation"

Dana connects power and privilege to both personal choices about what committees she wants to be a part of and the duties of her job. Dana has been integral to recognizing and acknowledging

who the people are at her place of work that are doing great things around diversity and anti-racism. Awarding these people can serve as a form of solidarity between people working toward the same goals. Additionally, Dana has taken a leadership role on a committee to address these same issues at her workplace. They have created a report and presented it to the office in charge of handling such issues. In her personal work, Dana tends to focus on representation, but representation because of ongoing exclusion rather than past discrimination. This involves both hiring and recruitment practices, as well as being cognizant of what groups her office is supporting to maintain different perspectives and ensure that no group is discriminated against. In doing this work, Dana recognizes some real challenges.

In her words above, she mentioned that she does not believe that other people in her office and other offices truly care that much about the work she is doing, so that much of her work goes uncompleted, unnoticed, or unutilized. Dana's statements point to the possibility that many of her colleagues have a low level of racial awareness so that her advocacy is not seen as crucial to the organization. Therefore, there are not many chances for staff to explore and possible move along in their racial awareness.

> *But there aren't many opportunities here, as staff, it doesn't feel like it's part of the culture here. As a training culture, as a diversity training. I think it sort of feels like people are afraid to talk about it here and so it sort of makes me more afraid to talk about it, which is strange because I'm not afraid to talk about it at all. It's something I care a lot about and I actually don't mind as I said to you before, I don't mind feeling uncomfortable with my own knowledge of a situation, so I would say that it hasn't been done well here for staff and faculty.*
> — Dana, White Female, Education Administrator, "Caring Confrontation"

The organization itself is not changing because diversity has not become part of the fabric of the institution. Dana is expressing the tendency for people to feel apprehensive when talking about diversity. Remarkably, Dana notices that this culture makes her feel more uncomfortable around diversity, even though she has a high racial awareness. There are not opportunities in her

workplace to explore that apprehension. Exploring her discomfort was essential to Dana moving to a higher level of racial awareness. The possibilities of similar changes are not apparent at her current place of work. Even when there are possibilities to attend trainings, they might not get people to where Dana is if they do not employ the *caring confrontation* model. Dana discusses how in a recent training in she attended that did not use the *caring confrontation*, the responses in the training were detrimental to the goal of having conversations about race. Dana entered this training with a high racial awareness and noticed some problems with the training.

> *I participated in one or two of what we called kind of like [name of the program]... It was the [name of a university office] that pulled together conversations about race and culture, but they were really uncomfortable and I don't mean uncomfortable in a good way. It was sort of like no one wanted to- there was no context provided for it. So all of a sudden we're at a round table and we have to talk about race. There was no preparing people. There was no learning about people around the table. It was really odd. So for me what's important is that you have to know who the person is. So if I'm talking to you, yeah you're a white male, but you're more than just a white male. So sort of learning and understanding. Because I can't have a talk with you about just race based on my very limited knowledge of you that you're a white male and a student.*
> — Dana, White Female, Education Administrator, "Caring Confrontation"

People in this training needed the context to be set in order to have an effective conversation. Dana is describing a poorly constructed *anti-racist curriculum* model training, where race is the first and only focus, but unlike other trainings in that model, no context is provided. By jumping right into it, people did not have to opportunity to slowly lower their defenses in order to really engage in the conversation. Engaging in the conversation would have created the "good" kind of discomfort, where people grapple with how race and privilege operate in their own lives. Instead people literally felt too uncomfortable to talk. Moreover, Dana begins a discussion of intersectionality, something that the *caring confrontation* also addresses. Each person is a member of a number of different identity groups such as race, class, and gender. These should not be considered separate entities, but should be recognized as coming together to form the

entirety of personal experience (Crenshaw 1991, 1995; Collins 1998, 2000; Davis 2008). As a result, the training did not succeed in Dana's mind. Had she not already had a high racial awareness, this could have been detrimental to her growth.

Through her experiences with the *caring confrontation* model, Dana has made a drastic shift from a low to a high racial awareness. Following a particularly horrible experience of feeling attacked, Dana was brought to an analysis of racism as institutional in a way to energized, rather than stifled her. This personal change related to her own workplace practices, but did not really change the organization as a whole because of a lack of support for diversity efforts. The *caring confrontation* model was perfect for getting Dana "there" on the personal, training model, and awareness of institutional racism levels.

<u>Starting From a Medium Level of Racial Awareness</u>

TONY

Tony is a white male teacher and administrator who entered a *managing and valuing diversity* training with a medium level racial awareness. Tony's goals for the training were to learn how to create an atmosphere in his school where all staff and students feel included in the organization because it is the right thing to do and it can increase the learning experience for all involved. This prompted the school to bring in a diversity consulting company that trains using the *managing and valuing diversity* model. The initial training that Tony and his colleagues participated in highlights how differences between the training model level of "getting there" and personal goals for "getting there" can inhibit change in racial awareness on all levels, unless there is room for flexibility.

> *Last year we started with what I would call pretty basic diversity training sessions. My honest feeling is that our faculty was a little more advanced and need more advanced*

experiences than the very first ones we had... So it was sort of basic 101 diversity training. We've moved from that into some other experiences where we've focused on specific aspects of diversity...and their last presentation back in November really focused on the notion of understanding what race is. Race as a social construct rather than an actual biological fact. It's really interesting. And I think the difficulty and the challenge that [names consultants] has coming into a school with 85 part-time faculty, is it's not a homogeneous group in terms of their understanding of race. It's incredibly diverse in their levels of interest, levels of experience, generational differences that make certain things relevant or irrelevant or it's just very interesting. So it's challenging for them to hit a real "sweet spot" on the whole faculty. So what I hear sometimes is 'oh that was old news' or 'wow that was really interesting. I'd never heard that before.' You get really, really completely different responses to the very same activity or very same information. So the challenge of course is, how do you take that and build it into something that will really address the needs of the high majority of members of the faculty that really are all over the map in their understanding...trying to get their hands around really who are these guys out there?... Really identifying what do people know? What do they think? What do they need to know?

  — Tony, White Male, Teacher/Administrator, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

This extended quote from my conversation with Tony touches on a number of key aspects that he sees coming from their work with the trainers. First, he and his staff were already too advanced in their knowledge of diversity for the initial training. People in higher stages of racial awareness need more challenging information to move them to new levels and gain skills. Tony, being fairly far along, but not quite "there" yet in terms of personal identity, recognized the basic training as unhelpful. Instead they decided to specialize on specific aspects of diversity such as race. Tony also touches on how difficult it can be for trainers to assess what information to include in a training without taking the time to really get to know the people involved. That the trainers were able to adapt their basic training to one more focused on race speaks to the flexibility of the *managing and valuing diversity* model in that it need not always include information on power and privilege, but can if the client requests it. In this model, where "there" is for the training shifts to match client goals. In this specific case, the *managing and valuing diversity* model has begun to resemble a critical diversity approach, incorporating power and privilege into the conversation of the business case for diversity.

This flexibility is also a luxury for the school. It is not often that organizations are able to bring the trainers back for multiple sessions to concentrate on problem areas in more depth. For Tony, this extended relationship with the trainers was absolutely necessary.

> *My feeling is that we've done enough one-hit wonders. We've definitely had people come in and do one presentation and left and everybody just goes, 'Okay. That was nice. Why did we do it?' and they just move on. And sometimes they'll incorporate little bits of it. I will say that it's not worthwhile to have an expert come in and say things that are wise and even relevant and meaningful. I mean that definitely has an impact on some people a little bit but it is really hard to get a big kind of pronounced impact on the whole community with just sort of one visit.*
> — Tony, White Male, Teacher/Administrator, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

Had the trainers simply come in for the initial training, they would have done the basic *managing and valuing diversity* model and left. Since Tony and his colleagues are more advanced than this, it would have had no impact whatsoever. Instead, the trainers came back for multiple sessions, allowing faculty and staff to delve deeper into the issues. This has given Tony tools to move along in his racial identity and reach a high level of awareness. Since this is an ongoing process, Tony was not able to comment on any larger changes that he has noticed. He was, however, about to articulate some changes that he would like to see and some barriers to organizational change.

> *And you have to do it for a committed length of time until you see change. Some of that change comes with turnover, I hate to say it. Some of it comes because the atmosphere you're creating becomes unpleasant for the people who won't get on board or integrate the stuff that they're learning. And people come in knowing that this is going to do that [diversity work] and say "oh I want to do that."*
> — Tony, White Male, Teacher/Administrator, "Managing and Valuing Diversity"

For Tony, the overall success of this training session will be whether or not they create an atmosphere marked by high racial awareness throughout his school. This will create the morally inclusive, productive workplace that Tony wants. Really, from the high racial awareness he now has, Tony is hoping to change the workplace culture to one that has an ongoing consciousness of

institutional racism and privilege. This will force faculty and staff to either "get there" on the

third level, or leave the organization. New faculty will recognize his school as an institution with

this agenda, so that only people who believe in this mission will seek to become new employees.

The ongoing work in the flexible *managing and valuing diversity* model can work toward this as

it begins to resemble a critical diversity approach at Tony's school.

JOHN

John is a white male youth development manager who came into diversity training in the

anti-racist curriculum model with a medium level of racial awareness. John's personal goals for

the training were to infuse his organization with a social justice agenda focused on anti-racist

work. John was inclined to social justice ideals, but thought he and his colleagues needed to

understand racism intellectually. In this case, all three levels of "getting there" were aligned. In

the *anti-racist* model, "getting there" means shifting a participant's lens to understand racism as

both interpersonal and institutional; John wanted a personal and organizational change in terms

of a full understanding of racism; and both of these contribute to the third level of "getting there"

in relation to acknowledging institutional racism and privilege. John displays "getting there"

personally in his reflection on what he learned from the training:

> *I think, well at this point it kind of seems like common sense looking back, but the fact that really just 1. how white privilege plays out and how white people take for granted some of the ways that society works, which they shouldn't take for granted and 2. that white people have to take the lead in terms of attacking racism. It can't be turning to the black people or people of color in the organization and asking "what do you think we should do?" which was clearly a problem that we had before hand. So I think really those 2 things stand out as the biggest pieces. While those sort of seem like simple thoughts, but they're pretty profound when you follow them out.*
> — John, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

John has integrated anti-racist teachings into his everyday consciousness. His point about it seeming "common sense" now speaks to the transformative nature of shifting a lens to focus on racism at the four levels of individual, interpersonal, institutional, and cultural. Learning about white privilege seems so obvious after the fact, but the most dangerous aspect of privilege is that it can so often go unnoticed and unnamed, while still affecting opportunity. John, then, went through a considerable personal change after experiencing a training that used the *anti-racist curriculum* model putting him in a high racial awareness. A similar transformation occurred for John's organization.

> *I think, so the good news is that, had it not been for [name of organization]'s training, the change that we went through, which was pretty radical and pretty transformational, wouldn't of happened… I think that before that time, in terms of how we both looked at the external world in our work and how we thought about ourselves and organized ourselves certainly anti-racism was way, way in the background. It was probably something that good liberal people think about but don't really practice well. And through the training I think it really changed people's awareness and we became a different staff and a different place.*
> — John, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

John's organization did experience a dramatic shift in focus as a consequence of the training. The organization took on a concerted anti-racist agenda, something that it had never done before.

> *One thing that I should note is our two largest initiatives. One of which…[names initiative] is the most well-known of all of our work… has a tremendous anti-racism agenda that almost kind of leads the work. And that directly came from this work [anti-racist training] and really transformed [names initiative]…they'll talk about anti-racism and social justice. And the other initiative…they use anti-racism as a major tenet of all of their work as well….Without what happened during the workshops, those two pieces of work…[the first initiative] touches 4500 high school students a year and is growing [the second initiative] touches every student within the lock-up system in [names state], so thousands of kids. That wouldn't have happened.*
> — John, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Here, the knowledge from the *anti-racist curriculum* model was fully integrated as a major piece of the organization's largest initiatives. This became specifically clear in the way that the

organization set up initiatives for high school students and kids in the criminal justice system. From John's perspective, none of this could have occurred without an internal continuation of the *anti-racist* model.

> *I think there was a conclusion that we had gotten what we needed to get from [names trainers] and that we could take it from there. And we in fact did….we basically continued going with it internally…The other piece is that it wouldn't have been successful had there not been an understanding of the fact that we needed something like this, which doesn't always exist. And had the staff not been sophisticated enough to sit through the training and say this is good and we need to kind of tinker with it and change some of it around to keep it going ourselves because from where we were we can now do a better job ourselves with what they gave us… a caveat is that it wouldn't have been successful had it not been for the willingness to do the work initially. And the capacity and willingness to follow it up and take it on our own.*
> — John, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

John has outlined some very specific things about his organization that he believes facilitated change. One was the racial awareness of the group at the start of the training. John labels them as "sophisticated," allowing them to sit through a provocative training and evaluate how the information they are learning about institutional racism relates to their organization. From this point, they were able to take the work on themselves in order to target specific aspects, such as education and criminal justice, where institutional racism affects the youth they look to develop.

The training had other concrete changes in terms of representation of people of color in the organization. Before the training, the organization was probably about one-third people of color. John explains how and why he thinks this changed:

> *John: After the training, over the years, it became at least ½ if not more than ½ people of color."*
>
> *David: Do you think that's directly related to the workshop and taking on a more anti-racist mindset?*
>
> *John: I think so yes. A combination of us recruiting more people of color and also them sticking around, ya know, retaining them.*
> — John, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

John's organization was able to retain more people of color, as they realized the anti-racist agenda that permeates the workplace culture. The organization provided an inviting place for people of color to work, as they saw the work they did with youth deconstructing institutional racism and privilege.

The diversity training in the *anti-racist curriculum* model served as the starting point for both personal and organizational change that transformed both individuals and the institution. John and his colleagues "got there" on all three levels and, by taking on anti-racist work internally, infused their most important youth initiatives with an anti-racist agenda. John and the organization shifted to a high level of racial awareness, but John is cautious to mention that he does not believe this change could have occurred had he and his colleagues not been at a medium level of racial awareness and prepared to receive the challenging information in the *anti-racist curriculum* model.

Starting from a High Level of Racial Awareness

BILL

Bill is a white male youth program manager who entered an *anti-racist curriculum* training with a high level of racial awareness. He has been working in non-profits with a personal anti-racist agenda for multiple decades. Intellectually speaking, there was not much for a training using the *anti-racist* model to teach him, so he did not really enter with personal goals for the training. Bill can be considered "there" on all three levels before entering the training. He understands his personal role in racism and privilege and agrees with the *anti-racist* model's goal to shift a lens to a multi-faceted view of racism, meaning that he also has the third level of "getting there," because of how closely it is related to the *anti-racist* model. What Bill was able

to do was reflect on how other people in the training reacted to the *anti-racist curriculum*, how content in the model was presented, and what happened in the organization after the training. In the training, Bill identified a number of times when people moved along in their racial awareness.

> *And then we'd have these 'a-ha moments='" where they'd say 'Oh! I guess I really didn't know all there was to know' and [Fred's] very good at that.*
> — Bill, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

In these "a-ha moments" people in the training were beginning to understand the analysis of racism in the *anti-racist curriculum* model that identified racism as not just individual and interpersonal, but also institutional and cultural. Bill believes that the way the content in this training was delivered promoted these revelations about the four levels of racism, rather than just interpersonal or individual.

> *One of the things that [Fred] does differently is that he came out right from the get-go and said this is what our objectives are here, is to provide people with the actual experience of institutional and structural racism through films and through discussion and through interactive activities rather than just lecturing.*
> — Bill, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Bill's colleagues were aware of the purpose of the training from the very start. This prepared them for the information that was going to be presented throughout the training, so that the controversial information about the persistence of racism could be accepted and people could change their awareness. White people, who made up most of the participants in this study, can react negatively to this information at first (Von Bergen et al 2002; Lynch 1997; Kalev et al 2006; Comer and Soliman 1996). On the contrary, if presented in an empowering way, like Fred did by using interactive activities and connecting the information to contemporary popular culture, this information can energize whites to shift their understanding of racism (Feagin and Vera 1994; Tatum 1997; Kivel 2002). Bill seems to believe that the type of delivery used in the

anti-racist curriculum training did promote this shift. His colleagues may have some understanding of "getting there" in terms of the model reaching its goals and having an understanding of institutional racism and privilege. He attributes this to the atmosphere that the trainers created.

> *They felt very safe, people were made to feel very safe…I think the main reason that that was the case was that [Fred] himself is a very, a very kind, yet assertive person…and also I think the reputation, the historic reputation of [Fred's anti-racist organization] is such that he had a very good reputation and the organization did historically.*
> — Bill, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

The safety of the training that Fred created in his delivery of the *anti-racist curriculum* allowed for people to openly and constructively explore their own racism. Bill is making the point that not only the model, but the type of trainer matters too. Simply using the content of the *anti-racist curriculum* model may not shift people's lenses if the trainer does not foster a safe atmosphere, where people can feel free to explore their own experiences with racism and privilege. So, while others in the training may have more knowledge about institutional racism, Bill is unconvinced about how much his organization actually changed.

> *White privilege was working throughout those non-profits… So, I think we saw potential for change. I think that part of the challenge with any of this stuff is that you get a grant and you spend the grant and you introduce ideas and you introduce processes and then the grant goes away. And so you don't have any funds for follow-up or for continually reinforcing this stuff, it's the challenge of all non-profit work that you're basically grant funded and when the grant goes away, there's no way to sustain the work. So that's the story of my life, right, I've been doing this stuff for 40 years. So the problem that you run into in that situation is how do you sustain this?... Continual exposure to these ideas and these concepts and their ability to get down below the conscious understanding of ourselves. Because most people are not, at this point in history, overtly racist. But most people will not confront institutional racism given the chance. They'll say 'well I'll do it tomorrow or next week or have someone else do it.' You can't do that. You have to be continually alert.*
> — Bill, White Male, Youth Services Manager, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Bill outlines a number of barriers to facilitating change in an organization. Change for Bill means deconstructing the basis for white privilege in non-profit work. The *anti-racist*

curriculum is considered a way to make that change because it exposes institutional racism. This exposure needs to be continuous. In the non-profit sector, where funds may not always be available to pay trainers to come in, sustaining this work can be extremely difficult. Bill has not seen the work fully incorporated into his organization. As his own analysis of the situation shows, without fully incorporating the knowledge from the *anti-racist* training, white privilege is not going to be eradicated from his organizations. Bill also touches on another barrier to change, namely color-blind racism and inactivity. Color-blind racism replaced overt racism of the past and functions to maintain racial inequality under the guise of equal opportunity, stereotyping, and minimizing the extent to which race continues to matter (Bonilla-Silva 2001, 2010). The lack of overtly racist actions hides the perpetuation of racism from Bill's colleagues who are at a lower level of racial awareness. The *anti-racist curriculum* can expose color-blind racism, but will only lead to inactivity, unless the anti-racist agenda is institutionalized and ongoing.

LARRY

Larry is a white male high-ranking administrator for a religious denomination, who entered an *anti-racist curriculum* training with a high racial awareness. Larry's goals for the training involve providing a common language around racism and privilege to be used internally and raise awareness about how white privilege works in his organization. Though Larry is in the high level of racial awareness, he has not fully grasped specific ways that he can collaborate with other anti-racists to specifically deconstruct white privilege and institutional racism. In this way, Larry has "gotten there" in personal terms because he thinks he has an awareness of institutional racism and privilege, but has not "gotten there" in terms of fully understanding how to work against institutional racism and privilege, something that the *anti-racist curriculum* model and

the third level of "getting there" in relation to power and privilege strive to accomplish. Larry's reflection on the role of changing leadership in his organization points to some reason why he may not have "gotten there" on these other two levels:

> *I think basically, over the number of years, the challenge with this is leadership is always changing so some people who have experienced a workshop or two, then might rotate out of leadership and there's new people in there who need that experience. We were hoping just as a baseline to raise some consciousness, to raise awareness, especially among white folk of their privilege and of the systemic racism. To be able to have some sort of analysis systemically and of course, over time we hope this creates a common language that some leadership can use with each other and that ultimately it impacts the decisions that we make and the ways that we look at our institution and the work that we're doing.*
> —Larry, White Male, Religious Services Director, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Because of changing leadership, Larry feels that his organization has been *"doing anti-racism 101"* for quite some time. This means that they have done a fairly basic training again and again to bring new people up to speed with those who have been in the training. Larry is suggesting that if he, or his colleagues who have done the trainings many times, are to get anything new out of it, the training needs to go farther, or become more advanced. This can explain why Larry does not really know how to apply his intellectual basis for institutional racism and privilege to actively working against racism. The action piece of anti-racist work is missing from the basic *"anti-racism 101"* training that his organization continues to do.

Over the years Larry has seen his personal lens shift from one where racism was considered interpersonal to an understanding of institutional oppression, but in terms of each training having an impact at this point in his career, Larry seems to echo Bill's sentiments about a lack of new information. Though he finds more novelty in the trainings than Bill, Larry has almost exhausted the extent to which the *anti-racist curriculum* model, especially *anti-racism 101*, can change his beliefs.

> *I feel like I am at a different place—I don't know if it's a good place or not (laughs). Ya know I am part of an ongoing group that tries to be an accountability group and it's*

people of color and white folk. I am committed as part of that group to do some ongoing learning myself and feel that that's something that I need to do as a white person and then everywhere else in terms of institutionally I have a lot of access, that's part of my privilege, to be able to raise some questions around racism, or diversity, or privilege, whenever I can... I certainly think in terms of my work, for better or worse, I'm one of the leadership people known now in this area as a white guy, an old white guy that raises these questions in our different places where we do business together.
—Larry, White Male, Religious Services Director, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

Larry has definitely incorporated knowledge from a decade or so of learning into his interpersonal relations, raising questions and trying to spark conversation about white privilege in his organization. He has not necessarily taken the final step of actively organizing ways to ensure that his organization is anti-racist. That the organization has been compelled to stay at "anti-racism 101" means that it is unlikely that Larry will have new experiences in these trainings that may give him a practical applicability of his knowledge. Larry has, though, identified various levels of racial awareness amongst his colleagues. More or less, Larry sees each level of racial awareness portrayed in the most recent *anti-racist curriculum* training he attended.

As you might imagine, we get different responses. There is always a small percentage that is resistant or not easily open to the subject matter. Then a lot of people are very new to this. Ya know some of this presentation is like a light goes on and it can be a little bit upsetting. I know when I first experienced this I had some anger, like why didn't I know this before? Because I thought I was moderately intelligent and had been moderately well educated but where was all this history and all of this stuff. So you get a little bit of that and then you get some that are ahead of the rest of us and they say 'yeh we've heard this before, let's do something about it' so I think you get that—people along that range entirely.
—Larry, White Male, Religious Services Director, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

In describing his own movement on the racial awareness continuum, Larry explains the anger that he experienced when coming out of low level of racial awareness. Prolonged exposure to anti-racist trainings allowed him to increase his awareness to where he is today, but for people hearing this information for the first time, it can be a bit of a shock. Once again the image of a

light going on is used to describe how people get "there" or begin the journey to "getting there," by having a sudden realization that the way they were conceptualizing racism was incorrect. He recognizes that people in this position are probably at one extreme in their understanding, while people like himself and other colleagues are at another end, with many people at different positions in between as they come to understand their racial identity. Even with these "light going on" moments, much of the work in Larry's organization continues to focus on simply raising awareness, rather than active deconstruction. When asked if he sees change in his organization, Larry responded in this manner:

> *I think it's always a struggle. I mean yes, I do [see change]. I mean now when in certain places when issues are raised you sort of don't have to explain, in most cases, what you're talking about or what you mean. And so that's one level of it and I think there are more people, not just people in leadership, who are raising questions and concerns around privilege as they come up.*
> —Larry, White Male, Religious Services Director, "Anti-Racist Curriculum"

So people are talking about these issues and dealing with privilege when concerns are brought to the table, but no institutional transformation has actually occurred. Larry has met his personal goal of the shared language, to facilitate communication about institutional racism and privilege and workplace practices have changed so that more people raise questions around racism in the organization, but the organization has not practically applied the knowledge gained from the *anti-racist curriculum* training.

Most of the managers in this chapter discuss either very minimal changes or no change at all in either their personal understanding of diversity and racial awareness or their organization's stance on issues of diversity and racism. Diversity trainings are either viewed as ineffective from the start or proven ineffective by their inability to get participants to the various levels of "there". Participants show a wide range of combinations of whether that got "there" in terms of personal goals, training model goals, and/or the larger goal of full awareness of institutional racism and

privilege. Various causes, such as the delivery of training material, the racial awareness of participants upon entering the training, and degree of institutional support are highlighted as both factors for and barriers against getting people to these "there" positions. Understanding the interplay of these aspects of the diversity training dynamic is essential for those seeking to implement a diversity training program or evaluate the success of a program already in place.

Diversity trainers need to consider these factors when developing their models and organizations need to understand how these factors combine internally, so that they can determine the correct diversity training model to reach their diversity goals. On a larger, more sociological scale, aspects of diversity training in general and the personal characteristics of participants inside the training provides insight into developing a training that effectively gets participants to the third level of "there" so that they understand institutional racism and privilege and can apply the information to deconstruct the basis for inequality in their organizations. The following chapter will outline the factors that trainers, researchers, and organizations must account for when designing, implementing, and evaluating a diversity training and provide suggestions for developing a diversity training model that fights against systemic oppression, while also reaching organizational goals.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION

The words of diversity trainers and managers in the previous two chapters make clear that the dynamics of diversity trainings are far more complicated than initially expected. A "diversity training" can be designed and implemented in many ways, as exemplified by the five diversity training models: *celebrating diversity, ensuring representation, managing and valuing diversity, caring confrontation, and anti-racist curriculum*. These five models all have distinct content, goals, and a delivery system making it difficult to evaluate "diversity training" as a monolith. Moreover, even if the same diversity training model is used at two different organizations, there is no guarantee that the outcome will be the same. Organizational culture, along with participants' own beliefs and ideas contribute to the effect that diversity trainings can have on changing individuals and most importantly, institutions. Therefore, this chapter will serve to address a number of significant factors affecting diversity training development and evaluation and the criteria trainers, organizations, and researchers need to consider when planning and evaluating diversity trainings .

First, trainers need to be acutely aware of the culture of an organization, the racial awareness of employees, and their personal beliefs about diversity when developing a diversity training for a particular organization. An organization cannot simply "do a diversity training" and expect to see desired results if they have not taken these three factors into account. Second, the best tools for changing an organization and individuals need to be examined. As post-racial ideology gains in popularity, the persistent and pernicious effects of racism and privilege are increasingly hidden from the public eye. Diversity trainings can provide a form of anti-racist action, while also attending to organizational goals. Models for diversity training need to be scrutinized so that participants and organizations can "get there" on the third level and leave with

an understanding of institutionalized racial power and privilege, to counteract the pervading view of society as post-racial and energize participants to work for racial equality inside and outside their institutions. Third, evaluators of diversity trainings need to be attentive to the fact that there are drastic differences between diversity trainings in terms of diversity training model, organizational diversity goals, and staff racial awareness. Evaluating all diversity trainings in the same way does a disservice to the trainers who have developed different models, the participants who have varying levels of knowledge on diversity, and the organization that takes a particular stance on diversity. Trainers, participants, and organizations combine to make each diversity training unique. Diversity trainings should be assessed so that the evaluation criteria matches the goals of the training model used, accounts for variance in organizational culture around diversity, and addresses different levels of racial awareness amongst individuals in the same organization and overall across organizations. Including these three aspects in evaluation provides stronger results for the effect a diversity training can have or has had on both the individual and organizational level.

How Should You Train?

That a variety of different diversity training models exist means that organizations have a choice. Diversity training does not have to be a "canned presentation," but can work to meet specific goals that an organization has regarding diversity. Diversity trainers must be conscious of what an organization hopes to attain by doing diversity trainings, when choosing a model and delivering the training. Once a model has been determined, individual participants must also be evaluated. The chapter on managerial responses to diversity trainings demonstrates that individual differences are important factors affecting the way that participants receive the

information in diversity trainings. Diversity trainers *must* recognize these differences if they are going to get participants "there" in terms of understanding the training model's goals and making any sort of personal or institutional change. Simultaneously, trainers must recognize their own belief about diversity and how this intersects with organizational goals and individual awareness, which may or may not be similar to the trainer's personal perspective. Thus, if diversity trainings are going to make any change—personal or institutional—trainers must be attentive to the complicated interplay of the organization, the employees, and themselves when crafting and delivering the training.

<u>*Organizational Culture*</u>

The organization provides the context in which the training is going to occur. Aspects of the organization, then, become the initial focus for how a trainer designs the content and delivery system, which become the diversity training model. Part of this involves what an organization wants to accomplish in the training. Not surprisingly, the organizational goals for diversity training dictate the model chosen. Managers in this study were able to explain distinct reasons why diversity trainings occurred at their organizations. In nearly every case, the model chosen aligned perfectly with the organizational goal. For example, Mark, a government worker, identified that he believed his organization was compelled to do a training about compliance with state law and protected groups. With this goal, his organization would clearly choose the *ensuring representation* model, which they did. John's organization wanted to move to an anti-racist agenda so that their programs would have a social justice mission, meaning the best training is the *anti-racist curriculum* model. When choosing a model, then, organizations seem to be fairly aware of how different models will reach different goals. What an organization may not be in tune with is whether or not the goals that are driving the diversity training reflect the

desired change. A diversity trainer must provide this oversight by being diligent before the training occurs.

If anything is going to change at an organization, diversity trainers must be aware of what is actually happening around diversity at that organization. To return to Mark, he knew what the goals for the training were, but he found them inapplicable to his work. His organization was not hiring or promoting, two major factors in representation and compliance, so the training model seemed disjointed from work at that agency. This is something that the trainer can prepare for before the training. For example, Natalie, the trainer in the *managing and valuing diversity* model always tailors the training to organizational needs. She meets with potential clients to assess what their major challenges are and adapts the training to cover the identified aspects. The *managing and valuing diversity* model is flexible, so Natalie has this luxury. Other models are not so elastic, so more work needs to be done to ensure that the model fits the organization. For example, trainers need to assess if an organization is seeking institutional change, individual change, or both.

For individual change around diversity, Jane's *celebrating diversity* model should fit the goals of making individuals more self-aware and able to communicate better. This was definitely true in the case of Gary, who worked in the housing industry and identified the major challenge in his organization as dealing with biases that can impede staff interaction with their multicultural residents. The *celebrating diversity* model specifically deals with this at the individual level, so the organizational goals for training matched what staff needed. If organizations are more inclined to institutional change, one of the critical models—*anti-racist curriculum* or *caring confrontation*—should be employed, as each seeks to change organizational culture. The critical models have different delivery systems, though, so the *anti-*

racist curriculum model should only be employed if the organization explicitly wants to create organizational change around race and racism. Diversity trainers, then, need to follow Natalie's lead and assess the major challenges at an organization if they hope to change any individuals or organizations.

Closely connected to an organization's goals and what type of change an organization may want is the language of diversity that permeates the organization. Trainers should be in tune with the way the organization talks about diversity and how this might affect what the organization wants in a training. For instance, above, Mark showed that he could fully comprehend the reason for the *ensuring responsibility* training that he participated in, even if it was not applicable to the organization. But why would an organization do a diversity training, where the main focus did not apply to employees? Christine, who trained at this organization, explained that being a government agency the predominant approach to diversity was *compliance-based diversity*. This approach to diversity drove the training that was implemented. Trainers need to understand what approach to diversity an organization is taking and decide whether or not this approach aligns with the desired change. For Mark, it did not. The interaction of training goals, desired change, and approaches to diversity creates a situation where diversity trainers and organizations need to collaborate to choose a training model that provides a solution to whatever the organization has identified as the problem they are having with diversity. The organizational culture, however, provides just one facet of the training dynamic. Individuals bring their own awareness to trainings, which diversity trainers must address.

Personal Goals and Racial Awareness of Employees

Managerial beliefs about diversity and reactions to diversity trainings have been integral to this study. The way managers think about diversity can dictate the way that they react to diversity training in the various models. For trainers to successfully get people "there" in terms of training goals, they must be attentive to who their audience is. Trainers and managers alike discussed the need for trainers to "meet people where they are at" instead of delivering an off-the-shelf diversity training. Meeting people where they are at entails recognizing potential personal goals for diversity and the racial awareness of participants.

"Getting there" in diversity trainings was represented by three possible destinations. The first level involved whether or not the goals of the training model were met. The second level involved whether or not individuals in the training reached their personal goals for "getting there." The relationship between the two levels dictates how and if people are going to personally change in their attitudes and behaviors around diversity. In this study, when the personal goals did not match the training goals, people tended to revert to their personal goals. Take Don, for example. Don is a "nice guy" manager who thinks of diversity training as a reminder of how to avoid being offensive in the workplace. This is a great goal. Nobody wants to feel discriminated against when they come to work. This, however, is not the crux of the *ensuring responsibility* training model that Don participated in. Don missed the point about legality and compliance based on protected groups because he was so curious about finding ways to make sure, interpersonally, that no one on his staff felt discriminated against.

Other participants enter with no personal goals for the training. Bill came into his *anti-racist curriculum* training with over four decades of work exploring racism and privilege. Because of his experience, Bill did not have personal goals for the training. Information may

have been presented in a different way, which he liked, but the training model itself did not offer new insights and thus no personal change occurred. For participants whose personal goals matched the training goals, such as Gary and the *celebrating diversity* training explained above, the result was quite nice. People felt that they left the training with some new tools to address a major issue that they face in their organization and trainers feel as if they have accomplished their duty and earned their pay.

Closely tied to personal goals and outcomes is a participant's racial awareness upon entering the training. In the previous chapter, each participant's racial awareness was identified and analyzed before and after the diversity training. Pre-training racial awareness poses a real challenge for diversity trainers when they attempt to design a diversity training. From one perspective, trainers need to ensure that the content is going to make sense to every participant in the room. Tony touched on this fact during his *managing and valuing diversity* training focused on race, when he discussed how for some people the training was "old news," while for others it was shocking material. The people who view the training as "old news" need more advanced material for them to "get to" any new level, while people who find the information shocking may need to slow down to fully grasp this new knowledge. This is especially true because the topic is race, which can elicit fairly strong emotions for people in a low level of racial awareness, when they are confronted with their one privilege or role in sustaining institutional racism. This is true for Dana, who had an awful experience when she first became aware of a form of color-blind racism that she was perpetuating.

Some trainers appeared to be aware of the fact that they were dealing with people who were at different levels in their racial awareness. Fred, the *anti-racist curriculum* trainer, mentioned that you find people all along the continuum of racial awareness. He did not,

however, express that this made the training difficult to deliver. He believes that his framework of working through racism from the individual and interpersonal level to the institutional and cultural level allows anyone to follow the material and leave the training with a lens that sees all four levels of racism. Christine, in the *ensuring representation* model, found this harder to navigate, in that some people disengaged from the training or responded negatively when issues of race were raised, while other participants, with higher racial awareness were in accord with Christine's material. Fred gives some insight into why this may occur when he talked about how when organizations bring in him and his colleagues, they are fully aware that the training is going to focus on anti-racism, so participants may be somewhat prepared for those difficult conversations. In Christine's, bringing up race may seem unnecessary, especially if participants are in a low level of racial awareness and prescribe to post-racial ideology.

As Christine and Fred's experiences show, racial awareness also affects how inclined people are to engage in the material. Larry, who is at a high level of racial awareness, finds diversity trainings in the *anti-racist curriculum* model to be helpful since this model talks about race and racism in terms that he understands and provides him with a common language to use with his colleagues. For Don, who is in a low level of racial awareness, when issues such as discrimination in task allocation are raised, they never resonate in his consciousness, so that from his position he cannot grasp institutional racism. This suggests that racial awareness is most important in determining whether or not an individual will reach the third level of "getting there," which entails a full awareness of how institutional racism and privilege affect organizations and how that individual may play a role in perpetuating the system.

Trainers can take steps to understand the racial awareness of participants before they come to a training to predict how they might react to certain information. Again, this is

something that Natalie does in the *managing and valuing diversity* model. Natalie talked about how she frequently discusses white privilege in schools, but would hesitate to do so in a business setting. She explained how people in schools had already talked about these issues and were eager to discuss them, meaning that these people had at least a moderate and possibly a high racial awareness. In the business setting, dominated by white male culture, Natalie does not see white privilege as a viable topic. She has assessed that the racial awareness of people in business settings is probably lower than those in schools, so they will not be able to engage with that information.

Part of how willing people are to engage with information on privilege is also tied to the training model. For example, Linda believes that she can get most people to understand power and privilege by using the *caring confrontation* model. Even people with low racial awareness can sympathize with someone in a wheelchair who would not be able to take the stairs in the event that an elevator was not working. From this starting point, her model should move people to where they can understand racial power and privilege, as well, so that most people leave the training with a high racial awareness, regardless of the setting. That Linda uses the same content in her model points to a difference between Natalie and Linda that diversity trainers also have to account for. Diversity trainers bring their own beliefs with them when they are hired to train at an organization. Trainers must navigate this situation to determine how those beliefs coincide with the organizational culture and employee awareness and what should take precedent in the event that these aspects differ from one another.

Maintaining Authenticity as a Trainer

Depending on a trainer's personal beliefs, conflict may or may not arise when organizational goals, participant racial awareness, and trainer beliefs do not coincide. Diversity trainers in this study discussed how they resolve issues where their personal beliefs about diversity are dissimilar than that of a client. This is a process of maintaining authenticity in a training and is something that diversity trainers need to reflect on when taking jobs and delivering diversity trainings. On the most basic level, no diversity trainer in this study was willing to deliver a training that they did not believe in overall. That is, Linda, in the critical *caring confrontation* model would not be willing to train using the *celebrating diversity* model because it lacks a message of power and privilege. Contrastingly, Jane, in the *celebrating diversity* model would not be willing to train in the *caring confrontation* model because it loses too much of the interpersonal interaction by looking at overarching problems, such as institutions. How trainers decide what they "believe in" dictates how authentic they will feel in the training.

Linda, Jane, and Fred did not have to worry about organizational goals dictating how they train and questioning their authenticity. Fred works for an anti-racist organization, so organizations already know his stance on race and racism and what the training will entail. Jane's *celebrating diversity* training is so focused on interpersonal relations that any organization could use it without making modifications so that Jane would not feel as if her personal message was lost. Linda believes that her overlapping approximations can work in any organization because of the delivery that eases people into an understanding of power and privilege. Thus, she can work her own message into an organization's goals. What she does have to worry about is whether or not she agrees with the mission of the organization as a whole. As she mentioned,

she would not work for a gun manufacturer because she disagrees with the work on a personal level. Trainers need to decide how much of their personal beliefs will enter a training. Linda, Jane, and Fred have decided that their personal beliefs will not be compromised. Christine and Natalie showed a slightly different configuration of how trainers can conceptualize their authenticity.

Sometimes, organizational restraints are very strong, such as in the case of a government agency that needs to focus on compliance. For this reason, Christine's training fell into the *ensuring representation* model. Still, Christine has her own beliefs about race and racism that go beyond the content of this training. She felt that she needed to be "safe" in the way she trained because she was new to the organization, so she did not want to cause too much conflict in the content of the training. This was not problem for her authenticity because she was able to rationalize her decisions as something she needed to do to get people on board with the diversity mission of the government agency. Trainers can concede certain parts of their personal beliefs if they feel the organization will benefit more as a whole by going in a different direction. To keep a semblance of authenticity in the constraints of government, Christine focused on delivery of material and ensured that dialogue played a large role in her training.

Natalie provided the most complex example of maintaining authenticity within organizational and individual differences. Natalie has a personal affinity for social justice organizations and enjoys talking about white privilege in her diversity trainings. Nevertheless, she frequently overlooks these personal beliefs to focus on corporations and the business case for diversity in the *managing and valuing diversity* model. Natalie thinks of diversity training very much as a consulting job with clients. Because the client and the business case are the predominant focus, her personal beliefs are sometimes disregarded, when organizations do not

want to discuss social justice issues or individuals are unprepared to discuss these issues because of low racial awareness. She does not have to feel inauthentic because she does not conceptualize diversity training as a means for furthering her own social agenda, which trainers like Linda and Fred do.

Hence, there are many different ways that trainers can rationalize their own authenticity when faced with organizations and individuals that may disagree with a trainer's personal beliefs or may be unprepared to discuss what the trainer feels is important. If a trainer wants to feel as if their personal beliefs have been integrated into the training, they need to choose organizations that are open to the message that the trainer has to offer and evaluate the racial awareness of participants to see if they will be able to grasp the information. This involves the work in the previous two sections to identify organizational culture and participant racial awareness. Coming from this study, the end goal of diversity training should be to get participants to the third level of "getting there" where racial power and privilege is understood at an individual and institutional level. If this is the case, trainers must stay authentic to a belief in the critical diversity approach and deliver the diversity training model accordingly. The next section will discuss why getting to this third level is so important in contemporary society, how participants in this study "got there", and how future trainings can be designed to increase the number of participants that "get there" at this level and to create organizational and social change.

Transforming Organizations, Individuals, and Workplace Culture

Training in a Post-Racial Society

One of the biggest concerns that diversity trainers in this study voiced was the difficulty that comes from discussing race. Some trainers disregard this difficulty and believe racism is so

engrained in our society that we have to talk about it, other trainers acknowledge the difficulty and refrain from discussing institutionalized racism unless asked for by a client, still other trainers equalize race with all other differences, which dispels the difficulty of talking about race altogether. Race is something that is difficult to talk about because it still matters. Post-racial ideology takes issue with this point (Bell 1992; Bonilla-Silva 2001). The President of the United States is black, "old school" racism in the form blatant exclusion and discrimination has been addressed through the legal system, and the black middle-class is growing. These points are heralded as signs that society has transcended race. Lost in this discussion is the fact that nine out of ten top executives in private industry in the U.S. is white and that the net worth of the average white family is eleven-fold that of an average black family and eight-fold that of an average Latino family (Shapiro 2004; EEOC 2010). Believing that society is post-racial will only perpetuate if not worsen these statistics.

As Bill spoke to in this study, his organization was characterized by white denial, where they needed some form of training to make their privilege visible and experience what it means to have a role in the perpetuation of racism. Additionally, Mark talked about the hiring and promotion freeze at his organization. People of color have not had the option to enter the agency or reach higher ranks for five years or so. This has created stagnation where racial diversity is very low at the organization and when lay-offs occur the organization tends to lose a high percentage of people of color because of lack of seniority. These are strong institutional problems that these managers are facing at this very moment. Attention needs to be brought back to how racialized society and the workplace continue to be, as race persists as a factor in opportunities to gain power in industry and build wealth for one's family. Diversity trainings

have the chance to disassemble the basis for post-racial ideology by exposing institutionalized racism and moving participants to the third level of "getting there".

Reaching the Third Level of "Getting There" and Creating Institutional Change

Of the managers interviewed, three people "got there" on all three levels as a result of their training experience: Dana, Tony, and John. Bill was "there" already on each level and Larry was "there" on the personal and training model level and very close to reaching full awareness of institutional racism and privilege in the third level. Hence, five people had a post-training racial awareness that was at a high level. For Don, Mark, and Gary, the third level of "getting there" is out of reach. These three men began in the low level of racial awareness and have had no opportunity in their diversity trainings to move any further.

Gary, in the *celebrating diversity* model was bombarded with messages about post-racialism, creating an atmosphere where he will discount the extent to which race matters at all in contemporary society, let alone that race matters in such a pervasive way as the discussion of institutional racism and privilege argues. Don and Mark both participated in the *ensuring representation* model. While this model touches on institutional racism in terms of exclusionary practices in hiring and promotion, racism is largely seen as something of the past that compliance with laws can remedy through representation in all levels of an organization. The connection to the past, rather than the present, will not make any change in their racial awareness, especially from a low level of racial awareness, where the individual does not have the tools to understand privilege and institutionalized bias.

It is clear, then, that for a person to reach the third level of "getting there" as a result of a diversity training, the training must take a critical approach. This does not mean that people who

partake in other training models will not understand institutional racism and privilege. It means that if they go into the training without that knowledge, the training is not going to move them along so that they gain this knowledge from the training. The *anti-racist curriculum* and *caring confrontation* models definitely can make this change as in the case of John and Dana, respectively. The *managing and valuing diversity* model has the opportunity to get participants to the third level of "getting there," *if* the training progresses in the way that Tony's did to focus on race and continuously go deeper into the issues to reach a discussion of institutional racism and privilege that resembles one of the critical models.. This is certainly not the norm for this model, which is mainly focused on the business case for diversity with some material on moral inclusion. Tony's situation represents a specific case, so the *managing and valuing diversity* model should not be counted on to make this shift on a regular basis.

Bill is the rare example of someone who was already at the third level of "getting there" before the training, so there was no need for the training to get him "there." For Larry, the situation was different. Larry has been doing anti-racist work and attending *anti-racist curriculum* trainings for years. He has still, though, not gotten fully "there" at the third level. This is due to the same training being done over and over again. Changing leadership has forced his organization to continuously do the same type of training. This training provides an awareness of institutional racism and privilege, but does not provide practical ways for managers to use the new information to deconstruct racism. Without this knowledge, Larry is stagnant and will not "get there" in entirety until the training shifts to get more in-depth and provide the context for using the new lens.

"Getting there" for the other three provide three different routes for how people can reach the third level of analysis, showing that there is no "one-size fits all" method for "getting there"

with a full awareness of racism. Tony "got there" on the third level because of continuous training. Tony's organization trained multiple times and continues to train with each session delving deeper into aspects of race and racism until the full picture of institutional racism and privilege is uncovered. This is a strength of the *managing and valuing diversity* model in that it allows for flexibility. This gives credence to the idea of topic seminars, where trainings focus in-depth on one particular issue, such as race, so that people are compelled to shift their racial awareness and end at a high level.

John "got there" because he and his organization made the conscious decision to take on a social justice and anti-racist agenda at their organization. He was already far along in his understanding of social problems and decided that racism was something that he needed to know more about in order to conceptualize it intellectually. Thus, John was already prepared to "get there" before the training and the *anti-racist curriculum* model provided him with the facts, lens, and language to "get there" and reach a high level of racial awareness. Dana's journey to "getting there" included a single transformative moment that energized her to work independently to reach the third level of analysis. A *caring confrontation* following an instance where she was attacked for the way she talked about race gave her comfort and passion that resulted in her "getting there". Each of these three ways show how different training models cause the shift to a high racial awareness and get people to a place where they can understand institutional racism and privilege. From this position, personal transformations can turn into organizational transformations, but only if the right climate exists at the organization.

Diversity trainings that routinely get people "there" at the third level have the opportunity to transform organizations to take an anti-racist, anti-oppression stance and create an organizational culture that reflects these ideals. Managers who have "gotten there" at the third

level, but have not seen their organizations change, expressed frustration at their inability to put their understanding to practice in the workplace. Managers and trainers both discussed challenges with creating organizational change around issues of racism, highlighting the factors that hurt the prospect of organizational transformation. One major aspect of this conversation is organizational support. Organizations must thoroughly explain how learning from the training relates to organizational goals and practices. In organizations such as Dana's, they may do trainings involving conversations about race, but the organizational culture around race and diversity resembles indifference. People do not care that much and there are not many opportunities for individuals to explore their racial identities and advance their racial awareness. Any knowledge gained from the training is not going to be applied to the organization because the organization seems detached from the entire process, which is focused on individuals.

Another major barrier is the inability to sustain the conversation. "One-hit wonders" do not work when it comes to diversity training, especially if the goal is to create institutional change around racial power and privilege. People need to be constantly reminded that the organization is concerned about these issues and that training is a way for people to learn ways to put this knowledge into practice. Bill's organization is an example of a place that they wish they could institutionalize the training so that it occurred over and over again, but do not have the funding. The cost of diversity training can be a large barrier to creating institutional change through repeated trainings. These repeated trainings also must increasingly go farther than the last training. In Larry's organization, they did the same "*anti-racism 101*" training many times, with the same information presented each time, so that eventually people stopped getting anything out of it. In Tony's experience, the trainings always explored new issues moving toward high racial awareness, so the conversations got more difficult and people continued to

learn. Sustaining the conversation and connecting the training to organizational goals are huge aspects if the organization wants to transform the workplace culture.

John is the only participant in this study who saw real organizational change. His experience demonstrates just how important the above factors are in precipitating this change. First, before the training, members of his organization recognized the goal of moving to a social justice orientation with an anti-racist agenda. From the beginning, then, he and his colleagues were primed to "get there" at the institutional level. With their new intellectual basis, John and his colleagues began to act. First they took over the training internally, so that delivering *anti-racist curriculum* trainings became a part of certain staff members' job descriptions. This sustained the conversation so that the high racial awareness would not falter. Then, the organization made a conscious effort to include an anti-racist agenda in their biggest programs. Being a youth services organization, this meant attacking institutional racism and privilege through programs targeted at youth in high schools and the criminal justice system. The result was a complete overhaul of the organization that infused the organization with an anti-racist culture and attracted more people of color to join and stay at the organization. This new culture has allowed the organization the maintain an anti-racist agenda, so that staff members stay "there" with a knowledge of institutional racism and privilege, which does not wane, but remains strong, providing a model for how organizations can use diversity training to promote organizational change around race and racism.

A New Model for Countering Post-Racialism and Fostering Individual and Institutional Change

This study has outlined various models of diversity training with many different goals. Some models, namely the *anti-racist curriculum, caring confrontation,* and *managing and*

valuing diversity models, have proven effective in getting people to the third level of "there". A combination of these three models, in concert with organizational support, can work against post-racial ideology, while also exposing institutional racism and privilege. As mentioned, the three models above all got participants to the third level of "there," when conditions within the organization were supportive, or when a personal experience was unsettling enough to spark change. Therefore, managerial responses suggest that a combination of these three models may be very effective in transforming organizations towards anti-racist work, so that post-racial ideology is overcome.

This combination of models has already been seen in this study. Tony, the white male teacher and administrator at an independent school explained a creative form of training that his school has undertaken. The training began in the *managing and valuing diversity* model with a concentration on how increasing representation of people of color and including them in the organization was not only morally right, but also an advantage in terms of the developing the most accurate curriculum and teaching students about the real world where they are going to interact with people of all races. It also provides students with the perspective of both whites and people of color as authority figures in teaching positions. Thus, the school was leveraging their diversity for the betterment of their organization, the school and their clients, the students. This training "wet the appetite" so to speak, but it was too basic for faculty and staff to become committed or change in their racial awareness.

This led to a series of trainings that focused specifically on challenging issues such as race. Going to multiple trainings that focused on race allowed faculty and staff to delve deeper and deeper into what race means, how it operates in society, and what that means for individuals and the institutions. This represents an ongoing *caring confrontation* model. People are not

being asked to confront their own racism from the start. They are eased into that analysis by slowly doing multiple training focused on one topic. Though Tony and his colleagues have not finished their training, it is conceivable that the end point of this series could be an *anti-racist curriculum* model that focuses explicitly on the different levels of racism from individual and interpersonal to institutional and cultural. If followed in this manner, the combination of these three models has the opportunity to completely transform any person who enters the training regardless of their racial awareness and provide the tools for organizations to change as a whole.

The *managing and valuing diversity* model intimately ties diversity to organizational goals. Organizations need diversity if they are going to be the most competitive in their industry. Much of the reason why this model was created centers around bringing white males into the diversity conversation so that they did not feel the intense backlash that occurred in compliance-based approaches such as the *ensuring representation* model (Thomas 1990, 1991; Lynch 1997; Ivancevich and Gilbert 2000; Von Bergen et al 2002, Hays-Thomas 2004). This justification can set the stage for "getting there" on the third level. It brings all people into the diversity discussion, especially powerful white males. The initial training can borrow from Natalie's training and begin with the basic case studies on why diversity is an advantage to global competitiveness and how employees can enhance interpersonal interaction within the workplace to increase productivity. Connecting the training directly to the organization's work is key for staff support, as the managers explained in this study. From an understanding that diversity relates to business goals, the *caring confrontation* model can take over. Through multiple trainings, the *caring confrontation* can guide people from a low, medium, or high racial awareness through the different levels of racism. The high level will already understand the information, such as Bill in this study, the medium level will be primed to accept the

information, such as Tony and John in this study, and the low level will be carried along in the *caring confrontation* such as Dana or possibly Mark, whose biggest problem with his diversity training was that it was not tied to the organization at all, something the *managing and valuing diversity* model will have already addressed. Thus, the *caring confrontation* will happen in phases.

An organization can begin training critically and talking about less challenging issues such as ableism or ageism, something that Linda does in her trainings. As organizations progress through different forms of oppression, people will learn the framework of racism at the individual, interpersonal, institutional, and cultural level. Using exercises like "concentric circles," individuals will have the opportunity to explore their own role in these four levels of oppression by talking with colleagues about personal experiences, something that a manager like Dana saw as extremely important to moving along in racial awareness. Similarly, videos like *Race: The Power of an Illusion* seem to be very powerful in exposing racism on multiple levels.

Oppression at this time does not necessarily need to be focused on race. The *managing and valuing diversity* training provides the business justification to get individuals on board and the *caring confrontation* provides the multi-leveled lens of oppression in a non-threatening way that moves participants along in their racial awareness. This is when the *anti-racist curriculum* training should be implemented. At some point in the training, if post-racialism is going to be countered and individuals and organizations are going to change around race and racism, racial power and privilege has to become the sole focus of the diversity training. At a medium-to-high level of racial awareness, achieved through the *caring confrontation*, the managers in this study showed an openness to address their own role in the persistence of institutional racism and privilege. Both Tony and Larry explained how certain trainings that they attended did not go far

enough to challenge individuals in the training. The *anti-racist curriculum* model brings this challenging information so that they leave the training having gotten to the third level of "getting there" or being very close to "there". Privilege walks provide an understanding of two levels of racial awareness. People recognize the historical nature of racism and recognize their own privilege in a powerful way (Trepagnier 2006). The *anti-racist curriculum* also touches on the last level of racial awareness when discussing how people are personally implicated in racism due to these historical factors and the continuous privilege, which may influence decision-making in organizations. The combination of these three models, then, should certainly make individual change and result in "getting there" on the third level. This new model can also create organizational change.

The first section of this chapter showed that throughout all of this the organization must be fully integrating the trainings in a sustained manner and connecting it to their programs through time, money, and effort if the organization is going to change in terms of institutional racism. The fact that this transformation will occur over multiple training sessions represents the sustained effort needed to show a commitment to anti-racism and diversity. It will be the onus of the organization to infuse their programs with this new agenda, but, if John and his organization are any indication, a whole group of individuals with high racial awareness can do wonders to transform an entire organization that never loses focus of an anti-racist agenda. The different models for diversity training do not just provide a choice in what model to use, but provide a choice in how to mix and match models to create organizational change. The proposed model above, which may be called the *business case for confronting racism* model, demonstrates how diversity training can be involved in deconstructing post-racial ideology. Diversity training can be a tool for increasing profits or including underrepresented groups, but it can be much more

than that. Implementing a strategy to infuse organizational diversity initiatives with business incentives as well as an anti-racist agenda can produce bottom-line benefits for the organization, while exposing and attacking institutional racism and privilege. It *is* necessary to meet participants "where they are at," but never forget what it means to fully "get there".

Evaluating the Impact of Diversity Trainings

When the diversity training dynamic begins to be dissected, it becomes nothing short of a complicated mess. The term "diversity training" actually represents a number of models, all of which have different goals and/or content. These goals can be so drastically different that it is unreasonable to expect that people in different models will reach the same outcomes. Additionally, even within the same model, people differ in their knowledge and beliefs about diversity-related issues. This means that comparing within the same model people may be polar opposites in terms of the merit they give to the training and the take-home message they do or do not get after the training. Comparing across models obscures outcomes even more as people can be in completely different diversity training models, learning completely different content, and having completely different views about what all of this content means for the individual and the organization. To make matters worse, the organization matters, too. How often the training takes place and how closely it is related to the organization's work affect outcomes.

Out of this convoluted structure of individuals, training models, and organizations, researchers, diversity trainers, and organizational officials have attempted to evaluate how well diversity trainings "work." In doing so, various studies and reports have been published—some saying diversity training works great, some saying it fails miserably, and some saying it has absolutely no impact whatsoever (Day 1995; Kochan et al 2003; Kidder et al 2004; Kalev et al

2006; Paluck 2006; Paluck and Green 2009). Evaluators of "diversity training" have failed to recognize how complex these levels of the individual, training model, and organization really are, especially when combined together. Therefore, evaluation needs to take a new approach that is attentive to the intricacies of each of these three levels. From the literature, three critiques of diversity training evaluation arise, which connect to the training model, organization, and individual levels. There is not just one "diversity training" model, organizations have different goals for diversity, and self-report surveys are subject to individual bias (Taylor and Brown 1988; Day 1995; Kochan et al 2003; Kalev et al 2006; Paluck 2006; Dobbin et al 2007) At least, these three critiques must be addressed in diversity training evaluations to accurately depict the impact that diversity training is having on individuals and organizations.

The Model

First and foremost, evaluation of diversity training *must* take into account the diversity training model. Diversity training cannot be touted as miraculous or ineffective without the model. Each model professes to produce different outcomes. This has to be taken into consideration in diversity training assessment. For example, a diversity training may be considered a failure if it does not increase the representation of people of color in managerial positions (Kalev et al 2006). If the company in question employed the *celebrating diversity* model, this accusation is unfounded. Increasing representation is not a goal of the *celebrating diversity* model. It is unfair and, frankly, inaccurate to call the training a failure based on these criteria. Evaluators must be aware of the training model used and the goals of the training. It is certainly fine to say that a diversity training failed to meet one of its stated goals, such as if the *ensuring representation* model does not lead to increased representation, or that it failed to meet

some specific, outside goal that is being used to compare models, such as what this study does with a discussion of power and privilege. It is mistaken to ask a model to reach a goal that it is not designed to reach and then label the particular model or diversity training in general as ineffective.

Organizational Goals

Trainers and managers in the preceding chapters made it very clear: for a training to make any large scale changes in organizations, the diversity effort must be sustained and institutionalized. The managers in this study describe a whole host of post-training changes that they have made in terms of the way they view and discuss race and racism, the way they interact with co-workers, the way they think about clients, and many other examples. Despite all of these personal changes, only one organization truly changed following the training. This change resulted from a concerted effort to shift the organizational culture to one that was to be rooted in an anti-racist agenda. This only occurred because the training was ongoing and the agenda became inseparable from the programs that the organization implemented as part of their work. Organizational goals, then, play a large part in how successful diversity trainings can be. Three managers in this study trained in the *anti-racist curriculum* model. Two saw some personal changes, but no modification in policies or practices that represent the institutionalization of the model's message. One saw an absolute transformation so that everything the organization does has an anti-racist focus. So is the *anti-racist curriculum* model a success or a failure? The unfulfilling answer is that it depends. Evaluators must look at how the organization integrates diversity work into its fabric before deciding whether or not diversity training is impacting the workplace.

Self-Report Surveys

The last piece of the diversity training puzzle that evaluators need to take into account is "where" the people in the organization are "at." Self-report surveys are commonly used after diversity training to measure staff reactions. These surveys are subject to a number of biases such as maintaining a positive sense of self by individuals saying that they personally changed from the training, when they did not, or giving a trainer a good evaluation in order to please the company who paid for the diversity training and wants positive results (Taylor and Brown 1988; Paluck 2006). A large piece of this, which is forgotten, is staff racial awareness. The managerial interviews reveal that where staff members are "at" when entering the training can influence whether they will get "there" on any of the three levels of "getting there". The mixture of people with various levels of racial awareness attending the same training and having their actions evaluated in the same way is problematic.

Individuals at different levels of awareness plainly do not think about diversity issues in the same way. Did a person give the training a low rating because they thought it was a bad training, or were they like Bill in this study and had such a high racial awareness that the *anti-racist curriculum* training did not have much to offer him? Individual differences are not reflected when taking self-report surveys in aggregate. In this study, information on discrimination in task allocation, to a manager with a low racial awareness, was taken as a one-time occurrence that did not necessarily represent real bias and had no bearing on his work as a manager. To a manager with a high racial awareness, this same information is likely to trigger thoughts about institutionalized privilege for certain groups and cause reflection on one's own managerial practices and whether or not this bias exists when that manager assigns tasks. The exact same information is being received differently and resulting in different outcomes based on

racial awareness. One can look at an organization as a whole to evaluate if diversity training has changed it, but that does not mean that other changes are not occurring at the individual level based on racial awareness or that racial awareness is not drastically skewing the results of self-report surveys.

This discussion of three considerations that all evaluation of diversity trainings should account for is not meant to discredit studies that have looked at the effects of diversity trainings. In fact, considering the billions of dollars exhausted on diversity training each year, the absence of this research would be astonishing. Still, there is a lack of systematic study into "what works" in diversity training. For a diversity training to be evaluated correctly, the diversity training model, the organizational culture around diversity, and the racial awareness of participants must be assessed. This will only help organizations decide what diversity training model best fits their organizational goals and how they can institutionalize diversity efforts so that they reach their goals, as opposed to wasting valuable time and money. Taking these factors into account, organizations can use diversity training as a tool for individual and organizational change.

LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

An undergraduate thesis is unavoidably limited by time constraints. The research and writing for this study occurred throughout the 2010-2011 academic year. This time constraint is particularly detrimental to sampling. As described in the methods chapter, this study began with a very rigorous design, which had to be adapted as time became a major factor. Consequentially, sampling for managers became more of less of convenience. While I was purposive in trying to select people for each of the five diversity training models, the actual managers for the study relied mainly on trainer referrals or recommendations. This may represent a bias in the sampling, if trainers only referred people that reacted favorably to their training, which would hurt the validity of this study. Additionally, for managers where sampling was more random, it could be that only those who had particularly positive or particularly negative experiences would respond, showing the extremes, but not the average. In this study, however, there are people who had particularly good experiences in their training, particular bad experiences in their training, and fairly average experiences in their training with no real opinion in either direction. This helps the validity of the study and may mean that convenience sampling was not too detrimental to the merit of the results.

Another issue is generalizability. In some of the models, I was only able to solicit one manager to discuss their experiences. I am unable to say whether or not this experience represents general staff sentiment in that model or just one perspective. While I asked participants to discuss how staff in general responded to the training and why that may or may not be similar to their experience, I cannot make statements about generalizability for the models with only one participant. Future research on this topic should ensure that there are multiple

perspectives in each model in order to compare managers within the same model, something this study largely cannot do.

Another sampling bias is that all organizations where managers work are in the service industry. Certain trainers alluded to the fact that the corporate setting may represent a different dynamic. Future research should work hard to gain access to these institutions. For this study, corporations expressed concerns about a researcher stifling conversation and fears about legality, making incorporating these experiences in the study a non-option. With more time or credibility beyond an undergraduate student, a researcher may be able to gain access to corporations to explore how the corporate world relates to and/or differs from the organizations in this study.

This discussion of the corporate world connects to another area of future research. Observation of diversity trainings was originally a large part of this study, so that I could evaluate for myself what occurs in the training, rather than rely on trainers and managers to relay information from their own perspectives. Since observations were not an option in this study, I had to rely on these manager and trainer accounts. A more systematic study would include this observation so that the researcher can have first-hand knowledge of the training dynamic to inform the analysis of data and also the data collection by pointing to important aspects of the specific training to probe during manager interviews. Observation would also get the researcher "in" at the organization to evaluate the organizational culture around diversity. This would assist in understanding why an organization was able to make institutional change or not and provide more context for the researcher when analyzing data.

Moreover, the focus of this training was on race and racial awareness as trainers and managers made this dimension of diversity particularly salient because of the difficulty discussing race and racism in trainings and the effects of a racialized workplace and society.

Race is not, however, the only aspect of diversity and not the only source of oppression. Many people suffer setbacks in organizations based on their membership in particular groups. This study is not meant to discount these experiences, but to pay attention to what surfaced as the most important dimension influencing employees' experiences with diversity training. Further research can focus on another aspect of diversity. Trainers suggested that sexual orientation and homophobia is another major form of pushback in diversity trainings meaning this is a possibility for the next direction of research of this nature. Taking an intersectional approach, future research could also attempt to show more systematically how race, gender, and/or class, etc. combine to influence individual and institutional change.

Lastly, the conclusion of this study set forth a number of factors that evaluators of diversity training should account for when making claims about the effectiveness of diversity training. Researchers looking at the impact of diversity trainings can use these factors to produce new reports attentive to the distinct experience of individuals and organizations based on their own beliefs and the goals of the diversity training model used. This study represents a preliminary look at if/how power and privilege is presented in diversity trainings and how diversity training can be used to promote institutional change around racism and oppression. This assortment of limitations and directions of future research demonstrates that studying this topic is only just beginning with many significant avenues yet to be explored.

REFERENCES

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society, 4*(2), pp. 139-158.

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender and Society, 20*(4), pp. 441-464.

Acker, J. (2009). From glass ceiling to inequality regimes. *Sociologie Du Travail, 51*(2), 199-217.

Adelman, L., & Cheng, J. (Producers) (2003). *Race: The power of an illusion.* [Motion Picture] San Francisco: California Newsreel.

Agars, M., & Kottke, J. (2004). Models and practices in diversity management: A historical review and presentation of a new integration theory. In M. Stockdale, & F. Crosby (Eds.), *The psychology and management of workplace diversity* (1st ed., pp. 55-77) Blackwell Publishing.

Ahmed, S. (2007). The language of diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(2), 235-256.

Allen, R. S., & Montgomery, K. A. (2001). Applying an organizational development approach to creating diversity. *Organizational Dynamics, 30*(2), 149-161.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.

Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y. D. (2009). *Understanding gender and organizations*. London: SAGE.

Anand, R., & Winters, M. (2008). A retrospective view of corporate diversity training from 1964 to the present. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7*(3), 356-372.

Asch, S. E., & Zukier, H. (1984). Thinking about persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(6), 1230-1240.

Baldi, S., & McBrier, D. B. (1997). Do the determinants of promotion differ for blacks and whites? *Work and Occupations, 24*(4), 478-497.

Baumeister, R. F., & Bushman, B. J. (2008). *Social psychology and human nature*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education.

Bell, J.,Derrick A. (1980). Brown v. board of education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review, 93*(3), 518.

Bell, D. A. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well : The permanence of racism*. New York, N.Y.: BasicBooks.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2001). *White supremacy and racism in the post-civil rights era*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010). *Racism without racists : Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the united states*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality Social Psychology Bulletin, 17*(5), 475.

Britton, D. M. (2000). The epistemology of the gendered organization. *Gender and Society, 14*(3), pp. 418-434.

Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1997). Benefits of mentoring relationships among managerial and professional women: A cautionary tale, , *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*(1), 43-57.

Burstein, P., & Monaghan, K. (1986). Equal employment opportunity and the mobilization of law. *Law & Society Review, 20*(3), pp. 355-388.

Carbado, D. (2000). Men, feminism, and male heterosexual privilege. In R. Delgado, & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 525-531). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Case, K. A. (2007). Raising male privilege awareness and reducing sexism: an evaluation of diversity courses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*(4), 426-435.

Charmaz, K. (2003). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J. A. Holstein, & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (pp. 311-328). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Chavez, C. I., & Weisinger, J. Y. (2008). Beyond diversity training: A social infusion for cultural inclusion. *Human Resource Management, 47*(2), 331-350.

Childs Jr., J. T. (Ted). (2005). Managing workforce diversity at ibm: A global hr topic that has arrived. *Human Resource Management, 44*(1), 73-77.

Collins, P. H. (1998). *Fighting words : Black women and the search for justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought : Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Collins, S. M. (1997). *Black corporate executives : The making and breaking of a black middle class*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Comer, D. R., & Soliman, C. E. (1996). Organizational efforts to manage diversity: Do they really work? *Journal of Managerial Issues, 8*(4), 470-483.

Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Corporate Leadership Council. (2004). Nextel communications: Conducting an ROI impact study on diversity training. *Corporate Executive Board,*

Cox, T. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations : Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco, Calif.: Barrett-Koehler.

Cox, T. (1994). A comment on the language of diversity. *Organization, 1*(1), 51-58.

Cox, T. (2001). *Creating the multicultural organization: A strategy for capturing the power of diversity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (Eds.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (First ed.). New York: The New Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), pp. 1241-1299.

Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of black : Diversity in african-american identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as buzzword. *Feminist Theory, 9*(1), 67-85.

Day, L. E. O. (1995). The pitfalls of diversity training. *Training & Development, 49*(12), 24.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2000). *Critical race theory : The cutting edge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality, ,* 5.

Dobbin, F., Kalev, A., & Kelly, E. (2007). Diversity management in corporate america. *Contexts, 6*(4), 21-27.

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1999). Reducing prejudice: Combating intergroup biases. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8*(4), pp. 101-105.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard Business Review, 85*(9), 63-71.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2010). *Job patterns for minorities and women in private industry, 2008* No. 2010 ASI 9244-1

Feagin, J. R., & O'Brien, E. (2003). *White men on race : Power, privilege, and the shaping of cultural consciousness*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Feagin, J. R., & Vera, H. (1994). *White racism : The basics*. New York: Routledge.

Fine, M. G. (1996). Cultural diversity in the workplace: The state of the field. *Journal of Business Communication, 33*(4), 485-502.

Freeman, A. D. (1977). Legitimizing racial discrimination through antidiscrimination law: A critcal review of supreme court doctrine. *Minnesota Law Review, 62*, 1049-1119.

Gallagher, C. A. (2008). The end of racism as the new doxa: New strategies for researching race. In T. Zuberi, & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White logic, white methods: Racism and methodology* (pp. 163-178). New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Gilbert, J. A., Stead, B. A., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1999). Diversity management: A new organizational paradigm. *Journal of Business Ethics, 21*(1), 61-76.

Gotanda, N. (1991). A critique of "our constitution is color-blind". *Stanford Law Review, 44*(1), pp. 1-68.

Greenwald, A., McGhee, D., & Schwartz, J. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1464.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 102*(1), 4-27.

Hacker, A. (1992). *Two nations : Black and white, separate, hostile, unequal*. New York : Toronto : New York: Scribner's ; Maxwell Macmillan Canada ; Maxwell Macmillan International.

Hanover, J. M. B., & Cellar, D. F. (1998). Environmental factors and the effectiveness of workforce diversity training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 9*(2), 105-124.

Hanscome, L., & Cervero, R. M. (2003). The impact of gendered power relations in HRD. *Human Resource Development International, 6*(4), 509-525.

Hansen, F. (2003). Diversity's business case doesn't add up. (cover story). *Workforce, 82*(4), 28.

Hays-Thomas, R. (2004). Why now? the contemporary focus on managing diversity. In M. Stockdale, & F. Crosby (Eds.), *The psychology and management of workplace diversity* (First ed., pp. 3-30) Blackwell Publishing.

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and white racial identity : Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Hepworth, J. T., & West, S. G. (1988). Lynchings and the economy: A time-series reanalysis of hovland and sears (1940). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*(2), 239-247.

Heydebrand, W. (1990). Government litigation and national policymaking: From Roosevelt to Reagan. *Law and Society Review, 24*(2), 477.

Hood, J. N., Muller, H. J., & Seitz, P. (2001). Attitudes of Hispanics and Anglos surrounding a workforce diversity intervention. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 23*(4), 444-458.

Hovland, C. I., & Sears, R. (1940). Minor studies of aggression: VI. correlation of lynchings with economic indices. *The Journal of Psychology, 9*, 301-310.

Ivancevich, J. M., & Gilbert, J. A. (2000). Diversity management : Time for A new approach. *Public Personnel Management, 29*(1), 75.

Jensen, R. (2005). *The heart of whiteness : Confronting race, racism, and white privilege*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights.

Johnston, W. B., Packer, A. E., & United States. (1987). *Workforce 2000 : Work and workers for the 21st century*. Indianapolis, Ind. : Washington, D.C.?: Hudson Institute ; U.S. Dept. of Labor.

Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.

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.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. (1998). How affirmative action became diversity management: Employer response to antidiscrimination law, 1961 to 1996. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41*(7), 960-984.

Kidder, D. L., Lankau, M. J., Chrobot-Mason, D., Mollica, K. A., & Friedman, R. A. (2004). Backlash toward diversity initiatives: Examining the impact of diversity program justification, personal and group outcomes. *International Journal of Conflict Management (2004-2005), 15*(1), 77-102.

Kirby, S. L., & Richard, O. C. (2000). Impact of marketing work-place diversity on employee job involvement and organizational commitment. *Journal of Social Psychology, 140*(3), 367-377.

Kivel, P. (2002). *Uprooting racism : How white people can work for racial justice*. Gabriola Island, B.C.: New Society Publishers.

Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., et al. (2003). The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network. *Human Resource Management, 42*(1), 3-21.

Leonard, J. S. (1985). What promises are worth: The impact of affirmative action goals. *The Journal of Human Resources, 20*(1), pp. 3-20.

Linnehan, F., & Konrad, A. M. (1999). Diluting diversity. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 8*(4), 399-414.

Linville, P. W., & Jones, E. E. (1980). Polarized appraisals of out-group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(5), 689-703.

Lorbiecki, A., & Jack, G. (2000). Critical turns in the evolution of diversity management. *British Journal of Management, 11*, S17-S31.

Lynch, F. R. (1997). The diversity machine. *Society, 34*, 32-44.

Lynch, F. R. (1997). *The diversity machine : The drive to change the "white male workplace"*. New York: Free Press.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In P. Rothenberg (Ed.), *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism* (3rd ed., pp. 123-127). New York: Worth Publishers.

Merton, R. K. (1948). The bearing of empirical research upon the development of social theory. *American Sociological Review, 13*(5), pp. 505-515.

Mills, C. W. (1997). *The racial contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Monaghan, C. H. (2010). Working against the grain: White privilege in human resource development. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education,* (125), 53-63.

Mor Barak, M. E. (2000). The inclusive workplace: An ecosystems approach to diversity management. *Social Work, 45*(4), 339-353.

Moscovici, S. (1976). *Social influence and social change*. New York: Academic Press.

Moskowitz, G. B. (2005). *Social cognition : Understanding self and others*. New York: Guilford Press.

Nayak, A. (2006). After race: Ethnography, race, and post-race theory. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 29*(3), 411-430.

Neuman, W. L. (2006). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (6th Edition ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Neumark, D., & Gardecki, R. (1996). Women helping women? Role-model and mentoring effects on female Ph.D students in economics. *Journal of Human Resources, 33*(1), 220-246.

Oliver, M. L., & Shapiro, T. M. (1995). *Black wealth/white wealth : A new perspective on racial inequality*. New York: Routledge.

Paluck, E. L. (2006). Diversity training and intergroup contact: A call to action research. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*(3), 577-595.

Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. P. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 339-367.

Pelled, L. H., Ledford, J., Gerald, E., & Mohrman, S. A. (1999). Demographic dissimilarity and workplace inclusion. *Journal of Management Studies, 36*(7), 1013-1031.

Peters, William (Producer and Director) (1985) *A class divided.* [Motion Picture]. Boston: Yale University Films and PBS.

Pless, N. M., & Maak, T. (2004). Building an inclusive diversity culture: Principles, processes and practice. *Journal of Business Ethics, 54*(2), 129-147.

Ragins, B. R. (1999). Gender and mentoring relationships: A review and research agenda for the next decade. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 347-370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Roberson, L., & Kulik, C. T. (2007). Stereotype threat at work. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 21*(2), 24-40.

Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(2), 212-236.

Shapiro, T. M. (2004). *The hidden cost of being african american : How wealth perpetuates inequality*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1953). *Groups in harmony and tension; an integration of studies on intergroup relations*. New York: Harper.

Sinclair, L., & Kunda, Z. (1999). Reactions to a black professional: Motivated inhibition and activation of conflicting stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(5), 885-904.

Society for Human Research Management. (2011). *Diversity training.* Retrieved December, 2010, from http://www.shrm.org/hrdisciplines/Diversity/Pages/divtrain.aspx

Stainback, K., & Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (2009). Intersections of power and privilege: Long-term trends in managerial representation. *American Sociological Review, 74*(5), 800-820.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of african americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 797-811.

Stewart, M. M., Crary, M., & Humberd, B. K. (2008). Teaching value in diversity: On the folly of espousing inclusion, while practicing exclusion. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7*(3), 374-386.

Stockdale, M. S., & Crosby, F. J. (2004). *The psychology and management of workplace diversity*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). An integrative theory of intergroup relations. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worschel (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 33-47). Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.

Tajfel, H., & Wilkes, A. (1963). Classification and quantitative judgement. *British Journal of Psychology, 54*(2), 101-114.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *"Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about the development of racial identity*. New York: BasicBooks.

Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(2), 193-210.

Thomas Jr., R. R. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(2), 107-117.

Thomas, K., Mack, D., & Montagliani, A. (2004). The arguments against diversity: Are they valid? In M. Stockdale, & F. Crosby (Eds.), *The psychology and management of workplace diversity* (1st ed., pp. 31-51) Blackwell Publishing.

Thomas, D. A. (2001). The truth about mentoring minorities race matters. *Harvard Business Review, 79*(4), 98-107.

Thomas, D. A. (2004). Diversity as strategy. *Harvard Business Review, 82*(9), 98-108.

Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. *Harvard Business Review, 74*(5), 79-90.

Thomas, R. R. (1991). *Beyond race and gender : Unleashing the power of your total work force by managing diversity*. New York, NY: AMACOM, American Management Association.

Thomas, R. R. (1996). *Redefining diversity*. New York: Amacom.

Trepangier, B. (2006). *Silent racism: How well-meaning white people perpetuate the racial divide*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Turnbull, H., Greenwood, R., Tworoger, L., & Golden, C. (2010). Skill deficiencies in diversity and inclusion in organizations: Developing an inclusion skills measurement. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 9*(1), 1-14.

United States Census Bureau. (2011). *Average earnings of year-round full-time workers by educational attainment: 2008* No. 702)U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2011.

Von Bergen, C. W., Soper, B., & Foster, T. (2002). Unintended negative effects of diversity management. *Public Personnel Management, 31*(2), 239.

Wellman, D. T. (1993). *Portraits of white racism*. Cambridge England ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wildman, S., & Davis, A. (1996). Making systems of privilege visible. In P. Rothenberg (Ed.), *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism* (3rd ed., pp. 109-115). New York: Worth Publishers.

Wilson, W. J. (1980). *The declining significance of race : Blacks and changing american institutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wise, T. (2009). *Between barack and a hard place: Racism and white denial in the age of obama*. San Francisco: City Light Books.

Wise, T. J. (2008). *White like me : Reflections on race from a privileged son*. Brooklyn, NY : Berkeley, Calif.: Soft Skull Press ; Distributed by Publishers Group West.

Wrench, J. (2005). Diversity management can be bad for you. *Race and Class, 46*(3), 73-84.

APPENDIX A

Interview Script for Trainers

EXPERIENCE

How did you become involved in diversity trainings?
Where have you trained?
Have those training experiences been similar/different?

GOALS

What do you hope to accomplish by giving these trainings? Why is diversity training necessary?
Are your goals shaped by the company you are serving? How so/not?
Do your goals align with your company's goals?

CURRICULUM DESIGN AND PEDOGOGY

How do you define diversity?
What are the major features of your firm's diversity trainings?
What is the justification for these particular features?

MEASUREMENT

Are there any metrics in place to measure the effectiveness of the training?
What do these entail and what are the normal results?

CLOSING

If you could change anything about the training process or material, what would it be?

Interview Script for Managers

OPENING QUESTION TO ALLOW FOR FLEXIBILITY IN CONVERSATION FLOW

How would you describe your initial reaction to the diversity training?
OR
Can you explain how you got to this position in your organization and the specific duties of your job (task allocation, supervising, promoting/hiring, etc.)?

VIEWS ON DIVERSITY

I'd like to first talk about how you think about diversity. How would you characterize your views on diversity? What is it? Is it important in the workplace? What advantages or challenges do you see as arising from diversity?

Is your view different from what you understand the company's views on diversity?

What messages do you get from other managers or top executives about diversity?

Do you think this view of diversity is unique to your organization or characteristic of most companies similar to your own?

How well do diverse individuals interact in your organization?

Other than diversity training, are there any programs in place regarding workforce diversity?

GOALS OF TRAINING

What do you see as the purpose of diversity training?
How would you characterize general staff sentiment towards the trainings?
What do you see as the key features of this particular training?
Do you think the trainings affect what happens in the workplace?

REACTIONS TO TRAINING

Did any parts of the training challenge or affirm your thinking about diversity?
Do you see any parts of the training as particularly necessary/unnecessary?
Was there any information in the training that was new to you?
Did you find anything in the training to be particularly insightful or shocking?
Would you want to see something added or eliminated from the training?

PERSONAL DIVERSITY GOALS

Do you have diversity goals? What are they? How did you come to form these goals?
Do you need to report your goals and outcomes to anyone in the company?

Are your diversity goals and outcomes a part of your performance review?

REFLECTIONS ON WORKPLACE INTERACTIONS

How would you describe your managerial style?
How would you describe your interactions with your employees?
Describe the typical steps to assign tasks when an important project comes up.
Do you have promotional or hiring responsibilities? How do you assess the merit of potential new hires or new managers?
Was there anything in particular about the training that caused you to reflect more on your employee interactions or management style? Is there anything you would change or plan to change?

CLOSING

How would you evaluate the success of diversity training sessions?
When will your next training session be and how will you feel when you receive notice that you another training session has been scheduled for you?

<u>**APPENDIX B**</u>

Boston College- Sociology Department
Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Adult Consent Form: TRAINER INTERVIEW
24 October 2010

My name is David Watsula and I am an undergraduate student of sociology at Boston College. As part of my senior honor's research, I am conducting interviews with diversity trainers involved in designing and delivering trainings or similar workshops.

I would like to invite you to participate in this research study. The aim of this study is to gain an understanding of how diversity trainings are delivered to and received by managers attending these sessions. I have chosen you based on your work in delivering diversity trainings or similar workshops. If you do agree to participate in this study, you will be one of about 10 diversity trainers included in this study.

<u>Participation</u>

Your participation is completely voluntary. If you agree to participate, I would like to talk to you regarding your experience with diversity training. I am very interested in how diversity training material connects to organizational decisions and how differences in training techniques create different organizational cultures. Our conversation will be semi-structured meaning I do have some specific questions to ask you, but would like to have an open dialogue with you about your experiences with the training and your role as a manager. You may also ask me questions at any time before, during, or after the interview. I anticipate our conversation lasting no longer than sixty minutes.

I would also like to request your permission to tape our conversation, but taping is not a necessary component of this interview. Before we begin the interview, I would like to reassure you that your participation in this project is completely voluntary and you may refuse to answer any question, or discontinue the interview, at any time. You may also stop and start the tape recorder at any time during the conversation.

<u>Confidentiality/Anonymity</u>

Excerpts of this interview may be part of the final research report or other writings, but under no circumstances will your name (or the company's name) or identifying characteristics be included at any time, unless I receive additional written consent from you. If you wish, you may review the interview transcript for accuracy, but you are not under any obligation to do so.

Tape recordings will be kept in a locked drawer in my apartment, and identifying information will be saved in a password protected personal computer. Transcripts will be saved on the same password protected computer and downloaded to an external hard drive, but will be kept separate from identifying information. I will have sole access to these materials.

You should know that it may be necessary to show this signed consent form to officials at the Boston College Institutional Review Board that oversee research involving human participants to ensure that I have followed correct procedures.

Potential Risks/ Benefits

To the best of my knowledge, there is no risk or harm to you by participating in this study, though there may be unknown risks. It is my hope that this research process and the data analysis will benefit you as you continue to adapt your training curriculum.

Payment

I have received no funding for the study, and thus, cannot provide any monetary compensation for your time.

Withdrawal from the Study

In order to gain a complete understanding of the effects of diversity trainings, I consider your experiences vital to this study. However, you may choose to terminate your participation at any time without penalty. You can do so by contacting me or my advisor whenever you wish. Our contact information is listed below.

Contact Information

I may be contacted by phone or by e-mail should you have any questions about this project. If you prefer, you may also speak with Deborah Piatelli, my research advisor who is overseeing this study. Should you have any questions about your rights as a participant in a research study, please feel free to contact the Boston College Office for Research Protections at 617-552-4778 or irb@bc.edu.

Thank you for your participation in this research study.

Certification

I have read and believe I understand this Informed Consent form. I believe I understand the purpose of this project and what I will be asked to do. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and they have been answered satisfactorily.

I understand that I may stop my participation in this study at any time and that I can refuse to answer any questions.

By signing below, I give David Watsula the permission to tape record, transcribe, and use my interview for his research and reports according to the above-stated guidelines. I understand that the tape recordings and identifying information will be kept confidential and separate during this study.

I have received a signed copy of this Informed Consent document for my personal reference. I hereby give my informed and free consent to participate in this study. _____ (initials).

Signatures

_____
Printed Name of Participant

_____
_____
Consent Signature of Participant   Date

_____
Signature of Researcher and Witness to Consent

Boston College- Sociology Department
Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Adult Consent Form: MANAGER INTERVIEW
24 October 2010

My name is David Watsula and I am an undergraduate student of sociology at Boston College. As part of my senior honor's research, I am conducting interviews with managers and trainers who take part in diversity trainings in different organizations.

I would like to invite you to participate in this research study. The aim of this study is to gain an understanding of how diversity trainings are delivered to and received by managers attending these sessions. I have chosen you based on your recent participation in a diversity training at _____ company. If you do agree to participate in this study, you will be one of about thirty individuals.

Participation

Your participation is completely voluntary. If you agree to participate, I would like to talk to you regarding your experience with the diversity training and your overall managerial style. I am very interested in how diversity training material connects to organizational decisions and how differences in training techniques create different organizational cultures. Our conversation will be semi-structured meaning I do have some specific questions to ask you, but would like to have an open dialogue with you about your experiences with the training and your role as a manager. You may also ask me questions at any time before, during, or after the interview. I anticipate our conversation lasting no longer than sixty minutes.

I would also like to request your permission to tape our conversation, but taping is not a necessary component of this interview. Before we begin the interview, I would like to reassure you that your participation in this project is completely voluntary and you may refuse to answer any question, or discontinue the interview, at any time. You may also stop and start the tape recorder at any time during the conversation.

Confidentiality/Anonymity

Excerpts of this interview may be part of the final research report or other writings, but under no circumstances will your name (or the company's name) or identifying characteristics be included at any time, unless I receive additional written consent from you. If you wish, you may review the interview transcript for accuracy, but you are not under any obligation to do so.

Tape recordings will be kept in a locked drawer in my apartment, and identifying information will be saved in a password protected personal computer. Transcripts will be saved on the same password protected computer and downloaded to an external hard drive, but will be kept separate from identifying information. I will have sole access to these materials.

You should know that it may be necessary to show this signed consent form to officials at the Boston College Institutional Review Board that oversee research involving human participants to ensure that I have followed correct procedures.

Potential Risks/ Benefits

To the best of my knowledge, there is no risk or harm to you by participating in this study, though there may be unknown risks. It is my hope that this research process and the data analysis will benefit you and other managers, as well as diversity trainers, as you continue to manage in a diverse environment.

Payment

I have received no funding for the study, and thus, cannot provide any monetary compensation for your time.

Withdrawal from the Study

In order to gain a complete understanding of the effects of diversity trainings, I consider your experiences vital to this study. However, you may choose to terminate your participation at any time without penalty. You can do so by contacting me or my advisor whenever you wish. Our contact information is listed below.

Contact Information

I may be contacted by phone or by e-mail should you have any questions about this project. If you prefer, you may also speak with Deborah Piatelli, my research advisor who is overseeing this study. Should you have any questions about your rights as a participant in a research study, please feel free to contact the Boston College Office for Research Protections at 617-552-4778 or irb@bc.edu.

Thank you for your participation in this research study.

<u>Certification</u>

I have read and believe I understand this Informed Consent form. I believe I understand the purpose of this project and what I will be asked to do. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and they have been answered satisfactorily.

I understand that I may stop my participation in this study at any time and that I can refuse to answer any questions.

By signing below, I give David Watsula the permission to tape record, transcribe, and use my interview for his research and reports according to the above-stated guidelines. I understand that the tape recordings and identifying information will be kept confidential and separate during this study.

I have received a signed copy of this Informed Consent document for my personal reference. I hereby give my informed and free consent to participate in this study. _____ (initials).

<u>Signatures</u>

_____
Printed Name of Participant

_____
_____
Consent Signature of Participant   Date

_____
Signature of Researcher and Witness to Consent