ABSTRACT

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PRELIMINARY VALIDATION OF THE WORKPLACE DIVERSITY CLIMATE SCALE
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Advisor: Dr. Leanne S. Son Hing

Diversity climate captures employees’ subjective experiences of their diversity-related work context. However, the diversity climate literature highlights past inconsistencies in its conceptualization and challenges in its operationalization. The present research aims to develop and validate a new scale for workplace diversity climate based on a novel conceptual framework. Across five studies, we adhered to current best practices to create a new scale of diversity climate and provide initial evidence of its construct validity. Studies 1, 2, and 3 provided evidence that the scale items were in line with our proposed definition and distinguishable from related constructs. Studies 4 and 5 investigated the scale’s factor structure and provided evidence of its internal consistency. Study 5 further provided evidence of the robustness of the scale’s factor structure across historically marginalized and non-marginalized employees. Together, the present set of studies gave rise to the 16-item Workplace Diversity Climate Scale.
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Development and Preliminary Validation of the Workplace Diversity Climate Scale

Demographic diversity is on the rise in the North American workplace. In 1990, visible minorities occupied less than 20% of employees in Canada and the United States; they now make up almost a third of the labour force (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018; Statistics Canada, 2019; Toossi, 2002). Similarly, women’s participation in the labour force has increased, with women currently making up nearly half of all employees compared to less than a third in 1950 (Catalyst 2017a; 2017b; Statistics Canada, 2018; Toossi & Morisi, 2017). These numbers are projected to rise over the next few decades (Statistics Canada, 2019; Toossi, 2012). As more research documents the impact of demographic diversity on workplace outcomes, it has become clear that these relationships are complex, with evidence supporting positive (e.g., Bantel & Jackson, 1989), negative (e.g., Williams & O’Reilly, 1998) and even null effects (e.g., Horwitz & Horwitz, 2007). Recent evidence suggests that organizational diversity management efforts can leverage positive workplace outcomes in demographically diverse organizations (e.g., performance, Pitts, 2009). The construct of diversity climate has thus garnered the attention of scholars, as it taps into employees’ subjective experiences of the treatment of issues related to diversity and historically marginalized employees in the organization. A positive diversity climate has been found to predict important organizational (e.g., group performance, Boehm, Dwertmann, Kunze, et al., 2014) and individual outcomes (e.g., turnover intentions, McKay, Avery, Tonidandel, et al., 2007) for historically marginalized and non-marginalized employees.

Despite its importance in today’s increasingly diverse organizations, research on diversity climate has yielded a number of inconsistent definitions and poorly developed operationalizations of the construct (Cachat-Rosset, Carillo, & Klarsfeld, 2017). The absence of a shared and clear understanding of diversity climate hinders scholars’ ability to gain confidence in research findings, advance diversity climate theory, and provide evidence-
based recommendations to organizations (Cachat-Rosset et al., 2017). As such, the goal of the current project is to develop a new scale of workplace diversity climate based on a new integrated definition, and to investigate its psychometric properties, including reliability and underlying factor structure.

The current research constitutes the primary steps of a larger scale validation project. In what follows, I will first introduce workplace diversity and its different typologies, underlining demographic diversity as the focus of the current research. Second, I will describe the construct of workplace climate and its importance in organizations. Third, I will highlight the challenges facing diversity climate research and explain why a new measure is needed. Fourth, the current methodology to generate and validate the new measure will be outlined. This will be followed by a presentation of five scale development studies that adhere to Hinkin’s (1998) scale validation best practices. The thesis will conclude with a discussion of the theoretical and practical contributions of the present research.

**Demographic Diversity in the Workplace**

Workplace diversity can be broadly defined as any compositional differences between individuals in a work unit, which influence how people perceive one another (Roberson, Ryan, & Ragins, 2017). Thus, workplace diversity can refer to any attribute on which employees differ, including demographic (e.g., gender), job-related (e.g., functional background), or psychological (e.g., personality) characteristics. The current research focuses on demographic diversity, particularly pertaining to the demographic attributes of historically marginalized groups in organizations. We define historically marginalized groups as those in society that have been and/or are currently are less accepted, treated as less valuable, and experience discrimination based on their group status (Berry, 1997). Thus, historically marginalized groups include those who have undergone a) historical, b) current, or c) historical and current marginalization in society. These groups can be marginalized based on
demographic factors such as gender or gender identity, racioethnicity, immigrant status, age, sexual orientation, or religious identification.

Our research focus on demographic diversity associated with historically marginalized groups is driven by empirical evidence highlighting the negative work experiences encountered by historically marginalized employees. These harmful experiences can be based on a multitude of identities such as gender (e.g., Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001), race (e.g., Triana, Jayasinghe, & Rieper, 2015), age (e.g., Posthuma & Campion, 2009), sexual orientation (e.g., Sears & Mallory, 2011), or disability status (e.g., Ren, Paetzold, & Colella, 2008). Such negative experiences are further exacerbated when an individual possesses intersecting marginalized identities (i.e., when an individual simultaneously possesses multiple marginalized identities within a given institutional and societal context, Holvino, 2010) in the organization (e.g., Berdahl & Moore, 2006; Derous, Ryan, & Serlie, 2015; Woodhams, Lupton, & Cowling, 2015). The intersectionality of marginalized identities can additionally guide how people are perceived by others, thus adding to the complexity of social perception (Johnson & Carpinella, 2011). As such, the present research seeks to address the challenge of perceiving multiple historically marginalized group identities by focusing on diversity climate perceptions for historically marginalized groups in general, as opposed to one historically marginalized group in isolation from others. We propose that this solution facilitates capturing the interdependent effects of employees’ intersecting historically marginalized identities on their work experiences and how they are socially perceived by others in the organization.

Despite being heavily investigated, the effects of demographic diversity in organizations are not well-understood, with prior research generating inconclusive findings. For instance, some meta-analytic evidence suggests that demographic diversity (e.g., gender, race) can lead to increased group conflict and reduced communication (Williams &
O’Reilley, 1998), while other meta-analytic evidence indicates that the negative effects of demographic diversity are rather small and disappear under certain conditions (e.g., low team interdependence, using objective performance ratings; Guillaume, Brodbeck, & Riketta, 2012; van Dijk, van Engen, & van Knippenberg, 2012). There are also findings suggesting that having more demographically diverse workgroups (e.g., gender, race) can lead to higher innovation, creativity and performance (e.g., McLeod, Lobel, & Cox, 1996; Miller & del Carmen Triana, 2009; e.g., Noland, Moran, & Kotschwar, 2016). It is evident that the relations between demographic diversity and workplace outcomes are not straightforward. This may be because the effects of demographic diversity are highly contingent on how diversity is managed. Indeed, evidence suggests that effective diversity management can yield positive employee and organizational outcomes in diverse organizations (e.g., Choi, 2009; Choi & Rainey, 2014; Pitts, 2009). This evidence has led scholars to advocate for a shift from main-effect investigations of demographic diversity toward gaining a better understanding of how it can be effectively managed by organizations (Guillaume et al., 2012).

What is Diversity Management?

Diversity management can be defined as a systematic and planned voluntary commitment by organizations to hire, maintain, and promote a diverse workforce (Bassett-Jones, 2005). The construct represents a shift from organizations’ mere compliance with legislations (e.g., Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity in the United States; Employment Equity Act in Canada) to a more proactive, day-to-day management of diversity in the form of formal policies and programs (Yang & Konrad, 2011).

The effective management of demographic diversity in organizations can engender a positive diversity climate, which describes employees’ subjective evaluations of whether issues pertaining to diversity and historically marginalized employees are treated positively.
in the organization. Therefore, investigations of diversity climate can offer a lens for organizations to evaluate the success of their diversity management efforts and provide academic insights on the antecedents and consequences of positive diversity climates. However, enhancing researchers and practitioners’ knowledge of diversity climate’s role hinges on a comprehensive understanding of the construct and establishing a robust method to measure it.

**Climate in the Workplace**

Before delving deeper into the literature on diversity climate, it is important to understand the notion of climates in the workplace more generally. The construct of workplace climate refers to employees’ perceptions of the policies, practices, procedures, routines, and behaviours that get rewarded and supported in the organization (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 1990). Accordingly, climate captures the meanings people attach to their work environments, and their subjective experiences of the formal (e.g., policies, practices) and informal organizational features (e.g., routines and behaviours by organizational members) (Schneider & Barbera, 2014). To provide an accurate understanding of climate, it is also important to note what it does not include. First, climate does not capture individuals’ affective experiences at work (e.g., “I like this organization”) (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013), as it is a perceptual construct that involves people’s interpretations of their work context. Second, climate does not involve individuals’ personal attitudes or values (e.g., “I think diversity is good for this organization”). Third, climate involves individuals’ perceptions of the collective (e.g., “People are treated well in this organization”) and not their own experiences (e.g., “I am treated well in this organization”) (Schneider & Barbera, 2014).

Workplace climate can manifest itself at the psychological (i.e., individual) or organizational (i.e., aggregated) levels (Ostroff, Kinicki, & Muhammad, 2012). Of primary interest to the current research is psychological climate, which taps into the individual’s
The evaluation of organizational events and the meanings they attach to them (James & James, 1989). Our focus on psychological climate is because of its established role in explaining the relationship between unit-level climate and employee outcomes (Seibert, Silver, & Randolph, 2004). In other words, psychological climates pave way for organizational climates to emerge, highlighting the former’s significance. Importantly, workplace climates, both psychological and organizational, are generally conceptualized and investigated with a narrow focus on a strategic, organizational goal (e.g., diversity, innovation, Ostroff et al., 2012).

**Diversity Climate in the Workplace**

**Current conceptualizations and operationalizations of diversity climate**

To date, there has been a lack of consensus in the literature on how diversity climate should be defined and assessed (Cachat-Rosset et al., 2017; Dwertmann, Nishii, & van Knippenberg, 2016). The lack of consensus has thereby led to various definitions and scales of the construct. Table 1 presents examples of common definitions and operationalizations of diversity climate. Most definitions of diversity climate suggest a multidimensional structure (Cachat-Rosset et al., 2017). However, the lack of agreement on what the primary elements of diversity climate are has led to many fragmented definitions. The various examples in Table 1 demonstrate some of the discrepancies in what constitutes diversity climate’s key components (e.g., integration, fairness, discrimination) and sources (e.g., policies and practices versus behaviours and attitudes). Table 1 also highlights potential misalignments between definitions that specify a component (e.g., definition 10) or source (e.g., definition 5) of diversity climate and corresponding scales that do not reflect these elements (e.g., operationalizations 5 and 10). The most commonly discussed components of diversity climate are the following:
**Valuing and promoting diversity.** The majority of definitions (definitions 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15, 19, 23, 24, 25) and operationalizations (operationalizations 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 25) of diversity climate often emphasize the broad notions of *valuing and promoting diversity*. These notions are highlighted by definitions describing diversity climate in terms of the organization’s recognition for the need for diversity (definition 3), commitment to diversity and diversity management (definitions 10 and 21), and value for creating a demographically diverse workforce (definitions 9 and 15). However, these definitions do not fully delineate how valuing diversity and historically marginalized employees manifests in the organization. It remains unclear in these definitions and resulting scales if the mere numerical integration of historically marginalized employees is sufficient for people to perceive that diversity is valued in a given organization.

**Inclusion and integration.** A few definitions (7, 15, 18, 22, 24) and operationalizations (operationalization 2) of diversity climate also refer to concepts of *inclusion and integration*, albeit using different terminology such as integration (definitions 7, 15, and 22), social integration (definition 24), or organizational inclusion (definition 18). Yet, it is not typically specified if, or how these concepts conceptually differ from one another, or from the numerical integration of historically marginalized employees. Critically, some definitions (definition 24) and scales (operationalization 2) specify historically marginalized employees as the target of inclusion or integration, while others suggest all employees as the target (definition and operationalization 20). Suggesting all employees as the target of inclusion or integration makes diversity climate redundant with other constructs such as inclusion climate, which refers to people’s perceptions of whether all employees are fairly treated, valued for who they are as people, and included in core decision-making (Nishii, 2013).
**Fairness.** Another heavily discussed component of diversity climate is fairness (Dwertmann et al., 2016). Indeed, most but not all definitions of diversity climate reflect notions of organizational fairness (definitions 7, 15, and 20), justice (definition 3), as well as equal access and treatment (definitions 18, 20, and 22). Interestingly, these definitions tend to characterize all employees as the target of the fairness perceptions and not only those belonging to historically marginalized groups. Similar to the component of inclusion and integration discussed above, there is little justification as to why perceptions should concern all employees instead of historically marginalized employees when defining or measuring diversity climate. This lack of specificity poses a limitation as it blurs boundaries between diversity climate and pre-established related constructs such as perceived overall justice, which refers to people’s perceptions of whether the organization treats its employees fairly (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009).

**Elimination of discrimination.** Finally, very few definitions explicitly mention elimination of discrimination as a component of diversity climate (definitions 6, 10, and 21). When describing diversity climate, researchers often group discrimination with fairness (definition 20). However, we propose that although the two are related, the presence of justice does not always dictate the absence of discrimination and vice versa. People could perceive that historically marginalized employees receive fair outcomes (e.g., pay) compared to their non-marginalized counterparts but that historically marginalized employees experience daily personal discrimination. Alternatively, injustice at work could not be based on one’s marginalized group status, but rather the way organizations are designed (e.g., unfair decision-making procedures). As such, it is important to differentiate between the two constructs in definitions and scales of diversity climate.

**Diversity climate and its sources.** In addition to highlighting its multidimensional nature, the majority of definitions of diversity climate emphasize its sources within the
organization. These sources include organizational values (definitions 9, 11, 14, 15, and 24), organizational policies and practices (definitions 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 19, 24, and 25), and organizational members’ interactions (definitions 4 and 16). A small minority of definitions make no mention of diversity climate sources and offer rather holistic descriptions of the construct (definitions 17 and 21), for instance, as “common perception that managing diversity and preventing discrimination really matter” (Drach-Zajavy & Trogan, 2013, p. 449). Among those that specify sources, some authors describe diversity climate as perceptions of formal organizational structures including policies, practices, or procedures (definitions 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 21, 24, and 26). Other definitions of diversity climate describe it as stemming from both the formal structures (e.g., policies, practices, and procedures) and informal organizational values (definitions 11, 14, and 24). In the latter definitions, it is unclear what constitutes informal values and how they are different from those formally espoused by the organization.

Some authors have defined diversity climate through a more relational lens, which places more emphasis on the attitudes and behaviours enacted by employees and less emphasis on formal organizational sources (definitions 4, 5, 16, and 24). This relational lens is in line with the “synergy” perspective in diversity climates, which refers to perceptions of “what is expected and rewarded with regard to how employees interact in order to learn from and leverage their synergistic potential,” (Dwertmann et al., 2016, p. 1140). Yet, the synergy lens is often neglected in measures of diversity climate (Dwertmann et al., 2016). The lack of focus on synergy has resulted in scales that overemphasize perceptions of what is being done in the organization (e.g., policies) to prevent the negative outcomes of diversity and conceal perceptions of the potential benefits that diversity has on employee interactions. We also propose that the lack of focus on relational sources of diversity climate has led to content
deficient measures that do not tap into perceptions of climate that stem from relational interpersonal interactions.

Table 1 contains several definitions and operationalizations that emphasize employee’s attitudes and behaviors as a source of diversity climate (definitions and operationalizations 1, 2, 4 and 16). The problem with some of these (definitions and operationalizations 1 and 2) is that they do not capture climate because they refer to the actual personal attitude or behavior of the respondent with respect to diversity and historically marginalized employees. As noted earlier, employees’ personal attitudes toward diversity do not capture climate as climate should reflect perceptions of the collective (e.g., work unit, organization, Schneider & Barbera, 2014). People could perceive there to be a negative diversity climate in their organization but still hold positive attitudes toward historically marginalized employees. Thus, we propose that definitions and scales of diversity climate should omit any reference to respondents’ personal attitudes and values.

Recent advances in defining diversity climate and why is a new diversity climate scale needed?

Cachat-Rosset and colleagues (2017) recently proposed a new definition of diversity climate based on a systematic review of the literature. In this definition, they integrate different sources of diversity climate in the organization and define it as employees’ perceptions “of intent, programs, attitudes and behaviours in favor of visible or invisible forms of diversity relevant to the organization’s social context” (p. 12). A key contribution of Cachat-Rosset and colleagues’ (2017) work to is the incorporation of three different sources of diversity climate: intent (i.e., assertion the organization is pro-diversity), programming (i.e., organizational policies and practices), and praxis (i.e., the general attitudes and behaviours of organizational members). However, their definition does not specify the components along which diversity climate can manifest itself (e.g., fairness, discrimination,
value, inclusion). A new definition of diversity climate is thus still needed that 1) specifies different components, 2) integrates primary sources, and 3) aligns with the construct of organizational climate.

In addition to challenges in its conceptualization, the diversity climate literature is replete with issues in its operationalization (please refer to columns 3-7 of Table 1 for an overview of current scales). For example, though the majority of diversity climate studies define it as a multidimensional construct, only a fraction has assessed it using a multidimensional scale (Cachat-Rosset et al., 2017). Hence, many of the existing measures are content deficient, in that they do not fully capture the domain of diversity climate (i.e., its different components and sources).

Many diversity climate scales further suffer from limitations related to the items used. As highlighted earlier, several scales contain items that assess perceptions for all employees about general constructs, such as fairness, and not just those who belong to historically marginalized groups, leading to construct contamination. Moreover, some scales include items that restrict focus on specific social identities such as gender or age (e.g., Mor Barak et al., 1998; Pugh et al., 2008) ignoring other historically marginalized identities. These items restrict respondents’ perceptions and fail to capture the complexity of the work experiences of historically marginalized individuals who possess more than one historically marginalized identities (e.g., Woodhams et al., 2015). Additionally, many of the existing scales contain non-climate items (operationalizations 1, 2, 3, 8, 11, 12, 13, 20 and 22), instead tapping into respondents’ personal attitudes (e.g., “I believe diversity is a strategic business case;” Mor Barak et al., 1998), personal beliefs about the outcomes of diversity (e.g., “Managing diversity helped my organization to be more effective;” Triana & Garcia, 2009), and personal experiences in the workplace (e.g., “I have sometimes been unfairly singled out because of the demographic group I belong;” Chrobot-Mason & Aramovich, 2013). As noted, such items
do not constitute climate, and their use should thereby be eliminated from diversity climate scales.

The dearth of investigations assessing the construct validity of current diversity climate scales also represents a significant challenge to diversity climate research and practice (Cachat-Rosset et al., 2017). To date, Mor Barak et al.’s (1998) Diversity Perceptions Survey remains the most commonly used scale for diversity climate, which has guided the development of other diversity climate scales (Paolillo, Pasini, Silva, & Magnano, 2017). Although the instrument captures several important components of diversity climate (e.g., fairness, inclusion), it does not capture the many sources of climate within the organization (e.g., relational sources, organizational values). Further, two of the four factors yielded through principal components analysis in Mor Barak et al.’s (1998) original study do not refer to climate but rather to respondents’ personal attitudes toward diversity. There is still a need for a reliable and valid scale of diversity climate that encapsulates its different components and sources, which could allow researchers to clarify its conceptual boundaries and examine its distinctions and overlapping similarities with related constructs.

The Current Research

Diversity Climate in the Workplace: An Integrated Definition

To move toward an integrated understanding of diversity climate, the target of diversity climate perceptions must first be clarified. We propose that diversity climate should not tackle perceptions for all employees, as that contaminates it with existing constructs (e.g., inclusion climate, Nishii, 2013). We thus refer to diversity climate perceptions as those concerning historically marginalized group members in the organization. Whereas the terms “minority” and “under-represented” connote a numerical value for representation (Little, McGivern, & Kerins, 2016), the term “historically marginalized” highlights a lack of historical social power, irrespective of whether employees are in the numerical minority in
the organization. Given that historically marginalized employees still encounter negative organizational experiences, even when they are a numerical majority (e.g., Rubaii-Barrett & Beck, 1998; Stainback, Ratliff, & Roscigno, 2011), we decided not to use either of these common terms. We also considered using the terms “stigmatized” or simply “marginalized.” However, the use of such terms could have potentially confused participants with the idea that those group members are currently being stigmatized or marginalized in their organization. Therefore, our decision was to use the term “historically marginalized.”

Our second goal was to unpack the sources of diversity climate (i.e., what or who conveys it) from its main components (i.e., how it manifests itself), to facilitate a more refined understanding of the construct. In line with current accepted definitions of workplace climate (e.g., Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2011), we integrated its formal and informal sources in our definition. Thus, we employed and clarified Cachat-Rosset et al.’s (2017) conceptual framework of diversity climate (i.e., intent, programming, and praxis), as it integrates different levels at which diversity climate can be conveyed. Specifically, we propose that diversity climate is reflected through: values adopted by the organization and its top leadership, organizational policies and practices, and general attitudes, behaviours, and informal routines by organizational members. The first source reflects the values espoused by the organization as a whole and its top leadership (i.e., senior management), because organizational leaders are viewed as representatives of the organization (Coyle-Shapiro & Shore, 2007). The second source reflects the enactment of these values through organizational policies, as well as organizational practices that develop over time, without necessarily being dictated by a formal policy. We decided to include practices as well as policies because it is quite possible for organizations to have policies that get enacted in a manner that violates the intention of the policy (e.g., Guth & Macmillan, 1986). We further decided to include managers and supervisors in the second source, as they are typically in
charge of the enactment of organizational policies and practices (e.g., Hammer, Kossek, Zimmerman, & Daniels, 2007). The third source finally reflects the interpersonal sources of climate that stem from interactions with organizational members, an often-neglected source in past definitions of diversity climate (Dwertmann et al., 2016). We decided to include general organizational members in this source (e.g., coworkers, other employees) because we believed these are the individuals that respondents would have the most daily, informal contact with (e.g., Fay, 2011).

Subsequently, we sought to identify the main components of diversity climate based on a review of the literature. After creating a conceptual map of the different diversity climate elements, we identified the following four components: 1) representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, 2) inclusion of historically marginalized employees, 3) justice toward historically marginalized employees, and 4) elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members. My advisor and I then met to discuss what each component’s definition should include.

The first two components, representation and worth of historically marginalized employees and inclusion of historically marginalized employees, were identified based on our understanding of organizational integration. Cox (1991) posits that there are two forms of integration: structural and informal, with the former describing the representation of historically marginalized individuals in the organization. Though numerical representation can indicate that historically marginalized employees are valued, it is not sufficient for their structural integration if they do not possess decision-making power to enact organisational change. We propose that for structural integration to take place, historically marginalized employees must both be represented and have their perspectives incorporated in organizational decision-making. Thus, we define the first component of representation and worth of historically marginalized employees as: the degree to which historically...
marginalized employees are viewed as assets to the organization, represented across its different levels, and have their perspectives integrated in decision-making.

Based on the notion of informal integration (Cox, 1991), we identified inclusion of historically marginalized employees as a second component of diversity climate. Despite the importance of structural integration in diversity climate evaluations, we reason it is equally important for diversity climate to capture historically marginalized employees’ social experiences at work. Informal integration describes the inclusion of historically marginalized employees in informal social networks (e.g., social gatherings, Cox, 1991). Accordingly, informal integration paves way for workplace inclusion; when historically marginalized employees are involved in informal social networks, they will possibly feel like they belong in the organization (i.e., can form strong interpersonal bonds), a core element of workplace inclusion (Shore et al., 2011). However, for employees to feel included, they must also feel like they are free to be who they are without the pressure to suppress parts of their identity to conform to dominant organizational norms (Jansen et al., 2014; Shore et al., 2011).

Therefore, in line with Shore et al.’s (2011) and Jansen et al.’s (2014) conceptualizations of workplace inclusion, we define the inclusion of historically marginalized employees as: the degree to which historically marginalized employees are treated like they belong and can be their true selves without the pressure to conform to organizational norms.

The third identified component is justice toward historically marginalized employees. Several constructs exist that assess perceptions of organizational justice (e.g., perceived overall justice, justice climate, Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Colquitt et al., 2002), which have been found to highly correlate with diversity climate (e.g., Buttner, Lowe, & Billings-Harris, 2010; Madera, Dawson, & Guichait, 2016). However, previous research indicates that justice perceptions are key to how employees qualitatively make sense of diversity-related events at work (Roberson & Stevens, 2006). These findings suggest that diversity climate
perceptions (e.g., does the organization facilitate a positive work environment for historically marginalized employees) are likely to involve justice perceptions (e.g., are historically marginalized employees treated fairly). Although it is possible that a positive diversity climate engenders perceptions of a fair organizational environment to all employees (e.g., Madera et al., 2016), we propose this is not always the case. People could perceive that the organization’s diversity climate is positive, but that historically non-marginalized employees are treated unfairly (e.g., Dover, Major, & Kaiser, 2016). Thus, we propose that justice perceptions should solely tackle historically marginalized employees to more accurately reflect the organization’s diversity climate. We consider this component broadly as tapping into fairness of outcomes, procedures, and the interpersonal treatment received by historically marginalized employees. We define **justice toward historically marginalized employees** as: the degree to which there is justice for historically marginalized employees that includes the fairness of outcomes, procedures, and interpersonal treatment.

The fourth and final identified component of diversity climate is the elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members. Despite its conceptual overlap with justice, we propose that this component should be viewed separately, as justice does not always imply the absence of discrimination. Indeed, research has shown that discrimination can now take place in more subtle yet harmful forms at work (e.g., Cortina, Farr, Leskinen, Huerta, et al., 2013; Holder, Jackson, & Ponterotto, 2015; Son Hing, Chung-Yan, Hamilton, & Zanna, 2008). As such, receiving fair outcomes, procedures, and treatment will not necessarily mean that overt and subtle forms of discrimination are eliminated. We further propose that a positive diversity climate cannot exist unless discrimination against historically marginalized group members is eliminated, as discrimination attacks employees’ core identities, by that adversely influencing their work experiences (Volpone & Avery, 2013). We also reason that this component captures the elimination of discrimination against
historically marginalized employees and non-employees. People could perceive that employees do not experience discrimination at work but that customers, clients, or partners belonging to historically marginalized groups experience discriminatory treatment from employees, without organizational intervention. In that case, people may perceive a negative diversity climate in the organization, despite the absence of discrimination toward employees.

Thus, we define the **elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members** as: *the degree to which negative or harmful treatment of historically marginalized group members that is based on their group status is eliminated.*

In sum, we define diversity climate at the psychological level as:

*individuals’ perceptions of the degree to which, at work, historically marginalized employees are represented and valued, socially included, treated fairly, and are not discriminated against, as demonstrated by top leadership and organizational values, organizational policies and practices, and the general attitudes, behaviours, and routines exhibited by organizational members.*

In total, the four proposed components along with the three climate sources create twelve quadrants of how diversity climate can be operationalized (please refer to Table 2 for a visualization of the quadrants and examples of proposed items for each).

The current research follows the initial steps outlined by Hinkin’s (1998) scale development best practices (please refer to Table 3 for a brief overview of each study). The first step involves the generation of items for each identified component of diversity climate based on the proposed definition. We supplement this step with item clarity feedback from employee samples (Pilot Study 1). The second phase involves recruiting samples representative of our population of interest (i.e., employees) to evaluate the relevance of the items to the intended definition of diversity climate and other conceptually similar constructs (Pilot Study 2, Pilot Study 3, Study 1, and Study 3), as well as sorting the items along the
four diversity climate components using item-sort tasks (Study 2). Following initial item reduction, the third step involves further scale refinement, by exploring its underlying factor structure using exploratory factor analysis and investigating its psychometric properties (Study 4). Fourth, the factor structure of the scale is further examined using confirmatory factor analysis (Study 5). We supplement this step by further assessing whether the factor structure remains invariant (i.e., the same) for participants, regardless of their historically marginalized group status. A more detailed description of each research step is provided below.

**Item Generation**

To begin the scale development process, an over-representative item pool was first generated using the deductive method of item generation (Hinkin, 1995; Hinkin, 1998). The deductive method relies on an existing conceptualization of a given construct, thus allowing for high content validity of the generated items and adequate sampling of the domain of interest (i.e., the different proposed components and sources of diversity climate). To generate the item pool, we first reviewed the diversity climate literature to evaluate items from existing scales of diversity climate (e.g., Chrobot-Mason & Aramovich, 2013; Chung et al., 2015; Hofhuis et al., 2012; Kaplan et al., 2011; McKay et al., 2007; McKay et al., 2008; Mor Barak et al., 1998; Oberfield, 2016; Pugh et al., 2008; Vrick & Greer, 2012). We also evaluated items from related measures as items from diversity climate scales did not fully capture our proposed components and sources. After examining scales assessing conceptually similar constructs to diversity climate, 72 items were incorporated from the Inclusion Climate Scale (Nishii, 2013), Diversity Promises Scale (Chrobot-Mason, 2003), the Organizational Diversity Inventory (Hegarty & Dalton, 1995), the Workforce Diversity Questionnaire (Larkey, 1996), and the Perceived Organizational Efforts to Support Diversity Scale (Triana & Garcia, 2009), and the Organizational Justice Scale (Colquitt, 2001).
Following the generation of the initial item pool, the pool was further refined. Three categories of items were created. The first category included 163 items that were tapping into one’s perceptions for others in the organization (i.e., climate items), the second category included 15 items tapping into one’s perceptions for oneself (i.e., personal experience items), and the third category included 28 items tapping into one’s personal attitudes, values, or beliefs (i.e., personal attitude items). The 43 items that were sorted into the latter two categories were accordingly omitted from the item pool, as they were not tapping into climate. A major concern was to ensure that the final item pool generalizes across organizational contexts and assesses individuals’ perceptions for all historically marginalized groups within the organization, as opposed to one particular group (e.g., racioethnic minorities). Subsequently, we examined the content of the remaining 163 items to make necessary item adaptations, by assessing whether the item was study specific (i.e., specific to an organizational setting where a study was conducted) or group specific (i.e., only tapped into perceptions for a specific historically marginalized group).

The adapted items from existing scales were further supplemented by 94 novel items. As scale items should be reflective of one idea or construct (Hinkin, 1998), we created items to correspond to each of the twelve quadrants of diversity climate (see Table 2), thereby creating four different subscales (i.e., representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, inclusion of historically marginalized employees, justice toward historically marginalized employees, and elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members). Each subscale contained items that reflected perceptions of top leadership and organizational values, organizational policies and practices, and the general attitudes, behaviours, and routines exhibited by organizational members. All novel and adapted items were worded such that they were clear, succinct, and not double-barrelled.
The item pool was subsequently revised to eliminate redundant items. In total, an initial pool of 140 items was generated and further revised by a team of subject matter experts (SMEs), consisting of four academic faculty and four psychology graduate students. The SMEs reviewed the items for content, clarity, and wording, which resulted in a final revised item pool of 118 items: 27 for representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, 29 for inclusion of historically marginalized employees, 31 for justice toward historically marginalized employees, and 31 for elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members (see Appendix A). The next stage involved a pilot examination of item clarity in employee samples to make necessary item revisions (Pilot Study 1).

Piloting Studies

Pilot Study 1

Following SME feedback, we next seek feedback from an employee sample on the clarity of the items, given employees were the intended population where the scale was to be administered in the future.

Method

Participants were recruited from Amazon’s MTurk in April 2019. This online crowdsourcing platform allows the recruitment of diverse employee samples, which are more representative of our intended population compared to college samples (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Goslin, 2011; Paolacci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010). We ran three item clarity pilots (Pilot Study 1A, Pilot Study 1B, and Pilot Study 1C) with a total of 72 participants, who were compensated $0.40 for their participation. Each participant was presented with half of the items from the diversity climate pool (i.e., 59 items for Pilot Study 1A and Pilot Study 1B; 56 items for Pilot Study 1C) to ameliorate participant fatigue. Participants were then asked to “please rate the level of overall clarity for each item” from 1 (poor) to 9 (excellent), with 5
indicating a rating of *adequate*. Items were presented randomly to prevent any potential systematic order effects on participants’ ratings.

**Results**

The results from Pilot Study 1A indicated that items beginning with “around here” were rated as less clear ($M = 6.30$) than other items ($M = 6.50$), thus prompting us to revise their stem from “around here” to “in this organization” to increase clarity. Pilot Study 1B resulted in the omission of two of the items that scored below 5 (*adequate*) and rewording of 33 low scoring items, which were modelled after higher scoring items (i.e., 5 or higher). Finally, Pilot Study 1C results indicated that approximately 81.03% of the items (i.e., 94 of 116 items) were rated as 5 (*adequate*) or higher. Thus, further wording revisions were made to 15 low scoring items, yielding a final revised pool of 112 items: 27 for representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, 27 for inclusion of historically marginalized employees, 31 for justice toward historically marginalized employees, and 27 for elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members (see Appendix B).

**Pilot Study 2**

The goal of the Pilot Study 2 is to assess the difficulty level of the item-sort task and the clarity of the task instructions in Study 1, including the provided construct definitions. In item-sort tasks, participants are provided with definitions of a construct of interest and conceptually-related constructs and are asked to sort items to the construct they think the item best reflects (Howard, 2018). All participants were recruited from Amazon’s MTurk and were compensated $0.40 for their participation. In Pilot 2A ($N = 20$) and Pilot 2B ($N = 25$), participants read definitions of diversity climate, inclusion climate, and perceived overall justice (see Appendices C and D), and were asked to sort 80 items from the three scales to their corresponding construct or to an “other” category (see Appendices B and E for items).
To reduce respondent fatigue, each participant was presented with half of the 112 diversity climate items (i.e., 56 items).

Inclusion climate refers to individuals’ perceptions that all employees are fairly treated in the work unit, valued for who they are, and included in core decision-making (Nishii, 2013). Perceived overall justice describes individuals’ overall judgments of whether the organization treats them and other employees fairly (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009). Thus, both constructs are related to diversity climate yet are conceptually distinct. Inclusion climate is similar to diversity climate in that it captures perceptions of the organization’s fairness toward its employees and whether they can express their true identities. Perceived overall justice and diversity climate are similar in that they involve perceptions of organizational fairness. A critical distinction between diversity climate and the two constructs, however, is that diversity climate only involves perceptions for historically marginalized employees. Further, diversity climate is a broader construct that comprises other components (e.g., representation, social inclusion, elimination of discrimination).

Pilot Study 2A results indicated that 75 diversity climate items (67%) were sorted incorrectly by more than half the participants, with 85 items most frequently confused with inclusion climate. Thus, the definitions provided in task instructions were reworded such that the target of each construct (i.e., historically marginalized employees, all employees, the respondent) was clearer to participants (see Appendix D). In Pilot Study 2B (N = 25), we conducted a second item-sort task with the new task instructions (see Appendix D). Participants sorted 80 items from the three scales. Results illustrated that 60 diversity climate items (53.60%) were still incorrectly sorted, with the majority also confused with inclusion climate. The results from Pilots 2A and 2B suggested the task was too difficult for participants. We reasoned that participants’ confusion stemmed from the constructs’
conceptual overlap, given their emphasis on fairness. Hence, we decided to proceed with an alternative construct to inclusion climate to reduce participants’ confusion.

**Pilot Study 3**

In light of Pilot 2 results, we substitute inclusion climate with another climate measure (i.e., psychological safety) for the current pilot study, which turned out to be the final pilot. This study is treated as a pilot as its goal was to merely assess if the task was still difficult for participants after the replacement of inclusion climate with psychological safety. Given that no substantive changes were made to the method of this final pilot, we provide more detail for this pilot below and analyze the data more substantively.

Psychological safety refers to individuals’ perceptions of how safe people feel to take interpersonal risks and express themselves in their work team (e.g., their ideas and opinions), without fear that others will reject or punish them (Edmondson, 1994; Edmonson & Lee, 2014). Thus, both psychological safety and diversity climate describe perceptions of how comfortable employees feel to express themselves at work, and how valued and supported they feel by others. Yet, similar to inclusion climate, psychological safety reflects perceptions for all employees. Further, diversity climate goes beyond psychological safety by capturing perceptions of how historically marginalized employees are represented, socially included, and treated fairly in the organization, and whether they do not experience discrimination.

**Method**

Participants ($N = 39$; see Table 4 for an overview of the data cleaning steps) read the consent form (see Appendix F) and were then provided definitions of diversity climate, psychological safety, and perceived overall justice (see Appendix G for task instructions). To enhance clarity, we further defined historically marginalized employees, as those who belong to groups that have been treated in society in an exclusionary or discriminatory way, either historically and/or currently. To reduce task difficulty, each participant was presented with
28 of the 112 diversity climate items (e.g., “Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity”). Participants were also presented with the 7-item Psychological Safety Scale (e.g., “Members of this team are able to bring up problems and tough issues,” Edmondson, 1994) and the 6-item Perceived Overall Justice Scale (e.g., “Overall, I’m treated fairly by my organization,” Ambrose & Schminke, 2009). Three instructional attention check items (e.g., “In this organization, there are many marginalized employees. Please sort into other”) were included to ensure that participants were reading the items carefully. Participants who failed to sort two or more of the three attention check items to the “other” category were excluded from analysis. All items were presented in a random order (see Appendices B and H for task items). Participants were then asked to sort each item to the construct they thought it best reflected based on the definitions provided or to an “other” category. Following the completion of the task, participants rated how honestly and accurately they answered the survey (1 = not at all honestly and accurately, 2 = somewhat honestly and accurately, 3 = moderately honestly and accurately, and 4 = very honestly and accurately). If this item was rated below a 3 (moderately honestly and accurately), participants were omitted from analysis. Participants then completed a brief demographics questionnaire (see Appendix I) and were debriefed (see Appendix J).

Results

In line with Anderson and Gerbing’s (1991) original item sort-task, we relied on items’ proportion of substantive agreement (Psa), which is the proportion of participants who correctly assign an item to its intended construct. The Psa values can range from 0.0 to 1.0, with 1.0 indicating that all participants assigned the item to its intended construct. Table 5 demonstrates the Psa values obtained for each item. Only fourteen diversity climate items

\[ Psa = n_c / N, \text{ where } n_c \text{ is the number of correct assignments and } N \text{ is the total number of participants.} \]

\[ \text{Of the 14 items that were removed, seven were often frequently confused with psychological safety, six were often frequently confused with perceived overall justice, and one was often equally confused with psychological safety and perceived overall justice.} \]
were sorted incorrectly by more than 50% of the respondents ($P_{sa} < .50$) and were thus eliminated. Accordingly, no further changes were made to the main study instructions, as we believed they were clear. Overall, 98 of the original 112 items were retained for Study 1: 28 for representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, 21 for inclusion of historically marginalized employees, 26 for justice toward historically marginalized employees, and 23 for elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members (see Appendix K).

**Study 1**

The purpose of Study 1 is to assess the substantive validity of the diversity climate items, which describes the degree of relevance between a proposed item and its corresponding construct of interest (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991). Substantive validity assessments at early stages of scale development help reduce the initially generated item pool and ensure that the new scale possesses construct validity in subsequent stages (Hinkin, 1998). In this study, we administer an item-sort task to an employee sample from Amazon’s MTurk, as judges of substantive validity during scale pretests should be representative of the population where the scale will be administered (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991). Specifically, Study 1 seeks to provide evidence that each diversity climate item is not reflective of conceptually-related constructs. In adherence with sample size recommendations for item-sort tasks, we aim to recruit between 10 to 30 participants for the sort task (Howard, 2018; Hunt, Sparkman, & Wilcox, 1982).

**Method**

**Participants.** One-hundred and seventy-one participants were recruited from Amazon’s MTurk, who were required to be full-time employees, proficient in English, and residing in Canada or the US. A full-time job was required since all items referred to the organization and thus required familiarity with organizational contexts. English proficiency
was also required, as all study materials were presented in English. We recruited participants who resided in North America, as the management of organizational diversity might differ in North America compared to other Western (e.g., European) and non-Western contexts. The differing sociocultural contexts could thus lead participants to differ in how they understand and respond to the diversity climate items. Participants were compensated $0.40 for their participation.

Of the 121 participants whose data was retained (see Table 6 for an overview of the data cleaning steps), 61 identified as male and 60 identified as female. The age range of the sample was between 23 and 69 years, with the mean age being 36.8 years (SD = 10.00). The majority of participants (95.87%) resided in the US, with only 4.13% indicating they resided in Canada.

Procedure. The procedure was identical to the one followed in Pilot Study 3 (see Appendices F to J for Study 1 materials). To further reduce the task’s cognitive demand, each participant was randomly assigned to one of four randomized blocks of the diversity climate items (see Appendix L). The first block was sorted by 31 participants and the three remaining three blocks were sorted by 30 participants each.

Results

Plan for analysis. We relied on Howard and Melloy’s (2015) substantive validity test of statistical significance, as opposed to Anderson and Gerbing’s (1991) original test. Howard and Melloy’s (2015) test is well-suited for item-sort tasks similar to ours, which include multiple construct choices (i.e., more than two). Substantive validity was established for an item if the frequency with which the item was correctly assigned to its intended construct (i.e., diversity climate) was greater than the critical number of assignments (m). The critical number of assignments (m) is the value where summing the binomial probabilities (i.e., 0.5) of a certain number of responses occurring, starting with the maximum possible
amount and decreasing, is less than .05 (Howard & Melloy, 2015). An item is substantively valid if it meets or exceeds the critical \( m \) value (please refer to Table 7 for critical \( m \) values for differing sample sizes provided in text by Howard and Melloy, 2015, p. 184). For the current study, we determined the critical number of assignments (\( m \)) to be 21 for block 1 of the items, and 20 for the remaining three blocks.

**Main results.** As shown in Table 8, 59 of the 98 items met or exceeded the critical \( m \) value and were thus deemed as substantively valid: 23 for representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, 16 for inclusion of historically marginalized employees, 10 for justice toward historically marginalized employees, and 10 for elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members.

Most of the proposed diversity climate scale items were frequently incorrectly sorted to perceived overall justice. Of the five representation and worth items that did not meet the critical \( m \) value, three were frequently incorrectly sorted to psychological safety, and two were equally frequently incorrectly sorted to psychological safety and perceived overall justice. Of the five inclusion of historically marginalized employees’ items that did not meet the cut-off, three were frequently incorrectly sorted to psychological safety, one was frequently incorrectly sorted to perceived overall justice, and one was often equally confused with perceived overall justice and the “other” category. Of the 16 justice toward historically marginalized employees’ items that did not meet the cut-off, 12 were frequently incorrectly sorted to perceived overall justice, two were frequently incorrectly sorted to psychological safety, and two were often equally confused with psychological safety and perceived overall justice. Finally, of the 13 discrimination against historically marginalized groups’ items that did not meet the cut-off, four were frequently incorrectly sorted to psychological safety, four were frequently incorrectly sorted to perceived overall justice, two were often incorrectly
sorted to “other,” two were often equally confused with psychological safety and perceived overall justice, and one was often equally confused with psychological safety and “other.”

**Discussion**

The results of Study 1 indicate that 59 of the 98 diversity climate items were consistently correctly assigned to diversity climate, indicating high level of substantive validity. Most of the items that did not meet the critical \( m \) value were justice items that were most often confused with the construct of perceived overall justice. Participants’ confusion between the two constructs could be attributed to their conceptual overlap, as both constructs emphasize fairness. The 59 retained items were used in Study 2 (see Appendix M).

**Study 2**

Since the diversity climate items were generated to reflect four distinct components, the purpose of Study 2 is to inspect whether each retained diversity climate item from Study 1 is only reflective of its respective component. Pilot Study 2 and Study 3 results suggested that participants were confused when sorting diversity climate items and those of related constructs. In light of these findings, we reason this confusion is further likely to arise when sorting the diversity climate items into the four proposed components. Thus, we primarily rely on the current study to guide necessary item revisions that could improve items’ wording.

**Method**

**Participants.** Twelve participants were recruited from Amazon’s MTurk, which was still within recommended item-sort task sample sizes (i.e., 10 to 30 participants, Howard, 2018). Participants were required to be full-time employees, proficient in English, and residing in Canada or the US. Participants were also required to not have participated in Study 1. All participants were compensated $0.40 for their participation. Of the 10 participants whose data was retained (see Table 9 for an overview of the data cleaning steps),
5 identified as male and 5 identified as female. The age range of the sample was between 29 and 60 years, with the mean age being 43.0 years ($SD = 9.60$). All 10 participants resided in the US.

**Procedure.** Participants first read the consent form (see Appendix N) and were presented with definitions of the four proposed dimensions of diversity climate (see Appendix O). Participants were then provided with the 59 diversity climate items retained from Study 1 (e.g., “Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture”), in addition to three instructional attention check items (e.g., “In this organization, there are many marginalized employees. Please sort into other”). All items (see Appendix M) were presented in a random order, and participants were asked to sort each item to the dimension they thought the item best reflected or to an “other” category. Following the completion of the sort task, participants were asked to rate how honestly and accurately they answered the survey (1 = not at all honestly and accurately, 2 = somewhat honestly and accurately, 3 = moderately honestly and accurately, and 4 = very honestly and accurately). Finally, participants completed a short demographics questionnaire (see Appendix I) and were debriefed (see Appendix P).

**Results and Discussion**

**Plan for analysis.** As Howard and Melloy’s (2015) substantive validity test is extremely conservative for small sample sizes (the critical $m$ value is 9 for an $n$ of 10), our main goal in Study 2 was to evaluate and revise items with a $P_{sa}$ value of less than .50 (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991).

**Main results and discussion.** The results are displayed in Table 10. Thirty-four of the 59 items obtained a $P_{sa}$ value of .50 or above: 7 for representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, 11 for inclusion of historically marginalized employees,
for justice toward historically marginalized employees, and 8 for elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members.

Based on items’ $P_{sa}$ values, revisions and eliminations were subsequently made to the item pool. Specifically, wording revisions were made to 10 items with $P_{sa}$ values of less than .50 (see Appendix Q). The revisions were primarily guided by whether item could be reworded to enhance clarity and which category the item was most frequently incorrectly assigned to. For example, the representation and worth item “In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is taken for granted” was most frequently sorted into “other.” We reasoned this was because of our word choice “taken for granted,” which might confuse participants. Thus, the term was substituted with “deeply valued,” which we believed better connoted our definition of representation and worth. In addition, 2 items that were negatively valenced (i.e., worded to be reverse scored when administering the scale) were most frequently incorrectly sorted to “other.” Hence, these items were reworded to be positively valenced, such that higher scores on these items would indicate a more positive diversity climate. Finally, four items were eliminated. The three representation and worth’ items were most frequently sorted by participants to the “other” category. One item “In this organization, employees receive recognition for valuing and promoting diversity” was sorted correctly by only four of the 10 participants. Two items “In this organization, people think historically marginalized employees do not bring anything valuable to the table” and “In this organization, there is an old boys’ club that makes it hard for historically marginalized employees to get ahead” were never correctly sorted by participants. The inclusion of historically marginalized employees’ item, “Top leadership in this organization values historically marginalized employees for who they are as people and not just the jobs they fill,” was removed as it was understandably frequently confused with the representation and worth of historically marginalized employees’ dimension.
In total, we retained 55 items of the 59 diversity climate items from Study 1 (see Appendix R). Ten of these items were revised based on the results of the current study. The 55 items were administered in a second construct-related item-sort task in Study 3 to establish their construct-related substantive validity, given the wording revisions.

**Study 3**

Since Study 1, 43 items had been eliminated from the diversity climate item pool and major wording revisions had been made to 10 of the items. Consequently, we believe that the diversity climate items had undergone substantive changes since Study 1 that warrant another construct-related item-sort task. This step is important to ensure that participants were still able to correctly sort the diversity climate items and distinguish them from the conceptually similar constructs of perceived overall justice and psychological safety. Thus, Study 3 includes a construct-related item-sort task, similar to the one used in Study 1, but using the revised items retained from Study 2.

**Method**

**Participants.** Thirty-five participants were recruited from Amazon’s MTurk, who were required to be full-time employees, proficient in English, and residing in Canada or the US. Participants were also required to not have completed Studies 1 or 2. Of the 31 participants whose data was retained (see Table 11 for an overview of the data cleaning steps), 21 identified as female and 10 identified as male. The age range of the sample was between 24 and 62 years, with the mean age being 45.4 years ($SD = 10.80$). All participants resided in the US and were compensated $0.40 for their participation.

**Procedure.** The procedure was identical to the one followed in Pilot Study 3 and Study 1 (see Appendices F to J for Study 3 materials). The only distinction between Studies 1 and 3 was that participants were provided with the 59 items retained from Study 2 (see Appendix R).
Results

Plan for analysis. We followed Howard and Melloy’s (2015) guidelines for substantive validity analysis (i.e., how relevant each item is to its proposed construct of interest, Anderson & Gerbing, 1991. The critical number of assignments ($m$) was determined as 21, such that items needed to meet or exceed this critical value to be substantively valid.

Main results. As displayed in Table 12, 52 of the 55 items met or exceeded the identified critical $m$ value. Thus, all 52 items were deemed as substantively valid and retained for Study 4: 20 for representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, 14 for inclusion of historically marginalized employees, 8 for justice toward historically marginalized employees, and 10 for elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members. Two justice toward historically marginalized employees’ items did not meet the critical $m$ value and were frequently incorrectly sorted to perceived overall justice. Further, one inclusion of historically marginalized employees’ item did not meet the critical $m$ value and was frequently equally confused with psychological safety and perceived overall justice.

Discussion

The results of Study 3 indicate that 52 of the 55 diversity climate items met the critical $m$ value, indicating high level of substantive validity. All three items that did not meet the critical $m$ value were most often confused with perceived overall justice. Thus, the results of Study 3 mirror those of Study 1, in that participants seemed to most often confuse the constructs of diversity climate and perceived overall justice, given their similar emphasis on fairness. Finally, it is worth noting that the least substantively valid diversity climate item was still correctly sorted more than 50% of the time ($P_{sa} > .50$). The 52 items were used in Study 4 (see Appendix S) to explore their factor structure and further eliminate poor items.
Study 4

The purpose of Study 4 is twofold. First, we seek to explore the underlying factor structure of the Workplace Diversity Climate Scale using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). What kind of factor structure might emerge is unknown given that scale items had been developed to capture four components (i.e., representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, inclusion of historically marginalized employees, justice toward historically marginalized employees, and elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members) and three sources of diversity climate (i.e., top leadership and organizational values, organizational policies and practices, and general attitudes, behaviours, and routines). Second, we aim to further reduce the number of items to create a more parsimonious scale, thereby minimizing future participant fatigue (Hinkin, 1998).

Method

Participants. Several sample size recommendations exist for studies using EFA (e.g., Costello & Osborne, 2005; MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang, & Hong, 1999). We planned to adhere to Schwab’s (1980) conservative recommendation of item-to-participant ratio of 1:10, as larger sample sizes produce more stable estimates of variances and factor loadings during factor analysis (Hinkin, 1998). Given that the diversity climate scale includes 52 items, 572 participants were recruited from Amazon’s MTurk, who were required to be full-time employees, proficient in English, and residing in Canada or the US. Participants were also required to not have completed Studies 1, 2, or 3. Of the 520 participants whose data was retained (see Table 13 for an overview of the data cleaning steps), 273 identified as female, 242 identified as male, and four identified as gender non-binary. The age range of the sample was between 19 and 87 years, with the mean age being 36.9 years ($SD = 11.12$). The three most common ethnic origins were White (75.19%), Black or African American (7.69%), and Asian (6.35%). The majority of participants (54.62%) worked in the private sector, followed
by the public sector (29.81%) and the not-for-profit sector (14.23%). The majority of participants resided in the US (98.65%). All participants were compensated $0.40 for their participation.

**Procedure.** Participants first read the consent form (see Appendix T) and were then provided with a brief definition of historically marginalized employees (see Appendix U for Study 4 questionnaire), as those who belong to groups that have been treated in society in an exclusionary or discriminatory way, either historically and/or currently (e.g., women, racial-ethnic minorities, LGBTQ, people with disabilities, etc.). The 52-item diversity climate scale from Study 3 was then presented and participants were asked to rate their agreement with each statement on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*very strongly disagree*) to 9 (*very strongly agree*). A sample item was “Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.” Three instructional attention check items (e.g., “In this organization, diversity is important. Please select *strongly disagree*”) were also included to ensure that participants were reading the items carefully. The diversity climate items and attention checks were presented in a random order. Participants who exhibited careless responding as indicated by failing two or more of the attention checks were not included in subsequent analysis.

After rating the diversity climate scale items, participants were asked to complete a demographics questionnaire (see Appendix V) that included items on their gender/gender identity, age, employment status, ethnic background, country of residence, sexual identity, religious identification, disability status, and parents’ socioeconomic status, and self-identification with historically marginalized groups. Finally, participants were asked to rate how honestly and accurately they answered the survey (1 = *not at all honestly and accurately*, 2 = *somewhat honestly and accurately*, 3 = *moderately honestly and accurately*, and 4 = *very honestly and accurately*). If this item was rated below a 3 (*moderately honestly*
and accurately), participants were omitted from analysis. Participants were then debriefed (see Appendix W).

Results

Plan for analysis. Using R (Version R 3.4.1 GUI 1.70 El Capitan build 7375) and R Studio (Version 1.0.153), an EFA was conducted on the data using principal axis factoring and an oblique promax rotation. An oblique rotation was chosen, as the proposed diversity climate dimensions were expected to be correlated. A promax rotation was chosen as it often yields a simple factor structure (Gorsuch, 1983; Yong & Pearce, 2013). To determine the number of emergent factors for the principal axis factoring, a visual scree plot and parallel analysis were used. A scree plot allows for visually inspecting the scale’s eigenvalues, where factors occurring before the sudden drop in eigenvalues are retained (Yong & Pearce, 2013). Parallel analysis allows an estimation of eigenvalues for each obtained factor based on random permutations of raw data, in this case, 10,000 permutations. Subsequently, factors with eigenvalues that do not surpass the simulated eigenvalues of the parallel analysis at the 95th percentile are not considered as meaningful (O’Connor, 2000). Finally, for scale reduction, items that loaded at .40 or higher on a given factor were retained. We further retained items that had a cross-loading of less than .32 on alternative factors and had a cross-loading difference of .20 or lower (Hinkin, 1998; Howard, 2016; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Preliminary data inspection. Adhering to EFA best practices (e.g., Howard, 2016; Yong & Konrad, 2013), we first checked that the data were suitable for factor analysis (i.e., there were sufficient correlations between items). The Keiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy was computed (KMO = .99), which indicated that there was sufficient common variance in the dataset. A typical convention is to acquire a KMO of .60 or above before conducting EFA (Dziuban & Shirkey, 1974; Howard, 2016; Kaiser, 1970). The Bartlett’s test of sphericity $\chi^2 (1326) = 26811.52$, $p = .000$, indicated that the observed
correlations matrix between items diverged significantly from an identity matrix (i.e., where there are zero relationships in the data), further suggesting sufficiently large correlations between the items for principal axis factoring.

**Main results.** The scree plot (see Figure 1) suggested a three-factor model, with the curve becoming flat (i.e., displaying a drop in eigenvalues) after the third factor. As seen in Table 14, the parallel analysis results also indicated that three factors should be retained, as the raw eigenvalues of the first three factors (*eigenvalues* = 31.15, 1.87, 0.58) exceed the eigenvalues of the random data (*parallel analysis* 95th percentile eigenvalues = 0.72, 0.62, 0.57), but the fourth eigenvalue of the raw data (0.38) does not exceed the eigenvalue of the random data (0.82). Hence, we specified a three-factor solution for the principal axis factoring.

The EFA with an oblique promax rotation indicated that the first factor accounted for 28.90% of the variance, the second factor accounted for 23.68% of the variance, and the third factor accounted for 12.43% of the variance (see Table 15). Cumulatively, all three factors accounted for 65.01% of the variance in the data.

Table 15 shows the items’ pattern matrix with the unique variance in each item accounted for by a given factor. Table 15 also indicates the items that were eliminated from the 52-item scale and the reason for their elimination. Specifically, two items were eliminated for having a pattern coefficient less than .40 on their respective factor. Six items were further removed for having a cross loading of .32 or higher on a second factor and a loading difference between the factors of less than .20. Further, items that were highly redundant with higher loading items (> .50) that better sampled the domain of diversity climate as per our initial definition were removed.

**Further scale refinement.** To ensure scale refinement and ease the interpretability of the factors’ underlying nature, three items were further eliminated. In particular, although one justice item highly loaded onto the organizational anti-discrimination factor, the item was
eliminated from the scale to achieve simple structure (Thompson, 2004). Similarly, two items that captured interpersonal discrimination, which loaded on the interpersonal worth and inclusion and organizational representation and inclusion factors (< .65) were dropped from their respective factors. In total, 34 items were eliminated leading to an 18-item scale.

**Description of factors.** Table 16 shows a visualization of the initially proposed 12 quadrants of diversity climate and how they are captured by the proposed factors, which are described below.

*Factor 1: Interpersonal worth and inclusion.* The first factor consists of seven items that, upon inspection, appear to measure the degree to which organizational members (e.g., managers, supervisors, and other employees) promote the valuing and inclusion of historically marginalized employees, as reflected by their attitudes, behaviours, and informal routines. In other words, these items seem to capture perceptions that historically marginalized employees are valued for what they contribute, provided with fair outcomes (e.g., pay, job assignments), and socially included by others. Table 16 demonstrates how this factor covers the quadrants of Representation and Worth, Inclusion, and Justice, and two of the sources, Organizational Policies and Practices (items related to organizational policies, and practices by managers and supervisors) and General Attitudes, Behaviours and Routines.

*Factor 2: Organizational representation and inclusion.* The second factor consists of six items representing the degree to which the organization promotes the numerical representation and inclusion of historically marginalized employees, as reflected by top leadership and organizational values, and organizational policies and practices. These items seem to capture perceptions that the representation and social inclusion of historically marginalized employees are an organizational priority. Table 16 demonstrates how this factor covers the quadrants of Representation and Worth, and Inclusion, and two of the sources, Top
Leadership and Organizational Values and Organizational Policies and Practices (items related to organizational policies).

**Factor 3: Organizational anti-discrimination.** The third identified factor consists of five items reflecting the degree to which the organization promotes the elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members, as reflected by top leadership and organizational values, and organizational policies and practices. These items seem to capture perceptions that the elimination of prejudice and discrimination against historically marginalized employees and group members in general is an organizational priority. As Table 16 demonstrates, this factor corresponds to two quadrants aligned with the sources of Top Leadership and Organizational Values and Organizational Policies and Practices, in relation to the theoretical dimension of Elimination of Discrimination.

**Reliabilities and correlations among subscales.** Means, standard deviations, reliabilities and correlations among all subscales are presented in Table 17. Internal reliabilities were calculated using Cronbach’s alpha. Reliability for the overall 18-item scale was $\alpha = .98$, and reliabilities for the seven-item interpersonal worth and inclusion, six-item organizational and inclusion, and five-item organizational anti-discrimination subscales were .92, .91, and .89, respectively. All reliabilities exceeded researchers’ recommended alpha of .80 (Nunnally, 1978; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). All three subscales were highly correlated with each other, with correlations ranging from .71 to .79.

**Discussion**

The EFA results did not support the initially proposed four components or three sources of diversity climate. Rather, the results supported a three-factor solution, where one factor captured interpersonal worth and inclusion of historically marginalized employees, a second factor captured organizational representation and inclusion of historically marginalized employees, and a third factor captured organizational anti-discrimination
against historically marginalized group members. Thus, the results indicate that factors concurrently emerge along both the components (i.e., representation and inclusion, worth and inclusion, and discrimination) and sources (i.e., interpersonal and organizational) of diversity climate.

Specifically, the results first suggest that diversity climate stems from two primary sources in the organization and not three as proposed by Cachat-Rosset et al. (2017). People seemed to differentiate between diversity climate stemming from a general organizational source (i.e., from top leadership and organizational values, organizational policies and practices) and diversity climate stemming from a general interpersonal source (i.e., from organizational members’ attitudes, behaviours, and informal routines). Thus, top leadership and organizational values, and organizational policies and practices appeared to be evaluated as one source, as opposed to two separate organizational sources of diversity climate. As well, the interpersonal source seemed to capture both the formal day-to-day activities (e.g., managers and supervisors paying historically marginalized employees fairly) and informal social interactions (e.g., employees involving historically marginalized employees in social gatherings) among organizational members.

Second, the results indicate that the representation and worth of historically marginalized employees are two distinct dimensions, contrary to what was proposed. The two components were initially thought of as analogous, given our proposition that the structural integration of historically marginalized employees requires not only their numerical representation (Cox, 1991), but the valuing and integration of their perspectives in decision-making as well. However, items tapping into the worth of historically marginalized employees loaded on the first factor, *interpersonal worth and inclusion*, which captures diversity climate at the interpersonal level, while items tapping into the representation of historically marginalized employees loaded on the second factor, *organizational*
representation and inclusion, capturing diversity climate at the organizational level. The separation of the two components on their respective factors according to the source is unsurprising: people likely perceive the organization to be primarily responsible for increasing the demographic diversity of its workforce, whereas perceptions of the worth and integration of historically marginalized employees in decision-making are likely more prominent at the interpersonal level, as demonstrated by the attitudes and behaviours of managers, supervisors, and other employees in the organization. Our results are in line with previous factor analytic evidence suggesting that the representation of demographic diversity (i.e., akin to our construct of representation) is a distinct construct from that of employee involvement and integration of diversity into organizational processes (i.e., akin to our construct of worth) (Roberson, 2006).

Third, it is worth noting that participants seemed to be able to gauge the deeper meaning of items, beyond their surface features (e.g., wording choices). For example, the item “managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity throughout the organization” loaded highly on the organizational representation and inclusion factor. This loading might seem surprising, given the item includes “managers and supervisors,” who are organizational members and could thus be perceived to reflect the interpersonal worth and inclusion factor. However, managers and supervisors are the object of this item and not the subject, since the subject is the organization that holds its managers and supervisors accountable. Further, the action demonstrated by the item (i.e., increasing diversity throughout the organization) overlaps with representation, which further explains its loading on the organizational representation and inclusion factor and not the interpersonal worth and inclusion factor. These results could imply that the factor structure found is not attributable to method artefacts (i.e., similarly worded items loading together). Rather, participants seem to be aware of the deeper meaning that items denote, beyond their surface-level attributes.
Fourth, justice toward historically marginalized employees did not load onto a distinct factor. Instead, the majority of the proposed justice items (i.e., five of eight) appeared to highly load (< .40) onto the interpersonal worth and inclusion of historically marginalized employees’ factor. It is worth noting that the high loading justice items on the interpersonal worth and inclusion factor, which did not cross-load on alternative factors, primarily captured justice of outcomes. Thus, it may be the case that evaluations of fair outcomes toward historically marginalized employees are needed for evaluations of whether historically marginalized employees are valued and socially included by organizational members. In fact, there was a lack of domain coverage for justice in the final scale, as none of the justice items that captured organizational and top leadership values or general attitudes, behaviours, and routines met our item retention criteria. The lack of domain coverage could be attributed to the small number of justice items that comprised the 52-item scale, where only 8 justice items were used in this study compared to 20, 14, and 10 items for the remaining three components. However, our results also suggest the possibility that diversity climate only involves perceptions of fair outcomes toward historically marginalized employees.

Finally, organizational anti-discrimination against historically marginalized group members appears to be a distinct factor from the interpersonal worth and inclusion or the organizational representation and inclusion of historically marginalized employees. Indeed, the proposed elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group member items clearly loaded on a separate factor. These results suggest that people evaluate the elimination of discrimination as stemming from the organization (top leadership, organizational values and policies) and see it as independent from interpersonal worth and inclusion, and organizational representation and inclusion.

A potential reason as to why an interpersonal anti-discrimination factor did not emerge is that there were only two items in the 52-item scale that tapped into this component
following Study 3. As such, a limitation of the current study is the unequal distribution of items along the proposed sources of diversity climate (see Appendix S). Although we adhered to empirically-derived cut-off criteria for substantive validity analysis (Howard & Melloy, 2015), a less conservative item-sort task criteria could have resulted in the retention of more diversity climate items for the current study and hence more equal distribution of items among the sources of diversity climate for each of the its proposed components.

In sum, Study 4 results indicate that the 18-item Workplace Diversity Climate Scale (see Appendix X) has adequate psychometric properties and internal consistency, as demonstrated by high total scale and subscale reliabilities (≥ .80). The next study provides confirmatory evidence of the scale’s three-dimensional structure.

**Study 5**

The goal of Study 5 is to confirm the factor structure of the Workplace Diversity Climate Scale found in Study 4 using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), thus providing initial evidence of the scale’s construct validity (Hinkin, 1995). Alternative models of the scale’s factor structure are tested, and the significance and fit of each model are compared to determine the model that fits the data best. In the second stage of analysis, multigroup CFA (mCFA) is conducted to assess if the scale’s factor structure is invariant (i.e., remained the same) for historically marginalized employees and historically non-marginalized employees. This step is crucial in light of prior evidence suggesting that historically marginalized employees typically report perceptions of more negative diversity climates in their organizations (Kossek & Zonia, 1998; Mor Barak et al., 1998). Thus, we seek to examine if there are any group differences in the scale’s factor structure and ascertain that any potential mean differences in scale scores between the two groups in future research are a result of differing experiences of diversity climate and are not attributable to systematic differences in
Based on Study 4 results, there were four possible models that could emerge, which are discussed below.3

**Model 1: Three-factor Superordinate Model with an Interpersonal Worth and Inclusion Factor, an Organizational Representation and Inclusion Factor, and an Organizational Anti-Discrimination Factor**

In light of the three-factor solution found in Study 4 and previous theory on psychological climate, we hypothesize that a three-factor superordinate model would emerge, which is manifested through organizational members’ valuing and inclusion of historically marginalized employees, organizational efforts for representation and inclusion of historically marginalized employees, and organizational anti-discrimination efforts toward historically marginalized group members (see Figure 2).

Our hypothesis that diversity climate is a superordinate model is in line with psychological climate theory (James & James, 1989), which posits that individuals try to make sense of their work environments using overarching schemas (i.e., stored mental frameworks) that help them evaluate the meaning of certain attributes of the work environment in relation to them and other key stakeholders (e.g., employees, customers, Burke, Borucki, & Kaufman, 2002). Accordingly, these overarching schemas guide people’s overall cognitive evaluations of the work environment (e.g., is the work environment supportive of diversity), which are then used to interpret and impute meaning to certain elements of the work context (e.g., are historically marginalized employees represented) (James, Choi, Ko, McNeil, et al., 2008).

This notion of higher-order psychological climate is also reflected in prior research on strategic climates, which as noted, tackle people’s perceptions of their work environment

---

3 Prior to conducting the EFA in Study 4, we initially proposed four alternative models that could emerge based on our conceptualization of diversity climate (see Appendix Y for a discussion of the initially proposed models).
pertaining to a strategic organizational goal, such as service (Schneider, White, & Paul, 1998) or safety (Griffin & Neal, 2002). Thus, it is possible that an organization’s strategy toward demographic diversity engenders overarching schemas of whether diversity is supported in the organization, which then guides people’s interpretations of the organizational values, policies, practices, as well as their interactions with organizational members. Consequently, diversity climate could represent a strategic climate that manifests itself as a second-order latent construct.

Specifically, we hypothesize that diversity climate could manifest itself in the organization through three first-order latent constructs, which reflect people’s meaning-making of more specific diversity-related work attributes. This model would suggest that perceptions that organizational members value what historically marginalized employees bring and socially include them are distinct from perceptions that the organization prioritizes their representation and social inclusion, or the absence of discrimination against historically marginalized group members in general. Therefore, perceptions of one of the three factors do not necessitate perceptions of the other factors.

Model 2: Three-factor Correlated Dimensions Model with an Interpersonal Worth and Inclusion Factor, an Organizational Representation and Inclusion Factor, and an Organizational Anti-Discrimination Factor

The first alternative model is a three-factor correlated dimensions model, where the three factors found in Study 4 (i.e., interpersonal worth and inclusion, organizational representation and inclusion, and organizational anti-discrimination) are correlated but not explained by second-order latent construct (see Figure 3). This model accounts for the possibility that people do not form overarching schemas to judge their diversity-related work environment. Instead, each first-order factor represents a distinct but correlated construct that exists independently from the other. Thus, this model would suggest that the relations
between the three first-order constructs are not explained by diversity climate as a second-order construct.

**Model 3: Two-factor Superordinate Model with an Interpersonal Diversity Climate Factor and an Organizational Diversity Climate Factor**

The second alternative model is a two-factor superordinate model that is based on diversity climate sources, where diversity climate at the interpersonal level and diversity climate at the organizational level are explained by diversity climate as a second-order latent construct (see Figure 4). This model is tested as Study 4 results suggested that diversity climate stems from two distinct sources in the organization, the interpersonal and organizational sources. Indeed, previous theoretical work on intraorganizational networks postulates that the organization is a complex system that consists of formal networks (e.g., organizational structure, processes, policies, values) and informal networks (e.g., social interactions) (Soda & Zaheer, 2012). Moreover, prior research on the employee-organization relationship suggests that employees can perceive the organization as a single entity, regardless of its possible agents (Coyle-Shapiro & Shore, 2007), further shedding light on perceptions of organizational sources of diversity climate arising separately from perceptions that stem from interactions with organizational members. In line with this reasoning, diversity climate could manifest itself through two main sources: the organizational source that reflects formal networks and the interpersonal source that reflects informal social networks within the organization.

Specifically, this model would suggest that, within each source of climate, people form overall evaluations of whether historically marginalized are represented, valued for what they contribute, socially included, and not discriminated against in the organization. In other words, people’s evaluations of the two diversity climate sources could be distinct but their evaluations of diversity climate’s components (i.e., worth, representation, inclusion,
discrimination) within each source could be similar, regardless of the way it manifests itself. Further, this model would suggest that diversity climate exists as a deeper, overarching evaluation of the diversity-related work context, which reflects itself through interpretations of two distinct sources.

**Model 4: Two-factor Superordinate Model with a Worth, Representation, and Inclusion Factor and an Anti-Discrimination Factor**

The third alternative model is a two-factor superordinate model that is based on diversity climate’s components, where the worth, representation, and inclusion of historically marginalized employees combine to form one factor and the elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members forms a second factor. In this model, both first-order factors are explained by diversity climate as a second-order latent construct (see Figure 5).

In particular, this model could help to disentangle a potential misunderstanding that organizational efforts to eliminate negative behaviours (i.e., discrimination against historically marginalized group members) are not equal to, or the same as, organizational and interpersonal efforts to promote positive behaviours (i.e., the representation, worth, and social inclusion of historically marginalized employees). Consistent with Ely and Thomas’s (2001) theoretical model regarding people’s different interpretations of workplace diversity, which suggests that the valuing and integration of diversity is a separate construct from having efforts to end discrimination, we reason that efforts to eliminate discrimination do not automatically translate to interpersonal efforts to value what historically marginalized contribute. Moreover, previous research suggests that, with rising organizational demographic dissimilarity (i.e., increasing representation), more discrimination is reported by historically marginalized employees (Avery, McKay, & Wilson, 2008). Similarly, discrimination can still occur within organizations that demonstrate inclusive values (Priola,
Lasio, De Simone, & Serri, 2014). Hence, this model would suggest that perceptions of organizational efforts to eliminate discrimination can exist separately from perceptions of organizational and interpersonal efforts to promote the representation, worth, and inclusion of historically marginalized employees. This model would also suggest that the two sources of diversity climate are not distinct but that there are two distinct constructs that emerge along two of diversity climate’s main components. Hence, people could evaluate diversity climate’s sources within each component similarly, regardless of whether it stems from interpersonal or organizational sources.

**Model 5: Single-factor Model with one Diversity Climate Factor**

The fourth alternative model is a single-factor model with one diversity climate factor, where diversity climate is a first-order latent construct (see Figure 6). This model would suggest that diversity climate is a single construct that exists without distinct factors. In this model, valuing historically marginalized employees, having them represented and socially included, and eliminating discrimination against historically marginalized group members, as well as the interpersonal and organizational sources of climate, are evaluated similarly by people, as they are all a part of the same underlying factor. In this model, diversity climate is interpreted as a single overarching construct where its items are its indicators. Thus, the items do not cluster into meaningful factors, potentially suggesting that people’s evaluations of diversity climate in their organizations are more holistic.

**Method**

**Participants.** Adhering to sample size recommendations for studies using CFA (Hinkin, 1998; Hoelter, 1983; Russell, 2002), we aimed to recruit a minimum of 200 participants to confirm the factor structure of our 18-item scale. We recruited 334 participants from Amazon’s MTurk, who were required to be full-time employees, proficient in English, and residing in Canada or the US. Participants were also required to not have completed
Studies 1, 2, 3, or 4. Of the 291 participants whose data were retained (see Table 18 for an overview of the data cleaning steps), 143 identified as female, 143 identified as male, and 4 identified as gender non-binary. One participant chose not to disclose their gender identity. The age range of the sample was between 18 and 71 years, with the mean age being 35.4 years ($SD = 10.32$). The three most common ethnic origins were White (71.13%), Black or African American (10.31%), and Asian (6.87%). The majority of participants (54.64%) worked in the private sector, followed by the public sector (34.36%) and the not-for-profit sector (10.31%). The majority of participants resided in the US (93.47%). All participants were compensated $0.40 for their participation.

Procedure. The procedure to Study 5 was similar to that followed in Study 4. Participants first read the consent form (see Appendix Z) and were then provided with a brief definition of historically marginalized employees and the 52-item diversity climate items from Study 4 (see Appendix AA for Study 5 questionnaire). Three instructional attention check items (e.g., “In this organization, diversity is important. Please select strongly disagree”) were also included to ensure that participants were reading the items carefully. The diversity climate items and attention checks were presented in a random order. Participants who exhibited careless responding as indicated by failing two or more of the attention checks were not included in subsequent analysis.

After rating the diversity climate scale items, participants were asked to complete a demographics questionnaire (see Appendix V). Finally, participants were asked to rate how honestly and accurately they answered the survey (1 = not at all honestly and accurately, 2 = somewhat honestly and accurately, 3 = moderately honestly and accurately, and 4 = very honestly and accurately). If this item was rated below a 3 (moderately honestly and accurately), participants were omitted from analysis. Participants were then debriefed (see Appendix AB).
Results

Plan for analysis. CFA with maximum likelihood estimation was conducted in R (R 3.4.1 GUI 1.70 El Capitan build 7375) and R Studio (Version 1.0.153) using the “Lavaan” package (Rosseel, 2012). All models were consistent with a standard congeneric model, such that factor loadings and variances were free to vary (i.e., no imposed restrictions; Edwards, 2001). In addition to examining the Chi-square value ($\chi^2$) to determine model fit, alternative fit indices were assessed, as Chi-square is sensitive to sample size (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1996). These indices included the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and Comparative Fit Index (CFI). Cut-off criteria for assessing model fit was a RMSEA value of .07 (Steiger, 2007), with RMSEA values between .08 and .10 indicating mediocre fit (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996). TLI and CFI values greater than .90 determined acceptable fit, with values higher than .95 preferred (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008). The model that fit the data best was deemed the most appropriate factor structure for the new scale. We also examined items’ factor loadings to ensure that each item had a minimum loading of .40 on its corresponding factor (Hinkin, 1998).

In the second stage of analysis, a series of mCFAs were conducted to test measurement invariance of the new scale for historically marginalized and non-marginalized employees. Measurement invariance was tested using the R “Lavaan” (Rosseel, 2012) and “semTools” packages (Pornprasertmanit, Miller, Schoemann, & Rosseel, 2013). The analyses included a series of model comparisons, starting with configural invariance (M0), where factor loadings, intercepts, and error variances were allowed to vary between the two groups. Configural variance was determined if the model fit the data equally well for each group. Second, metric invariance (M1) was assessed, where factor loadings were constrained, and other parameters (i.e., error variances, item intercepts) allowed to freely vary across groups.
Metric invariance was determined if the fit of M1 was not significantly worse than M0. Third, scalar invariance (M2) was tested, where factor loadings and item intercepts were constrained to be equal. Scalar invariance was established if the fit of M2 was not significantly worse than M1. Fourth, strict invariance (M3) was assessed, where factor loadings, item intercepts, and residual variances were all constrained to be equal. Strict invariance was determined if the fit of M3 was not significantly worse than M2. Adhering to current standards for measurement invariance model comparisons (Putnick & Bornstein, 2016), we relied on a change in CFI (ΔCFI) and RMSEA (ΔRMSEA) of ≤ .01 to determine if the more restricted model displayed an equally good fit to the data (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002; Rutkowski & Svetina, 2014). The Chi-square difference test was not used for model comparisons as it is too sensitive to scale differences in large sample sizes (Meade, Johnson, & Braddy, 2008).

**Factor structure results.**

**Model 1: Hypothesized three-factor superordinate model.** The results for diversity climate as a superordinate model with the three hypothesized factors are presented in Table 19. The model fit the data well. The RMSEA value was .07 with a 90% confidence interval of .06 to .08, indicating an acceptable fit (Steiger, 2007). The TLI and CFI values were .93 and .94, respectively, which are in line with model fit conventions of higher than .90 (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008). Overall, this model was an acceptable factor structure to model the Workplace Diversity Climate Scale.

**Model 2: Three-factor correlated dimensions model.** The results for the three-factor correlated dimensions model are displayed in Table 19. The model displayed identical fit to Model 1 (i.e., the hypothesized model) and thus appropriately fit the data. The identical fit between the models could be attributed to the same number of parameters being estimated in both models. Model comparisons using Chi-square difference tests could not be made.
between the two equivalent models given the same Chi-square value and degrees of freedom (Tomarken & Waller, 2003).

**Model 3: Two-factor superordinate model based on source.** The results for diversity climate as a superordinate model with one interpersonal factor and one organizational factor are presented in Table 19. The RMSEA value was .08 with a 90% confidence interval of .07 to .09, indicating a mediocre fit (Steiger, 2007). The TLI and CFI values were .93 and .94, respectively, which are in line with model fit conventions of higher than .90 (Hooper et al., 2008). Overall, this model displayed mediocre fit to the data. Chi-square difference tests indicated that the model fit the data significantly worse than the hypothesized three-factor superordinate model $\Delta \chi^2 = 22.2, p < .001$. The AIC value for this model ($AIC = -9406.81$) was also larger than that of the hypothesized model ($AIC = -9425.03$), further indicating worse fit (Hooper et al., 2008).

**Model 4: Two-factor superordinate model based on components.** The results for diversity climate as a superordinate model with one worth, representation, and inclusion factor and one anti-discrimination factor are presented in Table 19. The RMSEA value was .08 with a 90% confidence interval of .07 to .09, indicating a mediocre fit (Steiger, 2007). The TLI and CFI values were .92 and .93, respectively, which are in line with model fit conventions of higher than .90 (Hooper et al., 2008). Chi-square difference tests indicated that the model fit the data significantly worse than the hypothesized three-factor superordinate model $\Delta \chi^2 = 42.4, p < .001$. The AIC value for this model ($AIC = -9386.62$) was also larger than that of the hypothesized model ($AIC = -9425.03$), further indicating worse fit.

**Model 5: Single-factor model.** The results for diversity climate as a unidimensional model are displayed in Table 19. Overall, the model displayed mediocre fit. The RMSEA value was .08 with a 90% confidence interval of .08 to .09, indicating mediocre fit (Steiger,
The TLI and CFI values were .91 and .92, respectively, which are in line with model fit conventions of higher than .90 (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008). Chi-square difference tests indicated that the model fit the data significantly worse than the hypothesized three-factor superordinate model $\Delta \chi^2 = 84.5, p < .001$. Further, the AIC value for this model ($AIC = -9346.56$) was larger than that of the hypothesized model ($AIC = -9425.03$), indicating worse fit.

**Item analysis.** The hypothesized three-factor superordinate model fit the data significantly better than the alternative two-factor and single-factor models. Consequently, the hypothesized model was used for item analysis.

The means, standard deviations, and factor loadings of the 18 items are displayed in Table 20. Each item loaded highly on its respective factor ($> .40$; Hinkin, 1998), with factor loadings ranging from .55 to .84. Two items were removed from the organizational representation and inclusion factor because of high error correlations with other items in the scale. Specifically, the modification indices (MI) indicated that a Chi-square reduction of 23.7 (standardized parameter change) was expected if the residuals between items 8 and 13 were allowed to correlate, thus implying redundancy. Therefore, item 13 was eliminated from the final scale, given it possessed the lowest factor loading (.54). As well, the MI indicated a Chi-square reduction of 16.7 (standardized parameter change) if residuals between items 10 and 11 were to correlate. Accordingly, item 10 was eliminated after deciding that item 11’s content better captured the domain of diversity climate.

Following item reduction, the measurement model for the 16-item three-factor superordinate model indicated good fit $\chi^2 = 236.13$ with RMSEA value of .07 and a 90% confidence interval of .06 to .08, and TLI and CFI values of .95 and .96, respectively. The three factors had high loadings on the second-order construct of diversity climate. Loadings
for interpersonal worth and inclusion, organizational representation and inclusion, and organizational anti-discrimination were .93, .98, and .95, respectively.

**Subscale analysis.** Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and correlations among all subscales can be seen in Table 21. The overall scale and the three subscales exhibited high reliabilities, all above the recommended reliability of .80 (Nunnally, 1978). All three subscales were highly correlated, with correlations ranging from .78 to .83. Finally, Average Variance Extracted (AVE) was calculated to examine the convergent validity of the scale and the three subscales (i.e., how much variance the items share because of the latent construct relative to measurement error; Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The AVE values for the three subscales and the overall scale exceeded the recommended cut-off of .50 (interpersonal worth and inclusion $AVE = .57$; organizational representation and inclusion $AVE = .51$; organizational anti-discrimination $AVE = .53$; overall scale $AVE = .55$). These results indicate the convergent validity of the subscales and the ability of diversity climate as a second-order construct to explain much of the variance in the three first-order factors (Credé & Harms, 2015).

**mCFA results.** The results of the mCFAs are displayed in Table 22. The least constrained model (M0) fit the data well for historically marginalized ($n = 137$) and non-marginalized participants ($n = 154$), $\chi^2_{202} = 455.08$, RMSEA = .05 and CFI = .96, supporting configural invariance. Second, after constraining items’ factor loadings between the two groups, results of the metric invariance indicated that the model (M1) fit the data well ($\Delta$RMSEA = .001 and $\Delta$CFI = .001). Third, results of the scalar invariance (M2) indicated that further constraining item intercepts to be equal across groups did not significantly worsen the model fit ($\Delta$RMSEA = .000 and $\Delta$CFI = .002). Finally, results of the strict invariance indicated that the model (M3) fit the data well ($\Delta$RMSEA = .001 and $\Delta$CFI = .002). Therefore, imposing additional constraints in this model did not significantly worsen
its fit. These results support full measurement invariance of the 16-item Workplace Diversity Climate Scale.

**Discussion**

The results from Study 5 indicate that the hypothesized three-factor superordinate model of diversity climate is an acceptable fit for the data. The hypothesized model displayed significantly better fit than the alternative two-factor and one-factor models. In this model, diversity climate is a second-order latent construct that manifests itself through organizational members’ promotion of the valuing and inclusion of historically marginalized employees, organizational efforts for representation and inclusion of historically marginalized employees, and organizational anti-discrimination efforts toward historically marginalized group members. Given our proposed structure of diversity climate (i.e., the proposed twelve quadrants) was not supported by the CFA results, we revise our initial definition of diversity climate to reflect the three-dimensional structure found in Study 5. Although future research is needed to determine whether diversity climate’s three subscales differentially affect workplace outcomes, understanding diversity climate in terms of its three factors could be needed for an accurate reflection of the construct. Accordingly, we define diversity climate at the psychological level as:

- individuals’ perceptions of the degree to which: (a) the valuing and social inclusion of historically marginalized employees is promoted by organizational members’ interpersonal interactions; (b) the numerical representation and social inclusion of historically marginalized employees are an organizational priority as demonstrated through the organizational culture, top leadership and organizational values, and organizational policies; and (c) the elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members is an organizational priority as demonstrated through
the organizational culture, top leadership and organizational values, and organizational policies.

Second, although the fit of the three-factor superordinate model was identical to the three-factor correlated-dimensions model, we proceeded with the hypothesized superordinate model in our analysis. As many theoretically distinct measurement models that specify different relationships between constructs are mathematically equivalent (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2001), we could not rely on CFA results to determine superior model fit for these equivalent models. Thus, our decision was based on the theoretical and practical utility of the three-factor superordinate model. Specifically, prior theory suggests that psychological climates serve as overarching schemas for individuals to make sense of different elements of their work environment (Burke et al., 2002; James et al., 2008). Indeed, viewing psychological diversity climate as an overarching schema sheds light on the phenomena of organizational-level diversity climates (e.g., Chrobot-Mason & Aramovich, 2013; Gonzalez & DeNisi, 2009; McKay et al., 2009), which arise when organizational members attribute the same meaning to work contexts, thus sharing the same schema (Ostroff et al., 2012).

Moreover, our results indicate that the superordinate three-factor model was plausible, as each first-order factor had a strong relation with diversity climate (i.e., high factor loadings) and the high relations between the first-order factors could be explained by diversity climate as a second-order construct (i.e., high overall scale AVE, Credé & Harms, 2015). Finally, given the parsimony of the superordinate model and its ability to facilitate future assessment of diversity climate as a single theoretical construct, for instance, by computing a composite scale score (Edwards, 2001), we propose a three-factor superordinate model of diversity climate for the diversity climate measure. However, a limitation of the current study is that we could not rule out the possibility that the three-factor correlated dimensions model could also be used to explain the data.
Third, the results provide evidence of full measurement invariance of the 16-item scale with respect to historically marginalized group status. These results suggest that historically marginalized and non-marginalized employees were interpreting the scale items and its underlying constructs similarly, that the strength of the relations between items and their underlying factors was similar between the two groups, and that there were no systematic biases in how the groups responded to the items. Thus, this study provides evidence that any potential future differences in total or sub-scale scores between historically marginalized and non-marginalized employees are likely explained by true between-group differences and not systematic measurement bias.

Our measurement invariance results are noteworthy. Specifically, given previous field evidence indicating more negative diversity climate perceptions reported by historically marginalized employees compared to non-marginalized employees (Kossek & Zonia, 1998; Mor Barak et al., 1998), which could either suggest true between-group differences in diversity climate perceptions or a systematic bias in the endorsement of items in previous measures of diversity climate. A plausible explanation for our lack of detection of scalar variance (i.e., that item intercepts differ between the two groups) is simply our use of a new measure of diversity climate, which could arguably be capturing different content than previous scales, thereby resulting in equal item intercepts between the two groups. This finding is important as our proposed scale has been developed to capture climate (i.e., perceptions of the collective) and not individualized perceptions (i.e., perceptions for oneself). Alternatively, our findings could be attributed to the current sociocultural context surrounding our study, where historically non-marginalized employees could be becoming more attuned to diversity climates in their organizations (e.g., Kaplan et al., 2011; McKay et

---

4 An independent samples Welch’s t-test was conducted to compare diversity climate perceptions for historically marginalized and non-marginalized groups. There was a non-significant difference in overall diversity climate scores for the marginalized ($M = 6.29$, $SD = 1.24$, $N = 137$) and non-marginalized ($M = 6.55$, $SD = 1.55$, $N = 154$) groups; $t(260.22) = 1.51$, $p = .131$, two-tailed.
al., 2007). As such, historically non-marginalized employees could be endorsing more similar baseline item ratings to historically marginalized employees, reflective of their more accurate perceptions.

Finally, the results indicate high reliabilities for the final Workplace Diversity Climate Scale (see Appendix AC) and each of the three subscales, suggesting high internal consistency. Together, Study 5 findings provide initial evidence of the 16-item scale’s psychometric properties and construct validity.

**General Discussion**

Over the past two decades, diversity climate research has suffered from the lack of an agreed-upon definition of the construct and the lack of a psychometrically-sound measure (Cachat-Rosset et al., 2017). The inconsistent definitions pave way for a fragmented understanding of diversity climate, thus impeding researchers’ ability to theorize about the construct, draw conclusions about its antecedents and consequences, and develop a robust tool to measure it. The absence of a validated scale of diversity climate further precludes the design of methodologically rigorous studies from which knowledge can be confidently garnered. The present investigations sought to develop a new scale of diversity climate that addresses past conceptual and methodological limitations.

The current research developed a new reliable scale of diversity climate, that was initially validated across five independent samples in five studies. By reviewing the 18 existing diversity climate scales and identifying their challenges, we were further able to tackle the shortcomings of past scales, many of which have not undergone full construct validation efforts (Cachat-Rosset et al., 2017). Our review of the literature suggested that diversity climate is comprised of four main components: representation and worth, inclusion, justice, and elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members; and three primary sources: top leadership and organizational values, policies and practices,
and organizational members’ general attitudes, behaviours, and routines. Our proposed
definition consequently guided the scale development process and the generation of an over-
representative pool of 140 items.

In Studies 1 through 3, we provided evidence of the substantive validity of 52 of 112
diversity climate items by ensuring that each item was in line with our initially proposed
definition of diversity climate and its components. In Study 4, we explored the factor
structure of the new scale and reduced its length to 18 items to minimize future participant
fatigue. The results of the EFA did not fully support our initially proposed components and
sources of diversity climate. Instead, three factors were extracted from the proposed diversity
climate scale: (a) organizational members’ efforts to promote the valuing and social inclusion
of historically marginalized employees, (b) organizational efforts to promote their numerical
representation and social inclusion, and (c) organizational efforts to promote the elimination
of discrimination against historically marginalized group members. We labeled these factors:

a) Interpersonal Worth and Inclusion
b) Organizational Representation and Inclusion
c) Organizational Anti-Discrimination

In Study 5, the three-factor solution found in Study 4 was confirmed using CFA. The
results lent support to a multidimensional scale, where diversity climate could be modelled as
a superordinate latent construct (i.e., diversity climate) that is comprised of three first-order
latent constructs. The results of the EFA and CFA partially supported the sources included in
our initial definition of diversity climate, which are in line with Cachat-Rosset et al.’s (2017)
recent conceptual framework. However, rather than three distinct sources, diversity climate
emerged from a general interpersonal source (i.e., managers, supervisors, and other
employees’ attitudes, behaviours, and routines) and a general organizational source (i.e., top
leadership and organizational values, policies and practices).
Study 5 further provided evidence of the scale’s internal consistency and robust factor structure. More importantly, full measurement invariance with respect to historically marginalized group status was established in an employee sample, suggesting that potential future differences in mean scores between the two groups are comparable and not caused by systematic measurement differences. Together, the studies presented in this thesis provide the foundational empirical evidence of the 16-item Workplace Diversity Climate Scale. The next steps will involve the study of its nomological network (i.e., convergent validity, discriminant validity, and predictive validity).

Theoretical Contributions

The current investigations contribute to research on diversity climate in important ways. Specifically, we develop an integrated definition of diversity climate as:

individuals’ perceptions of the degree to which: (a) the valuing and social inclusion of historically marginalized employees is promoted by organizational members’ interpersonal interactions; (b) the numerical representation and social inclusion of historically marginalized employees are an organizational priority as demonstrated through the organizational culture, top leadership and organizational values, and organizational policies; and (c) the elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members is an organizational priority as demonstrated through the organizational culture, top leadership and organizational values, and organizational policies.

In relation to the four proposed theoretical components (i.e., representation and worth, inclusion, justice, and elimination of discrimination), the factor analysis results suggest that (1) representation is different from worth: worth emerges as an interpersonal dynamic among organizational members, and representation is reflected through top leadership and organizational values, and organizational practice; (2) justice is not an independent
component, but part of the interpersonal enactment of worth and inclusion; (3) inclusion is distinct from elimination of discrimination but is perceived similarly to worth at the interpersonal level, and representation at the organizational level; and (4) elimination of discrimination is distinct from worth, representation, inclusion, and justice, and is reflected through top leadership and organizational values, and organizational policies.

As the new definition of diversity climate is based on empirical evidence that is driven by a critical synthesis of the diversity climate literature, this research facilitates a more unified understanding of the construct. Past diversity climate definitions are often narrow (Dwertmann et al., 2016), suggesting that previous research has likely only addressed isolated components of diversity climate and not the construct in its entire domain. As such, it is possible that existing research has yet to gain a full understanding of how diversity climate operates in organizations. By promoting a comprehensive definition of diversity climate that integrates its different components and sources and clarifies its conceptual boundaries, the corresponding measure can help to ensure that future investigations are addressing the construct in its entirety.

Additionally, the current research clarifies conceptual distinctions between diversity climate, justice, and discrimination. Specifically, of the three proposed components of justice (i.e., justice of outcomes, procedures, and interpersonal treatment), the results shed light on justice of outcomes toward historically marginalized employees being key to their interpersonal worth and social inclusion. Hence, it is possible that other components of justice toward historically marginalized employees are not integral for perceptions of diversity climate. Our results further underscore the potential role played by justice of outcomes in historically marginalized employees’ social experiences of being valued and included by other organizational members. Yet, we could not dismiss the possibility that justice toward all employees is another component of diversity climate because none of our
items captured this component. It is thus conceivable that perceived overall justice is necessary to the formation of positive diversity climates. Similarly, our results point to discrimination being a distinct and core component of diversity climate,\(^5\) despite it being ignored in previous definitions of the construct. Specifically, we highlight the importance of organizational efforts to eliminate discrimination, as opposed to interpersonal actions by organizational members. Therefore, it could be the case that people perceive the organization to be primarily accountable for eliminating harmful treatment of historically marginalized group members. Further, we advance current theorizing on diversity climate by highlighting that elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members, and not just employees, should be treated as part of diversity climate and not merely as an outcome.

The current research further contributes to scholarly understanding of workplace climates by highlighting the role played by organizational members in shaping climate perceptions. Traditionally, diversity climate and other strategic climate measures (e.g., training climate, Tracey, Tannenbaum, & Kavanagh, 1995; safety climate, Zohar & Luria, 2005) have focused on organizational sources of climate (e.g., formal policies, managerial practices) while placing less emphasis on other employees as a source. The results from the present investigations suggest that in addition to organizational sources, other employees’ attitudes and behaviours are integral to our understanding of how workplace climates are reflected in organizations and how people make sense of them. Thus, to understand their organization’s strategic climates, people might not solely pay attention to formal organizational structures (e.g., espoused values and policies) but also appraise the actions of other organizational members.

\(^5\) CFA was further conducted on the diversity climate items after removing organizational anti-discrimination items (i.e., using items from interpersonal worth and inclusion and organizational representation and inclusion). The model showed poor fit, with RMSEA = .09, TLI = .93, and CFI = .94. Model comparisons could not be made between the hypothesized three-factor model and two-factor model, given the models were non-nested.
Practical Contributions

The present research makes several contributions to practice. For researchers, the 16-item Workplace Diversity Climate Scale can facilitate future theory development on how diversity climate affects organizations and employees. The ability of the proposed scale to tap into the full domain of diversity climate allows researchers to paint a more complete and accurate understanding of how diversity climate functions. The new tool can also encourage researchers to investigate currently overlooked areas of the literature, such as diversity climate’s antecedents (McKay & Avery, 2015). Moreover, as the new scale rectifies the limitations of past diversity climate measures such as construct contamination, this tool can ensure researchers are providing accurate conclusions regarding diversity climate’s nomological network. The scale further allows researchers to capture perceptions of historically marginalized employees’ intersecting social identities (Kang & Bodenhausen, 2015), which could be fundamental to people’s perceptions of the organization’s diversity climate. This is because the generated items do not restrict focus on perceptions for some historically marginalized groups in isolation from others and assess perceptions for historically marginalized employees in general.

For organizational practitioners, the new scale provides a reliable and valid method to help organizations gauge the success of their diversity management efforts. The scale can be used to assess what employees perceive to be successful in the organization’s approach to demographic diversity (e.g., formal policies, managerial practices, communicated commitment to diversity) and diagnose what they perceive to be less effective. Indeed, as the presence of diversity-related policies does not automatically translate to employees’ perceptions of a positive work environment (e.g., Kossek, Markel, & McHugh, 2003), it is imperative that organizations gain a better understanding of employees’ subjective experiences of diversity climate to better direct their efforts. Similarly, the three identified
factors of diversity climate can encourage organizations to tailor interventions and strategies toward specific levels, for example, by reassessing their formally espoused values and organizational policies or targeting the behaviours of managers, supervisors, and other employees. The new scale also offers a way for practitioners to examine group differences in diversity climate perceptions, thus identifying if employees belonging to certain historically marginalized groups perceive a less positive diversity climate than others. Empirical evidence has demonstrated that diversity climate’s effects on outcomes, such as turnover intentions, could be stronger for some historically marginalized groups (e.g., Hispanics) than others (e.g., African Americans) in a given organization (Gonzalez & DeNisi, 2009). Thus, assessments of diversity climate can help organizations garner knowledge of historically marginalized groups that policies and initiatives need to be directed toward.

The concise nature of the 16-item scale may be appealing to researchers and organizations alike, as they can administer the scale in a quick and cost-effective way. A single score of diversity climate can further serve as a meaningful metric to understand how employees are experiencing their diversity-related work context. Furthermore, a more accurate scholarly understanding of what diversity climate is could facilitate better knowledge of its impact on workplace and employee outcomes. With this knowledge, practitioners can be provided with more effective evidence-based solutions to identified issues in their diversity management approach. For example, in response to a need for better social inclusion of historically marginalized employees, organizations can plan diversity program bundles (e.g., formal and informal mentorships, networking opportunities, managerial diversity training), which are more effective than standalone diversity initiatives (e.g., formal mentorships) (Kulik, 2014). Hence, the current research can prompt organizations to be more intentional about how they direct their diversity management efforts.
Strengths, Limitations and Future Directions

The current project has several strengths. The Workplace Diversity Climate Scale was developed and validated using current best practices. Specifically, in adherence with Hinkin’s (1998) robust methodology, we were able to use subject matter experts (e.g., academic faculty) and employee samples that are representative of our population of interest to guide our item development process and facilitate the generation of unambiguous items. As well, independent samples (i.e., Amazon’s MTurk participants) were used for each step of the scale development process, which augmented the generalizability of the new scale. Similarly, using Amazon’s MTurk for participant recruitment allowed for the validation of the scale using diverse employee samples, who work in different job positions, organizational contexts, and sectors, further adding to the generalizability of the scale usage. Despite its strengths, there are also a few limitations to consider when interpreting the results of the present set of studies. These limitations offer insights into areas for future research.

First, diversity climate seems to conceptually overlap with related constructs. Specifically, the substantive validity results from Studies 1 and 3 suggest that participants seemed to confuse diversity climate items with justice items most often. Although substantively valid diversity items passed valid passed strict, empirically derived cut-off criteria and were most frequently correctly assigned to diversity climate, it is important to examine the relations between diversity climate and perceived overall justice, as well as their unique predictive abilities on workplace outcomes, in the future. Similarly, the results from the pilots suggest an overlap between diversity climate and inclusion climate, seeing as both constructs stress perceptions of fair organizational practices, employee authenticity and decision-making influence. However, there are important distinctions between the two constructs, with diversity climate emphasizing perceptions for historically marginalized employees and inclusion climate emphasizing perceptions for all employees, regardless of
group status. Further, our definition of inclusion of historically marginalized employees highlights both belongingness and authenticity as core elements (Jansen et al., 2014; Shore et al., 2011), whereas the current accepted definition and operationalization of inclusion climate does not reflect belongingness (Nishii, 2013). At the individual level, it is thus possible to perceive both positive diversity and inclusion climates in the organization (i.e., the environment is supportive of the functioning of historically marginalized employees and non-marginalized employees). It is also possible to perceive both negative diversity and inclusion climates (i.e., the environment hinders the functioning of both historically marginalized and non-marginalized employees). Yet, a positive diversity climate does not necessitate a positive inclusion climate, as individuals could perceive that non-marginalized employees are not treated fairly and given decision-making influence in the organization. Likewise, one could perceive a positive inclusion climate and a negative diversity climate. For example, people could perceive that all employees are treated fairly, able to display their full identities, and included in decision-making, but that the numerical representation and treatment of historically marginalized employees like they belong are not prioritized within the organization. These arguments hold true for organizational (i.e., shared) diversity and inclusion climates, where one need not dictate the other. Future investigations can hence help delineate the relations between the constructs across different organizational contexts and examine their overlapping and disparate antecedents.

Second, the current research does not examine the relations between diversity climate and other constructs. As noted, the present studies represent the first steps of a larger scale validation project. Thus, the next steps will examine whether the new scale: a) relates to other measures of diversity climate (i.e., convergent validity), b) does not relate to measures of theoretically unrelated constructs (i.e., discriminant validity), and finally, c) predicts constructs that should theoretically exist within its nomological network (i.e., predictive
validity). These steps can also shed light on the utility of diversity climate as a superordinate construct, for example, using usefulness analysis, thus determining if the overall construct predicts outcomes above and beyond its first-order factors (Johnson et al., 2011). The next steps can also provide guidance on the scale scoring process through further psychometric testing (Reise, Bonifay, Haviland, 2013). This guidance is especially important given the unequal number of items in each of the three subscales (i.e., seven, four, and five items). For instance, future investigations can compare the predictive validity of the scale under different item configurations. Specifically, research can assess whether, in addition to the 4-item organizational representation and inclusion subscale, examining the four highest loading items for interpersonal worth and inclusion and organizational anti-discrimination subscales alters the predictive validity of the overall 16-item scale. Future research can also examine whether the three subscale scores provide a more accurate index of true scale scores compared to the total scale score (Haberman, 2008), as well as the interpretability of the total score as a reflection of diversity climate and whether subscale scores reflect constructs that are independent from diversity climate (i.e., model-based reliability estimation, Brunner & Süß, 2005; Rakov, 1997).

Third, although the new Workplace Diversity Climate Scale was developed to address the limitations of past diversity climate scales, the current research does not empirically examine the relations between the new scale and previous scales, and whether they differentially relate to other constructs. For example, future research should examine if the new scale displays weaker relations with measures of perceived overall justice (i.e., toward all employees) compared to past diversity climate scales that reflect perceptions of fairness toward all employees (e.g., Chrobot-Mason & Aramovich, 2013; Mor Barak et al., 1998). Moreover, research can demonstrate if our scale is less strongly related to measures assessing personal attitudes toward historically marginalized groups (e.g., social dominance orientation,
Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) than previous diversity climate scales that assess personal diversity-related attitudes (e.g., Mor Barak et al, 1998). Correspondingly, future investigations can assess if the new scale more strongly relates to measures of interpersonal group dynamics (e.g., relational conflict, Jehn, 1994) compared to diversity climate measures that only emphasize organizational climate sources (e.g., Pugh et al., 2008). Similarly, compared to past scales that do not assess perceptions of diversity-related organizational and top leadership values, and managerial practices (e.g., Hofhuis et al., 2012), future research should determine if the new scale is more strongly related to measures of ethical and authentic leadership (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005). This is because both authentic and ethical forms of leadership are characterized by adhering to high ethical standards and moral decision-making, which can be reflected in leadership actions demonstrating a commitment to fostering diversity and supporting the functioning of historically marginalized employees. The above examples represent a few possible avenues for future research that are needed to demonstrate strengths of the new scale (e.g., lack of construct contamination, broader domain coverage) in relation to previous diversity climate measures.

Fourth, our strategy of assessing the scale items’ dimension-related substantive validity in Study 2 could have unnecessarily affected the items retained and the scale’s factor structure in subsequent studies. This is because we required participants to sort items to definitions of the four proposed components of diversity climate. Yet, the EFA and CFA did not support this factor structure. Thus, Study 2 could have resulted in the elimination of items that could have otherwise demonstrated high and clear factor loadings in Studies 3 and 4. Fortunately, given our implementation of less strict cut-off criteria in Study 2 than those used in Studies 1 and 3, Study 2 only resulted in the elimination of four of the 59 items. An alternative strategy to our research approach would have been the assessment of construct-
related substantive validity in Study 1 and then exploring the factor structure of the resulting items using EFA. Future research could examine whether a different factor structure emerges using all 98 items from Study 1 compared to the one yielded using the 52 items from Study 3.

Fifth, a potential limitation of the new scale is our use of the term “historically marginalized groups” as the target in the diversity climate scale. One possible problem is that the scale does not inform researchers and practitioners of the historically marginalized groups that respondents are thinking of when completing the scale. Respondents may be perceiving that one historically marginalized group is experiencing a more negative work environment than others, without the scale reflecting that. Another potential limitation with the use of this term is that it may confine perceptions to groups that are historically marginalized, and not necessarily ones that are currently marginalized within society, perhaps because they have only now become more visible. However, we were able to remedy these problems during scale administration. Specifically, we included a probing question following the scale that asks participants to name and rank the historically marginalized groups they were thinking of when responding to the items. As well, our scale instructions included a description of what the term “historically marginalized” means, which clarifies that these groups could be historically, currently, or historically and currently marginalized. We believe the use of “historically marginalized” in the scale allows capturing perceptions of the intersectionality of people’s multiple historically marginalized identities and their impact on their organizational experiences (Kang & Bodenhausen, 2015). If it is the intent of those administering the scale to understand employees’ diversity climate perceptions for certain groups, we recommend a similar open-ended question to the one we used that follows the administration of the scale, which allows people to identify the historically marginalized groups they were thinking of. Alternatively, future investigations can validate the use of the
scale after adapting items to reflect perceptions of specific historically marginalized groups (e.g., women).

Sixth, it is possible that the new scale does not generalize to contexts, where organizations lack diversity strategies and thus do not engage in efforts to support the functioning of historically marginalized employees. For example, only 65% of Mainland Chinese organizations report having a diversity and inclusion strategy in place (Lahrichi, 2012). Accordingly, our scale might not apply to other organizational contexts, where diversity is not a strategic business goal. However, since the scale items had been developed to be general, by not specifying historically marginalized groups or context-specific legislations and policies, the scale can likely be administered in organizations with a diversity strategy in place, even if they exist in different cultural contexts. Future studies can validate the use of the new scale in various cultural contexts and assess potential cultural differences in diversity climate perceptions. Such investigations can yield insights on the effectiveness of different diversity management paradigms employed across differing contexts.

Finally, the current research defines and validates diversity climate at the individual level (i.e., psychological diversity climate), which entails that the new scale cannot immediately be used as an organizational-level construct before further validation. Yet, our approach to the scale development process would not have differed had the scale been validated at the aggregate level (i.e., organizational diversity climate). Organizational climates capture individuals’ shared perceptions of the policies, practices, procedures, routines, and behaviours that get supported in the organization, which reflect the aggregation of individual-level climate perceptions (Schneider et al., 2013). Thus, if statistical agreement indices (e.g., interrater reliability, Bliese, 2000; interrater agreement, James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1993) indicate that a shared diversity climate exists in a given organization, the new scale can be further validated as an organizational-level construct. The scale development
steps outlined in the present research are similar to those used in the development of established organizational climate scales, such as service climate (Schneider et al., 1998), safety climate (Zohar, 1990), training climate (Tracey et al., 1995), and inclusion climate (Nishii, 2013).

**Conclusion**

The current research advances our understanding of diversity climate by moving toward an integrated definition of the construct and developing a new measure that tackles past methodological challenges. We developed a reliable measure of diversity climate and provided initial evidence of its construct validity across five studies. The integrated definition of diversity climate can allow researchers to delineate the theoretical mechanisms through which it enacts its effects in organizations, as well as examine its nomological network. An empirically validated scale of diversity climate can ensure that researchers are investigating the same construct, thus allowing them to confidently generate more accurate findings. The new 16-item Workplace Diversity Climate Scale can further serve as an assessment tool for organizations seeking to evaluate their diversity management efforts and inform future diversity-related policies and practices.
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Table 1 *Examples of Past Definitions and Operationalizations of Diversity Climate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row #</th>
<th>Diversity Climate Scale</th>
<th>Diversity Climate Definition and Proposed Scale Dimensions (if any)</th>
<th>Scale Used</th>
<th>Total # of Items</th>
<th># of Climate Items</th>
<th>Diversity Climate Source(s)</th>
<th>Diversity Climate Component(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kossek &amp; Zonia (1993)</td>
<td>Climate is generally conceived as the influence of work contexts on employee behaviour and attitudes, which are grounded in perceptions. Diversity climate is comprised of: valuing efforts to promote diversity, personal attitudes towards the qualifications of women and racioethnic minorities, and equality of departmental support of women and racioethnic minorities.</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P &amp; P</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mor Barak et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Diversity climate refers to employee behaviors and attitudes that are grounded in perceptions of the organizational context related to women and minorities. Diversity climate is comprised of: organizational fairness, organizational inclusion, personal comfort with diversity, and personal value for diversity.</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>P &amp; P</td>
<td>R &amp; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hicks-Clarke &amp; Iles (2000)</td>
<td>Climate is defined as perception of particular aspects of the organization, based largely on organizational rules, regulations and individuals’ interpretation of those rules and regulations. Diversity climate is comprised of: policy support for diversity and equity recognition (i.e., recognition of the need for diversity,</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>P &amp; P</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
existence of employee support for diversity, and the perception of organizational justice in HR policies, practices and procedures).

4 Hopkins et al. (2001) Diversity climate is a set of generally shared beliefs/attitudes toward minority employees, their values, and their roles.

5 Hobman et al. (2004) Diversity climate refers to an individual’s perceptions of the organization’s attention to diversity issues, as reflected through human resource policies and procedures (e.g., recruitment practices, flexible working conditions, and resource support for minority employees) and general attitude toward the value of a diverse workforce for organizational effectiveness.

6 Gelfand et al. (2007) Climate for Diversity (CFD) is defined as the policies, practices, and procedures that implicitly and explicitly communicate the extent to which fostering and maintaining diversity and eliminating discrimination is a priority in the organization.

7 McKay et al. (2007) Diversity climate is defined as employees’ perceptions that an organization adheres to fair personnel practices and the degree that minority employees are integrated into the work environment.

8 McKay et al. (2008) Diversity climate is defined as employees’ shared perceptions that an employer utilizes fair personnel practices and socially integrates underrepresented employees into the work environment.

9 Leslie & Gelfand (2008) A positive climate for diversity (CFD) reflects the extent to which an organization values diversity, and therefore seeks to create and maintain diverse organizational membership.

10 Pugh et al. (2008) An organization’s diversity climate refers to employees’ shared perceptions of the policies and practices that communicate the
extent to which fostering diversity and eliminating discrimination is a priority in the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Diversity Climate Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gonzalez &amp; DeNisi (2009)</td>
<td>Mor Barak et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Diversity climate refers to the aggregate member perceptions about the organization’s diversity-related formal structure characteristics and informal values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Soldan (2009)</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Organizational climate for diversity is referred to as the perceptions of personal, group and organizational dimensions that influence employee perceptions of management’s receptivity to diversity programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Triana &amp; Garcia (2009)</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Organizational efforts to support diversity refer to employee perceptions that the practices of the organization indicate that valuing and promoting diversity is a priority in the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Herdman &amp; McMillian-Capehart (2010)</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Diversity climate is aggregate perceptions about the organization’s diversity-related formal structure characteristics and informal values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kaplan et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Diversity climate is employee perceptions regarding the extent to which individual diversity is valued, integrated into organizational life, and supported through fair employment practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lauring &amp; Selmer (2011)</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>A positive organizational diversity climate refers to group members’ attention to issues related to demographic dissimilarities, creating an environment where individuals value and respect the views of those who are different and work actively with a wide variety of individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Authors (Year)</td>
<td>Definition of Diversity Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hofhuis et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Diversity climate is the degree to which an organizational climate facilitates the presence of cultural differences and views this diversity as a positive asset.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Volpone et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Psychological diversity climate is an individual assessment of the extent to which an employee perceives that his or her organization maintains an inclusive environment committed to providing equal opportunity to all employees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vrick &amp; Green (2012)</td>
<td>Diversity climate has been defined as collective perceptions of the extent to which an organization is viewed as having fair employee policies and integrates underrepresented individuals into the work environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chrobot-Mason &amp; Aramovich (2013)</td>
<td>Diversity climate consist of perceptions of a set of diversity practices aimed at providing fair and equal opportunities to all employees. Diversity climate is comprised of: equal treatment (i.e., perceptions that all employees are treated in the same way, and that discrimination, conflict, and exclusion along demographic lines is minimal) and equal access (i.e., perceptions that all employees have access to resources and power, and have the opportunity to take advantage of developmental opportunities within the organization.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Drach-Zajavy &amp; Trogan (2013)</td>
<td>Team diversity climate refers to team members’ common perception that managing diversity and preventing discrimination really matter in their unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>TL &amp; O</td>
<td>P &amp; P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Chung, Liao, Jackson, et al., (2015)</td>
<td>Perceived diversity climate is defined as shared perceptions among employees in a unit that people are treated fairly and are integrated into work environment regardless of background.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Goby et al. (2015)</td>
<td>Diversity climate refers to the perception employees have of their organization’s commitment to recruiting and celebrating people with different backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Dwertmann et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Diversity climate is the perceived ‘attitude’ or shared perceptions about the extent to which organizations value diversity as evidenced by formal structure, informal values, and social integration of under-represented employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Oberfield (2016)</td>
<td>Diversity climates refer to employees’ perceptions of their organizations’ commitment to diversity as indicated by its diversity policies and how they are implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Cachat-Rosset et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Diversity climate is the shared perceptions by employees of intent, programs, attitudes and behaviours in favour of visible or invisible forms of diversity relevant to the organization’s social context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TL & O = top leadership and organizational values; P & P = policies and practices; A & B = General attitudes, behaviours, and routines of organizational members. R & W = representation and worth of historically marginalized employees; I = inclusion of historically marginalized employees; J = justice toward historically marginalized employees; D = elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members. Grey cells denote studies that have not operationalized diversity climate.
Table 2 Visualization of the Proposed Twelve Quadrants of Diversity Climate and Examples of Proposed Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation and Worth of Historically Marginalized Employees</th>
<th>Top Leadership and Organizational Values</th>
<th>Organizational Policies and Practices</th>
<th>General Attitudes, Behaviours, and Routines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.g., “Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.”</td>
<td>E.g., “In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.”</td>
<td>E.g., “In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Historically Marginalized Employees</td>
<td>E.g., “This organization strives to create an environment in which historically marginalized employees can be themselves.”</td>
<td>E.g., “In this organization, managers and supervisors ensure that historically marginalized employees are informed about informal social activities and organizational social events.”</td>
<td>E.g., “In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice toward Historically Marginalized Employees</td>
<td>E.g., “Fairness for historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.”</td>
<td>E.g., “In this organization, the performance evaluation system is fair to historically marginalized employees.”</td>
<td>E.g., “In this organization, workers who treat historically marginalized employees unfairly are shunned.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of Discrimination against Historically Marginalized Groups</td>
<td>E.g., “This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized employees.”</td>
<td>E.g., “In this organization, managers and supervisors sometimes don’t follow the stated policies against discrimination.”</td>
<td>E.g., “In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized groups.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 *Overview of the Scale Development Steps*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Study Focus</th>
<th>Study Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td>Item Generation</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item Clarity Feedback</td>
<td>Pilot Study 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>Content Validity Assessment</td>
<td>Pilot Study 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot Study 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td>Exploratory Factor Analysis</td>
<td>Study 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td>Confirmatory Factor Analysis</td>
<td>Study 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 *Data Cleaning Steps for Pilot Study 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N before removal</th>
<th>Reason for case removal</th>
<th>n cases removed</th>
<th>N cases remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Did not consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Not full-time employee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Failed 2+ of 3 attention check</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Less than 3 for conscientiousness check</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 *Pilot Study 3 Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$P_{sa}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment to diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors are held</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountable for increasing diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees raise awareness about the</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treated like outsiders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>networking for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, decisions affecting pay and promotions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are communicated with historically marginalized employees in a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors give</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that historically marginalized employees put to their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is dedicated to ensuring</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that historically marginalized employees do not receive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative treatment by others in the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrimination against historically marginalized group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members immediately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees receive recognition for valuing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and promoting diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization values historically</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees for who they are as people and not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just the jobs they fill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization values complete transparency with</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized employees during HR-related decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to make it easy for historically</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees to fit in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is committed to eliminating bias and</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prejudice against historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$P_{na}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are assumed to be just as competent as everyone else.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, people think historically marginalized employees do not bring anything valuable to the table.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness for historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During decision-making, this organization values the input of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, workers believe that historically marginalized employees are given worse treatment during selection and/or performance procedures.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated fairly by other workers.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued for who they are by other workers, regardless of any potential differences.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors pressure historically marginalized employees to conform to organizational norms.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization aims to ensure impartiality in HR-related decision-making procedures for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors ensure that historically marginalized employees are informed about informal social activities and organizational social events.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees can see others who look like them.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees are intolerant of historically marginalized group members.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, people listen with an open mind to the ideas presented by historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies to ensure that historically marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Pna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are social events where historically</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees are less than welcome.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved in social gatherings by other workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees who advocate for diversity-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related issues are well respected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and retaining historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees aren't</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>left out by other workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that impact the advancement of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of promoting historically marginalized employees objectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, people are not comfortable having</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized employees in managerial positions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talents of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, the advancement of historically</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees is hindered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is bias and prejudice against</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is work being done so that</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that historically marginalized employees feel like insiders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouraged to present themselves the way they are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, workers believe that historically</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees deserve the same outcomes (e.g., pay,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotions) as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization strives to remove any</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obstacles that negatively impact historically marginalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors value</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors support the unique</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideas of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is a non-threatening environment in</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which historically marginalized employees can reveal their true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Psa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are safe ways for historically marginalized employees to voice their grievances when they feel like they are left out of important organizational matters.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is taken for granted.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors discriminate against historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, workers who treat historically marginalized employees unfairly are shunned.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to express their views during decision-making procedures that affect their outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions).</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is an old boys' club that makes it hard for historically marginalized employees to get ahead.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors provide fewer opportunities for advancement to historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to treat historically marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, HR-related decision-making procedures are fair for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors treat historically marginalized employees like their contributions are valuable.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, when historically marginalized employees are intentionally or unintentionally discriminated against by other workers, managers and supervisors take it seriously.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, performance evaluations seem to be biased against historically marginalized employees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated as less competent.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, workers believe that historically marginalized employees deserve explanations when they fail to receive outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions).</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$P_{na}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is zero tolerance for workers who</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exclude historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors make layoff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions for historically marginalized employees fairly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, the performance evaluation system is fair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to ensure that outcomes (e.g., pay,</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotions) are equally distributed to historically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors are candid</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when explaining decision-making procedures (e.g., for pay and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotions) to historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized employees to be themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization strives to ensure timely</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication with historically marginalized employees for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR-related decision-making procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization strives for the</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representation, across different levels, of historically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors can make</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized employees feel like outsiders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, policies that harm historically</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees are not questioned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for historically marginalized employees to express their full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees are educated on the negative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects of intentional and unintentional discrimination on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, some employees make negative remarks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, educational and developmental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities are provided for historically marginalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees who</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are capable can move up the ranks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at all levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, a person’s historically marginalized</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group status can negatively affect how they are viewed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for historically marginalized employees.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$P_{sa}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees make insensitive comments toward historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to create an environment in which historically marginalized employees can be themselves.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization aspires for HR-related decision-making procedures to be enacted fairly for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, workers believe that promotions should be given based on historically marginalized employees' merits.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization ensures that historically marginalized employees are treated with respect and dignity when decisions regarding pay and promotions are communicated.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are able to express who they truly are.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are pressured to conform to organizational norms.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, when historically marginalized employees speak, their words are given the same weight as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees who engage in discriminatory treatment toward marginalized groups are formally reprimanded.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors sometimes don’t follow the stated policies against discrimination.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, the old boys’ club is alive and well.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items met cut off criteria. $N =$ total number of participants who sorted the item. $P_{sa} =$ proportion of substantive agreement.
Table 6 *Data Cleaning Steps for Study 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N before removal</th>
<th>Reason for case removal</th>
<th>n cases removed</th>
<th>N cases remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Did not consent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Not full-time employee</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Failed 2+ of 3 attention check</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Less than 3 for conscientiousness check</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 Howard and Melloy (2015) Calculated Critical (m) Values for Item-Sort Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample size (n)</th>
<th>Critical value (m)</th>
<th>Sample size (n)</th>
<th>Critical value (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Study 1 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Critical (m)</th>
<th>Correct Number of Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization values historically marginalized employees for who they are as people and not just the jobs they fill.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees aren't left out by other workers.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage networking for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors value historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to make it easy for historically marginalized employees to fit in.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees feel like insiders.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way for historically marginalized employees to express their full identities.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Critical ($m$)</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$24_c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies to ensure that historically marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$24_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$24_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$24_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During decision-making, this organization values the input of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$23_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$23_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$23_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$23_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees receive recognition for valuing and promoting diversity.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$23_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be themselves.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$23_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness for historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$23_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$23_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to treat historically marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$23_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$23_c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$23_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$23_c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Critical (m)</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated fairly by other workers.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that impact the advancement of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees can see others who look like them.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is taken for granted.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are social events where historically marginalized employees are less than welcome.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to present themselves the way they are.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that historically marginalized employees put to their work.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Critical ($m$)</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of promoting historically marginalized employees objectively.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are assumed to be just as competent as everyone else.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is an old boys' club that makes it hard for historically marginalized employees to get ahead.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued for who they are by other workers, regardless of any potential differences.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, people think historically marginalized employees do not bring anything valuable to the table.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is zero tolerance for workers who exclude historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, some employees make negative remarks about historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to ensure that outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions) are equally distributed to historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20&lt;sub&gt;d&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization strives to remove any obstacles that negatively impact historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors support the unique ideas of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors treat historically marginalized employees like their contributions are valuable.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19&lt;sub&gt;d&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, people are not comfortable having historically marginalized employees in managerial positions.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19&lt;sub&gt;g&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees who advocate for diversity-related issues are well respected.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>Critical (( m ))</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors pressure historically marginalized employees to conform to organizational norms.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19\textsubscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors ensure that historically marginalized employees are informed about informal social activities and organizational social events.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19\textsubscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors can make historically marginalized employees feel like outsiders.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19\textsubscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization values complete transparency with historically marginalized employees during HR-related decision-making procedures.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization aims to ensure impartiality in HR-related decision-making procedures for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19\textsubscript{d}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to express their views during decision-making procedures that affect their outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions).</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19\textsubscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees who are capable can move up the ranks.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19\textsubscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors discriminate against historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19\textsubscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated as less competent.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19\textsubscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated like outsiders.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18\textsubscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, the performance evaluation system is fair to historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18\textsubscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors are candid when explaining decision-making procedures (e.g., for pay and promotions) to historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are safe ways for historically marginalized employees to voice their grievances when they feel like they are left out of important organizational matters.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, HR-related decision-making procedures are fair for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18\textsubscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees are educated on the negative effects of intentional and unintentional discrimination on historically marginalized group members.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors provide fewer opportunities for advancement to historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, a person’s historically marginalized group status can negatively affect how they are viewed.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Critical (m)</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization strives to ensure timely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication with historically marginalized employees</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for HR-related decision-making procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors make layoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions for historically marginalized employees fairly.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17\textsubscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, workers believe that historically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees deserve the same outcomes (e.g., pay,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotions) as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16\textsubscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is dedicated to ensuring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that historically marginalized employees do not receive negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treatment by others in the organization.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is bias and prejudice against</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, people listen with an open mind to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideas presented by historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16\textsubscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, decisions affecting pay and promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are communicated with historically marginalized employees in a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely manner.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, workers who treat historically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees unfairly are shunned.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, policies that harm historically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees are not questioned.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, performance evaluations seem to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biased against historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees are intolerant of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized group members.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16\textsubscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is a non-threatening environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in which historically marginalized employees can reveal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their true selves.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, workers believe that historically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees are given worse treatment during selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or performance procedures.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15\textsubscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, the advancement of historically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees is hindered.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15\textsubscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, workers believe that historically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees deserve explanations when they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fail to receive outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions).</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, when historically marginalized employees are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intentionally or unintentionally discriminated against by other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers, managers and supervisors take it seriously.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bolded items met or exceeded the critical (m) cut-off. N = total number of participants who sorted the item. Critical (m) is the critical number of assignments (Howard & Melloy, 2015).
a = item more often confused with psychological safety. 
b = item more often confused with perceived overall justice. 
c = item confused equally often with psychological safety and perceived overall justice. 
d = item confused equally often with psychological safety and other. 
e = item confused equally often with perceived overall justice and other. 
f = item confused equally often with psychological safety, perceived overall justice, and other. 
g = item confused equally often with other.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N before removal</th>
<th>Reason for case removal</th>
<th>n cases removed</th>
<th>N cases remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Did not consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Not full-time employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Failed 2+ of 3 attention check</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Less than 3 for conscientiousness check</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Critical ((m))</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees feel like insiders.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees aren't left out by other workers.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors value historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Critical $(m)$</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness for historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies to ensure that historically marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way for historically marginalized employees to express their full identities.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Critical (m)</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to treat historically marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that historically marginalized employees put to their work.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to make it easy for historically marginalized employees to fit in.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage networking for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of promoting historically marginalized employees objectively.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees can see others who look like them.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees receive recognition for valuing and promoting diversity.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Critical ($m$)</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated fairly by other workers.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued for who they are by other workers, regardless of any potential differences.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is taken for granted.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be themselves.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to present themselves the way they are.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that impact the advancement of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During decision-making, this organization values the input of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization values historically marginalized employees for who they are as people and not just the jobs they fill.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are social events where historically marginalized employees are less than welcome.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are assumed to be just as competent as everyone else.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Critical ((m))</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, some employees make negative remarks about historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is an old boys' club that makes it hard for historically marginalized employees to get ahead.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, people think historically marginalized employees do not bring anything valuable to the table.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is zero tolerance for workers who exclude historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items met the \(P_{sa}\) cut-off of .50. \(N\) = total number of participants who sorted the item. \(P_{sa}\) = proportion of substantive agreement. Critical \((m)\) is the critical number of assignments (Howard & Melloy, 2015). Correct number of assignments is the number of participants who correctly assigned the item to diversity climate.
Table 11 *Data Cleaning Steps for Study 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N before removal</th>
<th>Reason for case removal</th>
<th>n cases removed</th>
<th>N cases remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Did not consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Not full-time employee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Failed 2+ of 3 attention check</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Less than 3 for conscientiousness check</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Critical (m)</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that impact historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During decision-making, this organization values the input of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is deeply valued.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage networking for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity throughout the organization.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Critical (m)</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued, regardless of any potential differences.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees feel included.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to treat historically marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors value historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees can see others who look like them.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization strives to make it easy for historically marginalized employees to fit in.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Critical (m)</td>
<td>Correct Number of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24_d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24_c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24_b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be their true selves.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23_a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way for historically marginalized employees to express their full identities.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23_a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to not hide their identities.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23_a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that historically marginalized employees put to their work.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23_a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies to ensure that historically marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23_b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23_b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22_a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees feel like insiders.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22_a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of paying historically marginalized employees fairly.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22_b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, workers support flexibility in decision-making procedures to ensure fairness for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22_b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22_a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are always welcome at social events.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21_a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees aren't left out by other workers.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21_a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, employees don’t make negative remarks about historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21_a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, there is zero tolerance for workers who ignore historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20_c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fairness for historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.  

In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated fairly by other workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Critical (m)</th>
<th>Correct Number of Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness for historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated fairly by other workers.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items met or exceeded the critical (m) cut-off. N = total number of participants who sorted the item. Critical (m) is the critical number of assignments (Howard & Melloy, 2015). Correct number of assignments is the number of participants who correctly assigned the item to diversity climate.  

<sup>a</sup> = item more often confused with psychological safety.  
<sup>b</sup> = item more often confused with perceived overall justice.  
<sup>c</sup> = item confused equally often with psychological safety and perceived overall justice.  
<sup>d</sup> = item confused equally often with psychological safety and other.

<sup>e</sup> = item confused equally often with perceived overall justice and other.  
<sup>f</sup> = item confused equally often with psychological safety, perceived overall justice, and other.
Table 13 *Data Cleaning Steps for Study 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N before removal</th>
<th>Reason for case removal</th>
<th>n cases removed</th>
<th>N cases remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>Did not consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>Not full-time employee</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Failed 2+ of 3 attention check</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Less than 3 for conscientiousness check</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 *Parallel Analysis Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Raw Data</th>
<th>95th Percentile Random Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 *Factor Pattern Coefficients for the Three-Factor Rotated Solution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1 Item Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 2 Item Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 3 Item Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUST_38</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_34</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_33</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees aren't left out by other workers.</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_17</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background.</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_18</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued, regardless of any potential differences.</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_30</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are always welcome at social events.</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST_40</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of paying historically marginalized employees fairly.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_19</td>
<td>In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_3</td>
<td>During decision-making, this organization values the input of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_12</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors value historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_31</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST_15</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Factor 1 Item Loadings</td>
<td>Factor 2 Item Loadings</td>
<td>Factor 3 Item Loadings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC_51</td>
<td>In this organization, employees don’t make negative remarks about historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_29</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST_37</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that historically marginalized employees put to their work.</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_27</td>
<td><strong>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be their true selves.</strong></td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_1</td>
<td>Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_22</td>
<td>This organization strives to make it easy for historically marginalized employees to fit in.</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_32</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to not hide their identities.</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST_36</td>
<td>This organization strives to treat historically marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST_39</td>
<td>In this organization, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_23</td>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees feel like insiders.</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST_42</td>
<td>In this organization, workers support flexibility in decision-making procedures to ensure fairness for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td><strong>0.5</strong></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_13</td>
<td><strong>When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.</strong></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td><strong>0.961</strong></td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_9</td>
<td>This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td><strong>0.956</strong></td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_10</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity throughout the organization.</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td><strong>0.919</strong></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Factor 1 Item Loadings</td>
<td>Factor 2 Item Loadings</td>
<td>Factor 3 Item Loadings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_20</td>
<td>In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is deeply valued.</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_4</td>
<td>This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_5</td>
<td><strong>Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.</strong></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_21</td>
<td>In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_26</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage networking for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_7</td>
<td>Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_11</td>
<td>In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC_52</td>
<td>In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_2</td>
<td>Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_14</td>
<td>In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_6</td>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_28</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way for historically marginalized employees to express their full identities.</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_8</td>
<td>This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_25</td>
<td>The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Factor 1 Item Loadings</td>
<td>Factor 2 Item Loadings</td>
<td>Factor 3 Item Loadings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP_16</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees can see others who look like them.</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC_49</td>
<td>In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC_50</td>
<td>In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC_46</td>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.*</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC_43</td>
<td>This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC_48</td>
<td>In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC_47</td>
<td>Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC_44</td>
<td>This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC_45</td>
<td>Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that impact historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST_41</td>
<td>In this organization, there are policies to ensure that historically marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as historically non-marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC_24</td>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST_35</td>
<td>Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td>12.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Pattern coefficients greater than |.40| are bolded. Cross-loadings less than |.32| are in grey. The asterisk (*) denotes a retained item that cross-loaded on another factor but the difference between the loadings was above the recommended cut-off value of 0.20 (Howard, 2016). Percent variance is post-rotation. Items that were chosen for the final version of the scale are bolded. 

a = item dropped due to having a loading of < .40, b = item dropped due to cross-loading of ≥ .32 and a loading difference of < .20, c = item dropped due to redundancy with higher loading items, d = item dropped from factor to maintain scale’s simple structure.
### Table 16 A Visualization of the Initially Proposed 12 Quadrants of Diversity Climate Captured by the EFA Factors in Study 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top Leadership and Organizational Values</th>
<th>Organizational Policies and Practices</th>
<th>General Attitudes, Behaviours, and Routines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation and Worth of HM Employees</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of HM Employees</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice toward HM Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of Discrimination against historically marginalized Groups</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Factor 1 = Interpersonal worth and inclusion; Factor 2 = Organizational representation and inclusion; Factor 3 = Organizational Anti-Discrimination.
Table 17 Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations with Confidence Intervals Among All Subscales for Study 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal Worth and Inclusion</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Representation and Inclusion</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.67, 0.75]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Anti-Discrimination</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.75, 0.82]</td>
<td>[0.76, 0.82]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 520. M and SD are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Alpha on the diagonal. Values in square brackets indicate the 95% confidence interval for each correlation. The confidence interval is a plausible range of population correlations that could have caused the sample correlation (Cumming, 2014). * indicates p < .05. ** indicates p < .01.
Table 18 *Data Cleaning Steps for Study 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N before removal</th>
<th>Reason for case removal</th>
<th>n cases removed</th>
<th>N cases remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Did not consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Not full-time employee</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Failed 2+ of 3 attention check</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Less than 3 for conscientiousness check</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 *Fit Indices of the Hypothesized Model and Alternative Models in Study 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesized Three Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate (Model 1)</td>
<td>328.215</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-9425.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlated-dimensions (Model 2)</td>
<td>328.215</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-9425.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two Factor Superordinate (Sources)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate (Model 3)</td>
<td>350.436</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-9404.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two Factor Superordinate (Components)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate (Model 4)</td>
<td>370.623</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-9384.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidimensional (Model 5)</td>
<td>412.683</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-9346.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $\chi^2$ = chi-square; df = degrees of freedom; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index, CFI = Comparative Fit Index, RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation, AIC = Akaike Information Criterion. N = 291.*
Table 20 Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Loadings for the 18-item Workplace Diversity Climate Scale in Study 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Worth and Inclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspectives brought by historically marginalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees are valued by other workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In this organization, historically marginalized</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees have the same opportunity to receive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentoring as historically non-marginalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically marginalized employees to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their true selves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In this organization, managers and supervisors have a</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>track record of paying historically marginalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees fairly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In this organization, historically marginalized</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees are involved in social gatherings by other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In this organization, historically marginalized and</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically non-marginalized employees often share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and learn about one another as people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the talents of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Representation and Inclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Top leadership in this organization strives for the</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representation, across different levels, of historically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This organization demonstrates complete commitment</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to its historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invested to ensure that historically marginalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees feel included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture. 6.47 1.84 .75

12. In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity throughout the organization. 6.01 2.04 .70

13. When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them. 5.53 1.97 .55

**Organizational Anti-Discrimination**

14. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against. 6.57 1.88 .84

15. In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately. 6.49 1.95 .81

16. In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups. 6.37 2.01 .81

17. In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination. 6.45 1.89 .72

18. Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture. 6.45 2.05 .59

*Note. SD = standard deviation. Factor loadings are for the hypothesized three-factor congeneric superordinate model.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal Worth and Inclusion</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Representation and Inclusion</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.79, .86]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Anti-Discrimination</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.74, .82]</td>
<td>[.78, .85]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total Diversity Climate Scale Score</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.93, .96]</td>
<td>[.91, .94]</td>
<td>[.90, .94]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Alpha on the diagonal. Values in square brackets indicate the 95% confidence interval for each correlation. The confidence interval is a plausible range of population correlations that could have caused the sample correlation (Cumming, 2014). * indicates *p* < .05. ** indicates *p* < .01.
Table 22 Results of Multigroup CFAs to Test Invariance of the Three-Factor Superordinate Structure of the 16-Item Workplace Diversity Climate Scale between Historically Marginalized (n = 137) and Historically Non-Marginalized (n = 154) Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (Δ$\chi^2$)</th>
<th>Df (ΔDf)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>RMSEA (ΔRMSEA)</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>CFI (ΔCFI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1 Configural invariance</td>
<td>455.08</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>16217</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 Metric invariance</td>
<td>475.72 (17.43)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.049 (0.001)</td>
<td>16205</td>
<td>.958 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(loadings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3 Scalar invariance</td>
<td>488.43 (14.86)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.049 (0.000)</td>
<td>16194</td>
<td>.956 (.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(loadings, and intercepts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4 Strict invariance</td>
<td>496.51 (12.86)</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>.011*</td>
<td>.050 (0.001)</td>
<td>16194</td>
<td>.954 (.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M3 plus residual variances)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 291$. $\chi^2$ = chi-square; df, degrees of freedom; CFI, comparative fit index; TLI, Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA, root mean square error of approximation; AIC, Akaike information criterion.
* $p < .05$
Figure 1. Scree Plot for the EFA in Study 4.
Figure 2. Model 1 hypothesized three-factor superordinate model.
Figure 3. Model 2 three-factor correlated dimensions model.
Figure 4. Model 3 two-factor superordinate model based on source.
Figure 5. Model 4 two-factor superordinate model based on components.
Figure 6. Model 5 single-factor model.
Appendix A

Item Clarity Diversity Climate Items (Following SME Feedback)

Total = 118 items.

Representation and Worth of Historically Marginalized Employees [27 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

1. Top leadership demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.
2. This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its marginalized employees.
3. Top leadership values what marginalized employees bring to the table.
4. Valuing marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.
5. Top leadership strives for marginalized employees to be well-represented across the organization’s different levels and functions.
6. This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining employees belonging to marginalized groups.
7. This organization values the input of marginalized employees in decision-making.
8. Top leadership is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for marginalized employees.

Organizational policies and practices

9. Around here, organizational decision-makers draw on the talents of marginalized employees.
10. Around here, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward achieving diversity goals.
11. Around here, some organizational decision-makers treat marginalized employees like they have nothing to contribute.
12. Around here, organizational decision-makers make marginalized employees feel valued.
13. Around here, organizational decision makers are held accountable for progress in diversity.
14. Around here, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels of the organization.
15. Around here, the input of marginalized employees is considered in organizational decision-making.
16. Around here, organizational decision-makers demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

17. Around here, people value the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by marginalized employees.
18. Around here, people view marginalized employees positively, regardless of their background.
19. Around here, some people think marginalized employees do not bring anything valuable to the table.
20. Around here, people receive recognition for valuing and promoting diversity.
21. Around here, employees who advocate for diversity-related issues in the organization are well respected.
22. Around here, some people would prefer to have a leader that belongs to a non-marginalized group.
23. Around here, people have a difficult time really listening with an open mind to the ideas presented by marginalized employees.
24. Around here, there is an old boys' club that makes it hard for marginalized employees to get ahead.
25. Around here, marginalized employees see others who look like them around here.
26. Around here, having marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is a given.
27. Around here, some people are not comfortable with marginalized employees in managerial positions.

Inclusion of Historically Marginalized Employees [29 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

1. This organization strives to create an environment in which marginalized employees can be themselves without facing the pressure to conform to organizational norms.
2. Top leadership is committed to ensuring that marginalized employees are able to express who they truly are.
3. Top leadership values marginalized employees for who they are as people and not just the jobs they fill.
4. Top leadership is committed to ensuring that marginalized employees feel like insiders in the organization.
5. This organization strives to make it easy for marginalized employees to fit in.
6. This organization aims for marginalized employees to feel welcomed.
7. Top leadership is committed to making marginalized employees feel included.
8. The inclusion of marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.

Organizational policies and practices

9. Around here, organizational decision-makers encourage marginalized employees to be themselves without facing the pressure to conform to organizational norms.
10. Around here, organizational decision-makers pave the way for marginalized employees to express their full identities.
11. Around here, there is a non-threatening environment in which marginalized employees can reveal their true selves.
12. Around here, organizational decision-makers support marginalized employees’ unique ideas.
13. Around here, marginalized employees' insights are used to rethink or redefine work practices.
14. Around here, organizational decision-makers place a lot of pressure on marginalized employees to conform to the organization's norms.
15. Around here, organizational decision-makers make marginalized employees feel like outsiders.
16. Around here, there are informal events where marginalized employees are made to feel unwelcome.
17. Around here, marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.
18. Around here, managers ensure that marginalized employees are informed about informal social activities and organizational social events.
19. Around here, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that marginalized employees feel included.
20. Around here, managers encourage the formation of employee network support groups for marginalized employees.
21. Around here, the old boys’ club is alive and well.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

22. Around here, people pressure marginalized employees to conform to the organizational norms.
23. Around here, people encourage marginalized employees to present themselves the way they are.
24. Around here, people value marginalized employees for who they are, regardless of any potential differences.
25. Around here, marginalized and non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.
26. Around here, people treat marginalized employees like outsiders.
27. Around here, people put in the effort to ensure that marginalized employees aren’t left out.
28. Around here, people do their best to involve marginalized employees in informal gatherings.
29. Around here, there is zero tolerance for people who exclude marginalized employees.

Justice toward Historically Marginalized Employees [31 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

1. Top leadership aspires for HR-related decision-making procedures to be enacted fairly for marginalized employees.
2. This organization aims to ensure impartiality in HR-related decision-making procedures for marginalized and non-marginalized employees.
3. This organization values complete transparency with marginalized employees during HR-related decision-making procedures.
4. This organization strives to treat marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.
5. Top leadership strives to ensure timely communication with marginalized employees for HR-related decision-making procedures.
6. Top leadership is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for marginalized employees.
7. Fairness for marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.
8. This organization strives to ensure that outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions) are equally distributed to marginalized and non-marginalized employees alike.
9. Top leadership is committed to ensuring that outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions) are fairly granted to marginalized employees.
10. Top leadership ensures that marginalized employees are treated with respect and dignity when decisions regarding pay and promotions are communicated.

Organizational policies and practices

11. Around here, organizational decision-makers give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that employees put to their work, regardless of their marginalized group status.
12. Around here, marginalized and non-marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring.
13. Around here, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for all employees, regardless of their marginalized group status.
14. Around here, HR-related decision-making procedures are fair for marginalized employees.
15. Around here, there are safe ways for marginalized employees to voice their grievances when they feel like they are left out of important organizational matters.
16. Around here, marginalized employees are encouraged to express their views during decision-making procedures that affect their outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions).
17. Around here, capable people succeed at all levels in the organization, regardless of their marginalized group status.
18. Around here, the performance evaluation system is fair to marginalized employees.
19. Around here, organizational decision-makers are candid when explaining decision-making procedures (e.g., for pay and promotions) to marginalized employees.
20. Around here, decisions affecting pay and promotions are communicated with marginalized employees in a timely manner.
21. Around here, organizational decision-makers have a track record of promoting employees objectively, regardless of their marginalized group status.
22. Around here, organizational decision-makers make layoff decisions fairly, regardless of employees’ marginalized group status.
23. Around here, there are policies that ensure that marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as non-marginalized employees.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

24. Around here, people encourage marginalized employees to voice their grievances if they feel like they are left out of important organizational matters.
25. Around here, people treat marginalized employees fairly.
26. Around here, people assume those from marginalized groups are just as competent as everyone else.
27. Around here, people who treat marginalized employees unfairly are shunned.
28. Around here, people believe that marginalized and non-marginalized employees deserve the same outcomes (e.g., pay, promotion).
29. Around here, people believe that promotions should be given based on employees’ merits, regardless of their marginalized group status.
30. Around here, people believe that marginalized employees are given worse treatment during selection and/or performance procedures.
31. Around here, people believe that marginalized employees deserve explanations for the outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions) they do or do not receive.

Elimination of Discrimination against Historically Marginalized Group Members [31 items]

Top leadership and organizational values
1. Top leadership strives to remove any obstacles that negatively impact marginalized employees.
2. Top leadership aims to eliminate any barriers that impact the advancement of marginalized employees.
3. Intolerance of discrimination against marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.
4. Top leadership is dedicated to ensuring that marginalized employees do not receive negative treatment by people in the organization.
5. This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward its marginalized employees.
6. Top leadership is committed to ensuring that marginalized employees are not discriminated against.
7. This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against marginalized employees.

Organizational policies and practices

8. Around here, organizational decision-makers typically provide fewer opportunities for advancement to marginalized employees.
9. Around here, there are formal policies that negatively impact the advancement of marginalized employees.
10. Around here, recruitment strategies fail to target marginalized employees.
11. Around here, organizational decision-makers sometimes don’t always follow the stated organizational policies against discrimination.
12. Around here, organizational decision-makers engage in discriminatory treatment toward marginalized employees.
13. Around here, when people intentionally or unintentionally discriminate against marginalized employees, organizational decision-makers take it seriously.
14. Around here, employees who engage in discriminatory treatment toward marginalized groups are formally reprimanded.
15. Around here, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against marginalized groups immediately.
16. Around here, employees are educated on the negative effects of intentional and unintentional discrimination for marginalized group members.
17. Around here, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against marginalized groups.
18. Around here, there is work being done so that marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.
19. Around here, marginalized employees are less likely to be developed or advanced compared to non-marginalized employees.
20. Around here, performance evaluations seem to be biased against marginalized employees.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

21. Around here, organizational policies that harm marginalized employees are not questioned.
22. Around here, people support organizational policies that negatively impact the advancement of marginalized employees.
23. Around here, some people make negative remarks about marginalized groups.
24. Around here, marginalized employees who may have different ways of talking or acting are treated as less competent or smart.
25. Around here, marginalized employees are interpreted differently than non-marginalized employees, even when they are saying the same thing.
26. Around here, when there is a conflict between people of different groups, other employees tend to take the side of the non-marginalized group.
27. Around here, people sometimes make insensitive comments toward marginalized groups.
28. Around here, sometimes a person's marginalized group status negatively impacts how they are viewed.
29. Around here, some people are biased and prejudiced against marginalized employees.
30. Around here, some people are intolerant of marginalized groups.
31. Around here, people raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against marginalized groups.
Appendix B
Pilot Study 2 Diversity Climate Items (Following Pilot Study 1)

Total = 112 items.

Representation and Worth of Historically Marginalized Employees [27 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

1. Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.
2. This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its employees who are members of marginalized groups.
3. Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by employees who are members of marginalized groups.
4. Valuing employees who are members of marginalized groups is very much a part of this organization's culture.
5. Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of employees who are members of marginalized groups.
6. This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining employees who are members of marginalized groups.
7. During decision-making, this organization values the input of employees who are members of marginalized groups.
8. Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for employees who are members of marginalized groups.

Organizational policies and practices

9. In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of employees who are members of marginalized groups.
10. In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.
11. In this organization, managers and supervisors treat employees like their contributions are valuable, regardless of marginalized group status.
12. In this organization, managers and supervisors value employees who are members of marginalized groups.
13. In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity.
14. In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels.
15. In this organization, managers and supervisors demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce.
16. In this organization, managers and supervisors support the unique ideas of employees who are members of marginalized groups.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

17. In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by employees who are members of marginalized groups are valued by other workers.
18. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups, are viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background.
19. In this organization, people think employees who are members of marginalized groups do not bring anything valuable to the table.
20. In this organization, employees receive recognition for valuing and promoting diversity.
21. In this organization, employees who advocate for diversity-related issues are well respected.
22. In this organization, people listen with an open mind to the ideas presented by other employees, regardless of marginalized group status.
23. In this organization, there is an old boys' club that makes it hard for employees who are members of marginalized groups to get ahead.
24. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups can see others who look like them around.
25. In this organization, having employees who are members of marginalized groups represented in senior management positions is taken for granted.
26. In this organization, people are not comfortable having employees who are members of marginalized groups in managerial positions.
27. When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.

Inclusion of Historically Marginalized Employees [27 items]

Top leadership and organizational values:

28. This organization strives to create an environment in which employees who are members of marginalized groups can be themselves.
29. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that employees who are members of marginalized groups are able to express who they truly are.
30. Top leadership in this organization values employees who are members of marginalized groups for who they are as people and not just the jobs they fill.
31. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that employees who are members of marginalized groups feel like insiders.
32. This organization strives to make it easy for employees who are members of marginalized groups to fit in.
33. Top leadership in this organization is committed to making employees who are members of marginalized groups feel included.
34. The inclusion of employees who are members of marginalized groups is very much a part of this organization's culture.

Organizational policies and practices:

35. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage employees who are members of marginalized groups to be themselves.
36. In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way for employees who are members of marginalized groups to express their full identities.
37. In this organization, there is a non-threatening environment in which employees who are members of marginalized groups can reveal their true selves.
38. In this organization, the insights of employees who are members of marginalized groups are used to rethink or redefine work practices.
39. In this organization, managers and supervisors pressure employees who are members of marginalized groups to conform to organizational norms.
40. In this organization, managers and supervisors can make employees who are members of marginalized groups feel like outsiders.
41. In this organization, there are social events where employees who are members of marginalized groups are less than welcome.
42. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups have access to informal networking opportunities.
43. In this organization, managers and supervisors ensure that employees who are members of marginalized groups are informed about informal social activities and organizational social events.
44. In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that employees who are members of marginalized groups feel included.
45. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage networking for employees who are members of marginalized groups.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines:

46. In this organization, the old boys’ club is alive and well.
47. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups are pressured to conform to organizational norms.
48. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups are encouraged to present themselves the way they are.
49. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups are valued for who they are by other workers, regardless of any potential differences.
50. In this organization, employees often share and learn about one another as people, regardless of their marginalized group status.
51. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups are treated like outsiders.
52. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups aren't left out by other workers.
53. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups are involved in social gatherings by other workers.
54. In this organization, there is zero tolerance for workers who exclude employees who are members of marginalized groups.

Justice Toward Historically Marginalized Employees [31]

Top leadership and organizational values:

55. Top leadership in this organization aspires for HR-related decision-making procedures to be enacted fairly for employees who are members of marginalized groups.
56. This organization aims to ensure impartiality in HR-related decision-making procedures for all employees, regardless of their marginalized group status.
57. This organization values complete transparency with employees who are members of marginalized groups during HR-related decision-making procedures.
58. This organization strives to treat employees who are members of marginalized groups with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.
59. Top leadership in this organization strives to ensure timely communication with employees who are members of marginalized groups for HR-related decision-making procedures.

60. Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for employees who are members of marginalized groups.

61. Fairness for employees who are members of marginalized groups is very much a part of this organization’s culture.

62. This organization strives to ensure that outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions) are equally distributed to all employees, regardless of their marginalized group status.

63. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions) are fairly granted to employees who are members of marginalized groups.

64. Top leadership in this organization ensures that employees who are members of marginalized groups are treated with respect and dignity when decisions regarding pay and promotions are communicated.

Organizational policies and practices:

65. In this organization, managers and supervisors give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that employees put to their work, regardless of their marginalized group status.

66. In this organization, all employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring, regardless of their marginalized group status.

67. In this organization, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for all employees, regardless of their marginalized group status.

68. In this organization, HR-related decision-making procedures are fair for employees who are members of marginalized groups.

69. In this organization, there are safe ways for employees who are members of marginalized groups to voice their grievances when they feel like they are left out of important organizational matters.

70. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups are encouraged to express their views during decision-making procedures that affect their outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions).

71. In this organization, capable employees succeed at all levels in the organization, regardless of their marginalized group status.

72. In this organization, the performance evaluation system is fair to employees who are members of marginalized groups.

73. In this organization, managers and supervisors are candid when explaining decision-making procedures (e.g., for pay and promotions) to employees who are members of marginalized groups.

74. In this organization, decisions affecting pay and promotions are communicated with employees who are members of marginalized groups in a timely manner.

75. In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of promoting employees objectively, regardless of their marginalized group status.

76. In this organization, managers and supervisors make layoff decisions fairly, regardless of employees’ marginalized group status.

77. In this organization, there are policies to ensure that employees who are members of marginalized groups receive the same job opportunities as employees who are members of non-marginalized groups.
General attitudes, behaviours and routines:

78. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups are encouraged to voice their grievances if they feel like they are left out of important organizational decisions.

79. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups are treated fairly by other workers.

80. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups are assumed to be just as competent as everyone else.

81. In this organization, workers who treat employees who are members of marginalized groups unfairly are shunned.

82. In this organization, workers believe that all employees deserve the same outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions), regardless of their marginalized group status.

83. In this organization, workers believe that promotions should be given based on employees' merits, regardless of their marginalized group status.

84. In this organization, workers believe that employees who are members of marginalized groups are given worse treatment during selection and/or performance procedures.

85. In this organization, workers believe that employees who are members of marginalized groups deserve explanations when they feel to receive outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions).

Elimination of Discrimination Against Historically Marginalized Group Members [27]

Top leadership and organizational values

86. Top leadership in this organization strives to remove any obstacles that negatively impact employees who are members of marginalized groups.

87. Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that impact the advancement of employees who are members of marginalized groups.

88. Intolerance of discrimination against employees who are members of marginalized groups is very much a part of this organization’s culture.

89. Top leadership in this organization is dedicated to ensuring that employees who are members of marginalized groups do not receive negative treatment by others in the organization.

90. This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward employees who are members of marginalized groups.

91. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that employees who are members of marginalized groups are not discriminated against.

92. This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against employees who are members of marginalized groups.

Organizational policies and practices

93. In this organization, managers and supervisors provide fewer opportunities for advancement to employees who are members of marginalized groups.

94. In this organization, the advancement of employees who are members of marginalized groups is hindered.

95. In this organization, managers and supervisors sometimes don’t follow the stated policies against discrimination.
96. In this organization, managers and supervisors discriminate against employees who are members of marginalized groups.

97. In this organization, when employees who are members of marginalized groups are intentionally or unintentionally discriminated against by other workers, managers and supervisors take it seriously.

98. In this organization, employees who engage in discriminatory treatment toward marginalized groups are formally reprimanded.

99. In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against marginalized group members immediately.

100. In this organization, employees are educated on the negative effects of intentional and unintentional discrimination on marginalized group members.

101. In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against marginalized groups.

102. In this organization, there is work being done so that employees who are members of marginalized groups can feel safe from discrimination.

103. In this organization, performance evaluations seem to be biased against employees who are members of marginalized groups.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

104. In this organization, policies that harm employees who are members of marginalized groups are not questioned.

105. In this organization, some employees make negative remarks about marginalized groups.

106. In this organization, employees who are members of marginalized groups are treated as less competent.

107. In this organization, when employees who are members of marginalized groups speak, their words are given the same weight as employees who are members of non-marginalized groups.

108. In this organization, employees make insensitive comments toward marginalized groups.

109. In this organization, a person’s marginalized group status can negatively affect how they are viewed.

110. In this organization, there is bias and prejudice against employees who are members of marginalized groups.

111. In this organization, employees are intolerant of marginalized group members.

112. In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against marginalized groups.
Appendix C

Pilot Study 2A Item-Sort Task Instructions

PAGE 1
Please read below before moving on.

On the next page are definitions of three categories or ways to describe workplaces: workplace diversity climate, workplace inclusion climate, and perceived justice in the workplace. In this study, you will be presented with statements that conceptually belong to one of these three categories. Your task is to indicate which category you feel each statement belongs to.

If you think a particular statement does not belong to any of the categories, select the “other” category. If you feel a particular statement fits into more than one category, select the category that you feel is the best choice.

Please note that some categories have more statements than do others. Therefore, you should not aim to sort the same number of statements to each category.

PAGE 2
Carefully read the three concepts below and their definitions. You will need to remember them throughout the study. These definitions will also appear at the top of the screen, which will make it easier for you to refer to them throughout the study.

**Workplace diversity climate**: This involves the degree to which an organization, its leaders, and people handle diversity-related issues in a positive way. This is demonstrated by valuing diversity and *marginalized employees*, including them socially, treating them fairly, and not discriminating against them.

**Workplace inclusion climate**: This involves the degree to which *all employees* and their input are valued, they are able to be their true selves, and they are treated fairly within their work unit.

**Workplace perceived justice**: This involves how a person believes that he or she is treated fairly by his or her organization and that his or her organization is fair.

PAGE 3
Remember to assign the statements to the concept that it fits best based on the definitions. If you do not believe that the statement belongs to any of the concepts, select the “other” category.
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Pilot Study 2B Item-Sort Task Instruction

PAGE 1  
Please read below before moving on.

On the next page are definitions of three categories or ways to describe workplaces: workplace diversity climate, workplace inclusion climate, and perceived justice in the workplace. In this study, you will be presented with statements that conceptually belong to one of these three categories. Your task is to indicate which category you feel each statement belongs to.

If you think a particular statement does not belong to any of the categories, select the “other” category. If you feel a particular statement fits into more than one category, select the category that you feel is the best choice.

Please note that some categories have more statements than do others. Therefore, you should not aim to sort the same number of statements to each category.

PAGE 2  
Carefully read the three concepts below and their definitions. You will need to use them throughout the study. These definitions will also appear at the top of the screen, which will make it easier for you to refer to them throughout the study.

**Workplace diversity climate**: The degree to which an organization, its leaders, and people demonstrate that they value diversity and historically marginalized employees by including them socially, treating them fairly, and not discriminating against them. By historically marginalized employees, we mean those who belong to groups that have been treated in society in an exclusionary or discriminatory way, either historically and/or currently (e.g., women, racio-ethnic minorities, LGBTQ, people with disabilities, etc.).

**Workplace inclusion climate**: The degree to which people perceive that, in their unit, employees are able to be their true selves, there is fairness, and that the input of employees is valued. Inclusion climate refers to how people perceive their work unit in general and how all employees are treated.

**Workplace perceived justice**: The degree to which a person believes that he or she, personally, is treated fairly by his or her organization and that his or her organization is fair.

PAGE 3  
Remember to assign the statements to the concept that it fits best based on the definitions. If you do not believe that the statement belongs to any of the concepts, select the “other” category.

Please take your time with the task, as it will not be possible to do the task effectively if you rush.
Appendix E

Pilot Study 2 Item-Sort Task Items

WORKPLACE INCLUSION CLIMATE ITEMS

1. This work unit has a fair promotion process.
2. The performance review process is fair in this work unit.
3. This work unit invests in the development of all its employees.
4. Employees in this work unit receive “equal pay for equal work.”
5. This work unit provides safe ways for employees to voice their grievances.
6. This work unit is characterized by a non-threatening environment in which people can reveal their “true” selves.
7. This work unit values work-life balance.
8. This work unit commits resources to ensuring that employees are able to resolve conflicts effectively.
9. Employees of this work unit are valued for who they are as people, not just for the jobs they fill.
10. In this work unit people often share and learn about one another as people.
11. This unit has a culture in which employees appreciate the differences that people bring to the workplace.
12. In this work unit employee input is actively sought.
13. In this work unit, everyone’s ideas for how to do things better are given serious consideration.
14. In this work unit, employees’ insights are used to rethink or redefine work practices.
15. Top management exercises the belief that problem-solving is improved when input from different roles, ranks, and functions is considered.

WORKPLACE PERCEIVED JUSTICE ITEMS

1. Overall, I’m are treated fairly by my organization.
2. In general, I can count on this organization to be fair.
3. In general, the treatment I receive around here is fair.
4. Usually, the way things work in this organization are not fair.
5. For the most part, this organization treats its employees fairly.
6. Most of the people who work here would say they are often treated unfairly.

INATTENTION CHECK ITEMS

1. In this organization, there are many marginalized employees. Please sort into “other.”
2. In this organization, marginalized employees are treated well. Please sort into “other.”
3. In this organization, diversity is important. Please sort into “other.”
You are invited to participate in a research study titled “Sorting Workplace Concepts” conducted by Nouran Sakr and Dr. Leanne Son Hing from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph. The results of this study will contribute to Nouran Sakr’s master’s thesis research. The purpose of this letter is to provide you with information to help you make an informed decision on participating in this research. The purpose of this study is to investigate how individuals think about and distinguish between different concepts related to the workplace.

As informed consent is paramount in research, it is essential that researchers ensure that participants understand this consent document. If you find any information in this consent document to be inaccessible or unclear, you are encouraged to contact the researchers with any questions or concerns. In addition, if you have any questions or concerns about the research, please contact:

Nouran Sakr, Master’s student, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph; nsakr@uoguelph.ca
Leanne Son Hing, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph; sonhing@uoguelph.ca

Only these researchers will have access to the personal information you provide.

Inclusion Criteria:
The researchers wish to be inclusive in their recruitment process. Participants need be at least 18 years old, full-time employees, proficient in English, and reside in the United States of America or Canada.

Procedure
Participation in this study involves completing a sort task for which you will be asked to sort individual statements (i.e., questionnaire items) to the appropriate category, choosing among: workplace diversity climate, workplace psychological safety, and workplace perceived justice. We will provide definitions for each of these construct categories when you are completing the study. This study should take 20 minutes to complete.

Payment for Participation
You will be compensated 40 cents for completing the study for 20 minutes of work.

Potential Risks and Discomforts:
Please note that the researchers do not foresee any risks to you for participating in this study, nor do they expect that you will experience any discomfort or stress. You are free to skip any questions you prefer not to answer and still remain in the study.
The data will be used for scientific purposes only. All data is studied at the group level not the individual level (we always look at group means not individual scores) and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity. In addition, you are welcome to contact the researchers to obtain a summary of findings for this study upon its completion. You will be reminded of this option when you are debriefed.

**Potential Benefits to Participants and/ or Society:**
There are no immediate benefits from participating in this study.

**Confidentiality:**
You will NOT be asked to provide your name or any immediate identifying information. The information you provide will be available only to the researchers, to the extent allowed by law. However, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the Internet.

**Participation and Withdrawal:**
You are under no obligation to complete this study, and your participation is completely free and voluntary. As a participant, it is within your rights to not participate in this study or to withdraw from the study at any time. You may withdraw from this survey at any time by simply closing your Internet browser. You are also free to skip any questions you prefer not to answer and still remain in the study. Once you have submitted the questionnaire you will not be able to withdraw your data, since we will not be collecting any identifying information.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact the researchers listed above.

**Rights of Research Participants:**
You do not waive any legal rights by agreeing to take part in this study. This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants.

If you have questions regarding your rights and welfare as a research participant in this study (REB#: 19-03-014) please contact: Director of Research Ethics; University of Guelph; reb@uoguelph.ca; (519) 824-4120 ext. 56606

**CONSENT OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT**

If you wish to participate in this study, please click the “I agree to participate” button below. If you do not wish to participate, please click the “I decline to participate” button below.

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records. You may print this page.

**Do you agree to participate in this study?**

I agree to participate

I decline to participate
Appendix G
Pilot Study 3, Study 1, and Study 3 Item-Sort Task Instructions

PAGE 1
Please read below before moving on.

On the next page are definitions of three categories or ways to describe workplaces: workplace diversity climate, workplace psychological safety, and workplace perceived justice. In this study, you will be presented with statements that conceptually belong to one of these three categories. Your task is to indicate which category you feel each statement belongs to.

If you think a particular statement does not belong to any of the categories, select the “other” category. If you feel a particular statement fits into more than one category, select the category that you feel is the best choice.

Please note that some categories have more statements than do others. Therefore, you should not aim to sort the same number of statements to each category.

PAGE 2
Carefully read the three concepts below and their definitions. You will need to use them throughout the study. These definitions will also appear at the top of the screen, which will make it easier for you to refer to them throughout the study.

Workplace diversity climate: The degree to which an organization, its leaders, and people demonstrate that they value diversity and historically marginalized employees by including them socially, treating them fairly, and not discriminating against them.

By historically marginalized employees, we mean those who belong to groups that have been treated in society in an exclusionary or discriminatory way, either historically and/or currently (e.g., women, racio-ethnic minorities, LGBTQ, people with disabilities, etc.).

Workplace psychological safety: The degree to which people perceive that, in their work team, other team members can be trusted to support them and other employees, and that the team members will not punish or reject them.

Workplace perceived justice: The degree to which a person believes that he or she, personally, is treated fairly by his or her organization and that his or her organization is fair.

PAGE 3
Remember to assign the statements to the concept that it fits best based on the definitions. If you do not believe that the statement belongs to any of the concepts, select the “other” category.

Please take your time with the task, as it will not be possible to do the task effectively if you rush.
Appendix H

Pilot Study 3, Study 1, and Study 3 Item-Sort Task Items

WORKPLACE PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY ITEMS
1. If you make a mistake on this team, it is often held against you.
2. Members of this team are able to bring up problems and tough issues.
3. People on this team sometimes reject others for being different.
4. It is safe to take a risk on this team.
5. It is difficult to ask other members of this team for help.
6. No one on this team would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts.
7. Working with members of this team, my unique skills and talents are valued and utilized.

WORKPLACE PERCEIVED JUSTICE ITEMS
7. Overall, I'm are treated fairly by my organization.
8. In general, I can count on this organization to be fair.
9. In general, the treatment I receive around here is fair.
10. Usually, the way things work in this organization are not fair.
11. For the most part, this organization treats its employees fairly.
12. Most of the people who work here would say they are often treated unfairly.

INATTENTION CHECK ITEMS
4. In this organization, there are many marginalized employees. Please sort into “other.”
5. In this organization, marginalized employees are treated well. Please sort into “other.”
6. In this organization, diversity is important. Please sort into “other.”
Appendix I

Pilot Study 3, Study 1, Study 2, and Study 3 Demographics

1. What do you identify as?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Gender non-binary
   d. Identity not listed above (please specify): ____________
   e. Prefer not to disclose

2. What is your age?
   a. Please enter: ____________
   b. Prefer not to disclose

3. What is your current employment status?
   a. Employed full-time
   b. Employed part-time
   c. Unemployed
   d. Prefer not to disclose

4. In which country do you currently permanently reside?
   a. Canada
   b. United States
   c. Other (please specify): ____________
   d. Prefer not to disclose

5. Are you proficient in English?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Prefer not to disclose
Appendix J

Pilot Study 3, Study 1, and Study 3 Debrief

Thank you for your participation in the study “Sorting Workplace Concepts.” The purpose of this study was to examine whether individuals can differentiate between concepts related to workplace diversity, psychological safety, and justice. The goal was to assess whether participants were able to correctly sort items belonging to each concept to their correct category. Specifically, we are interested in the items that you assigned to the diversity climate category, as these items will be used to design a new scale of diversity climate.

The three concepts included were workplace diversity climate, workplace psychological safety, and workplace perceived overall justice. These three constructs are similar but there are important differences between them. Diversity climate involves the degree to which an organization, its leaders, and its people handle diversity-related issues positively, which is demonstrated by valuing diversity and marginalized employees, including them socially, treating them fairly, and not discriminating against them. On the other hand, workplace psychological safety involves the degree to which all employees are safe to take interpersonal risks and express themselves within their work team, without fearing that others will reject or punish them. Finally, workplace perceived justice involves how a person believes that he or she is treated fairly by his or her organization and that his or her organization is fair.

We ensure confidentiality in our treatment of your study responses. Your responses will not be associated with your identity. Only people associated with this research will see your responses. The data will be used for scientific purposes only and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity. Finally, all data is studied at the group level rather than at the individual level. Researchers will not be looking at your individual responses.

If you have any further questions about the study or would like a summary report of the results, please contact Leanne Son Hing at sonhing@uoguelph.ca or (519) 824-4120 x. 54475. If you have any concerns with ethical issues related to this research, please contact the Director of Research Ethics at (519) 824-4120 x. 56606 or reb@uoguelph.ca.

For more information on the topic of the study, see:

Appendix K

Study 1 Diversity Climate Items (Following Pilot Study 3)

Total = 98 items.

Representation and Worth of Employees who are Members of Marginalized Groups [28 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

1. Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.
2. This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.
3. Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by historically marginalized employees.
4. During decision-making, this organization values the input of historically marginalized employees.
5. Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for historically marginalized employees.
6. This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining historically marginalized employees.
7. Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.
8. Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.

Organizational policies and practices

9. In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity.
10. In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.
11. In this organization, historically marginalized employees can see others who look like them.
12. In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.
13. In this organization, managers and supervisors value historically marginalized employees.
14. In this organization, managers and supervisors support the unique ideas of historically marginalized employees.
15. When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.
16. In this organization, there is an old boys' club that makes it hard for historically marginalized employees to get ahead.
17. In this organization, managers and supervisors treat historically marginalized employees like their contributions are valuable.
18. In this organization, managers and supervisors demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce.
19. In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

20. In this organization, employees receive recognition for valuing and promoting diversity.
21. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background.
22. In this organization, people think historically marginalized employees do not bring anything valuable to the table.
23. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued for who they are by other workers, regardless of any potential differences.
24. In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.
25. In this organization, people listen with an open mind to the ideas presented by historically marginalized employees.
26. In this organization, employees who advocate for diversity-related issues are well respected.
27. In this organization, people are not comfortable having historically marginalized employees in managerial positions.
28. In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is taken for granted.

Inclusion of Employees who are Members of Marginalized Groups [21 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

29. The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.
30. In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.
31. Top leadership in this organization values historically marginalized employees for who they are as people and not just the jobs they fill.
32. This organization strives to make it easy for historically marginalized employees to fit in.
33. Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.
34. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees feel like insiders.

Organizational policies and practices

35. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage networking for historically marginalized employees.
36. In this organization, managers and supervisors pressure historically marginalized employees to conform to organizational norms.
37. In this organization, managers and supervisors ensure that historically marginalized employees are informed about informal social activities and organizational social events.
38. In this organization, there are social events where historically marginalized employees are less than welcome.
39. In this organization, there is a non-threatening environment in which historically marginalized employees can reveal their true selves.
40. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.
41. In this organization, there is zero tolerance for workers who exclude historically marginalized employees.
42. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be themselves.
43. In this organization, managers and supervisors can make historically marginalized employees feel like outsiders.
44. In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way for historically marginalized employees to express their full identities.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

45. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated like outsiders.
46. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.
47. In this organization, historically marginalized employees aren’t left out by other workers.
48. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to present themselves the way they are.
49. In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.

Justice Toward Employees who are Members of Marginalized Groups [26 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

50. This organization values complete transparency with historically marginalized employees during HR-related decision-making procedures.
51. Fairness for historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.
52. This organization aims to ensure impartiality in HR-related decision-making procedures for historically marginalized employees.
53. This organization strives to treat historically marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.
54. This organization strives to ensure that outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions) are equally distributed to historically marginalized employees.
55. Top leadership in this organization strives to ensure timely communication with historically marginalized employees for HR-related decision-making procedures.
56. Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for historically marginalized employees.

Organizational policies and practices

57. In this organization, decisions affecting pay and promotions are communicated with historically marginalized employees in a timely manner.
58. In this organization, managers and supervisors give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that historically marginalized employees put to their work.
59. In this organization, there are policies to ensure that historically marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as historically non-marginalized employees.
60. In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of promoting historically marginalized employees objectively.
61. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.
62. In this organization, there are safe ways for historically marginalized employees to voice their grievances when they feel like they are left out of important organizational matters.
63. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to express their views during decision-making procedures that affect their outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions).
64. In this organization, HR-related decision-making procedures are fair for historically marginalized employees.
65. In this organization, managers and supervisors make layoff decisions for historically marginalized employees fairly.
66. In this organization, the performance evaluation system is fair to historically marginalized employees.
67. In this organization, managers and supervisors are candid when explaining decision-making procedures (e.g., for pay and promotions) to historically marginalized employees.
68. In this organization, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for historically marginalized employees.
69. In this organization, historically marginalized employees who are capable can move up the ranks.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

70. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are assumed to be just as competent as everyone else.
71. In this organization, workers believe that historically marginalized employees are given worse treatment during selection and/or performance procedures.
72. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated fairly by other workers.
73. In this organization, workers believe that historically marginalized employees deserve the same outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions) as historically non-marginalized employees.
74. In this organization, workers who treat historically marginalized employees unfairly are shunned.
75. In this organization, workers believe that historically marginalized employees deserve explanations when they fail to receive outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions).

Elimination of Discrimination Against Employees who are Members of Marginalized Groups [23 items]

Top leadership and organizational values
76. Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.
77. Top leadership in this organization is dedicated to ensuring that historically marginalized employees do not receive negative treatment by others in the organization.
78. This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.
79. Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that impact the advancement of historically marginalized employees.
80. Top leadership in this organization strives to remove any obstacles that negatively impact historically marginalized employees.
81. This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized employees.
82. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.

Organizational policies and practices

83. In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.
84. In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.
85. In this organization, the advancement of historically marginalized employees is hindered.
86. In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.
87. In this organization, managers and supervisors discriminate against historically marginalized employees.
88. In this organization, managers and supervisors provide fewer opportunities for advancement to historically marginalized employees.
89. In this organization, when historically marginalized employees are intentionally or unintentionally discriminated against by other workers, managers and supervisors take it seriously.
90. In this organization, performance evaluations seem to be biased against historically marginalized employees.
91. In this organization, policies that harm historically marginalized employees are not questioned.
92. In this organization, employees are educated on the negative effects of intentional and unintentional discrimination on historically marginalized group members.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

93. In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized groups.
94. In this organization, employees are intolerant of historically marginalized group members.
95. In this organization, there is bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.
96. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated as less competent.
97. In this organization, some employees make negative remarks about historically marginalized groups.
98. In this organization, a person’s historically marginalized group status can negatively affect how they are viewed.
Appendix L

Study 1 Diversity Climate Item Blocks

Block 1

1. When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.
2. Top leadership in this organization strives to ensure timely communication with historically marginalized employees for HR-related decision-making procedures.
3. In this organization, workers believe that historically marginalized employees are given worse treatment during selection and/or performance procedures.
4. In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.
5. In this organization, historically marginalized employees can see others who look like them.
6. In this organization, workers believe that historically marginalized employees deserve explanations when they fail to receive outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions).
7. In this organization, managers and supervisors treat historically marginalized employees like their contributions are valuable.
8. In this organization, managers and supervisors demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce.
9. In this organization, the advancement of historically marginalized employees is hindered.
10. In this organization, managers and supervisors give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that historically marginalized employees put to their work.
11. In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is taken for granted.
12. Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.
13. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.
14. In this organization, a person’s historically marginalized group status can negatively affect how they are viewed.
15. In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity.
16. Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.
17. In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized groups.
18. In this organization, employees are educated on the negative effects of intentional and unintentional discrimination on historically marginalized group members.
19. Top leadership in this organization strives to remove any obstacles that negatively impact historically marginalized employees.
20. In this organization, there is bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.
21. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage networking for historically marginalized employees.
22. In this organization, managers and supervisors make layoff decisions for historically marginalized employees fairly.
23. This organization strives to ensure that outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions) are equally distributed to historically marginalized employees.
24. In this organization, employees are intolerant of historically marginalized group members.
25. This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining historically marginalized employees.

Block 2

1. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated as less competent.
2. Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for historically marginalized employees.
3. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated fairly by other workers.
4. In this organization, there are policies to ensure that historically marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as historically non-marginalized employees.
5. In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way for historically marginalized employees to express their full identities.
6. This organization strives to make it easy for historically marginalized employees to fit in.
7. In this organization, there are safe ways for historically marginalized employees to voice their grievances when they feel like they are left out of important organizational matters.
8. In this organization, managers and supervisors discriminate against historically marginalized employees.
9. Fairness for historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.
10. Top leadership in this organization values historically marginalized employees for who they are as people and not just the jobs they fill.
11. During decision-making, this organization values the input of historically marginalized employees.
12. Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for historically marginalized employees.
13. In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.
14. In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.
15. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.
16. In this organization, historically marginalized employees aren’t left out by other workers.
17. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.
18. In this organization, managers and supervisors value historically marginalized employees.
19. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees feel like insiders.
20. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be themselves.
21. In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.
22. In this organization, employees receive recognition for valuing and promoting diversity.
23. In this organization, there are social events where historically marginalized employees are less than welcome.
24. Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.
25. This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.

Block 3

1. In this organization, people think historically marginalized employees do not bring anything valuable to the table.
2. In this organization, decisions affecting pay and promotions are communicated with historically marginalized employees in a timely manner.
3. In this organization, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for historically marginalized employees.
4. The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.
5. In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.
6. Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.
7. In this organization, performance evaluations seem to be biased against historically marginalized employees.
8. In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels.
9. In this organization, managers and supervisors ensure that historically marginalized employees are informed about informal social activities and organizational social events.
10. In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.
11. In this organization, workers who treat historically marginalized employees unfairly are shunned.
12. In this organization, managers and supervisors are candid when explaining decision-making procedures (e.g., for pay and promotions) to historically marginalized employees.
13. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are assumed to be just as competent as everyone else.
14. This organization values complete transparency with historically marginalized employees during HR-related decision-making procedures.
15. In this organization, HR-related decision-making procedures are fair for historically marginalized employees.
16. In this organization, policies that harm historically marginalized employees are not questioned.
17. In this organization, when historically marginalized employees are intentionally or unintentionally discriminated against by other workers, managers and supervisors take it seriously.

18. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background.

19. In this organization, managers and supervisors can make historically marginalized employees feel like outsiders.

20. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated like outsiders.

21. In this organization, people listen with an open mind to the ideas presented by historically marginalized employees.

22. In this organization, people are not comfortable having historically marginalized employees in managerial positions.

23. In this organization, historically marginalized employees who are capable can move up the ranks.

24. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued for who they are by other workers, regardless of any potential differences.

Block 4

1. This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.

2. Top leadership in this organization is dedicated to ensuring that historically marginalized employees do not receive negative treatment by others in the organization.

3. In this organization, managers and supervisors pressure historically marginalized employees to conform to organizational norms.

4. Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.

5. Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by historically marginalized employees.

6. This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized employees.

7. In this organization, workers believe that historically marginalized employees deserve the same outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions) as historically non-marginalized employees.

8. In this organization, there is zero tolerance for workers who exclude historically marginalized employees.

9. Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that impact the advancement of historically marginalized employees.

10. In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.

11. In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.

12. This organization strives to treat historically marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.

13. In this organization, there is a non-threatening environment in which historically marginalized employees can reveal their true selves.

14. In this organization, managers and supervisors support the unique ideas of historically marginalized employees.
15. In this organization, managers and supervisors provide fewer opportunities for advancement to historically marginalized employees.

16. In this organization, employees who advocate for diversity-related issues are well respected.

17. This organization aims to ensure impartiality in HR-related decision-making procedures for historically marginalized employees.

18. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.

19. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to present themselves the way they are.

20. In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of promoting historically marginalized employees objectively.

21. In this organization, there is an old boys' club that makes it hard for historically marginalized employees to get ahead.

22. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to express their views during decision-making procedures that affect their outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions).

23. In this organization, some employees make negative remarks about historically marginalized groups.

24. In this organization, the performance evaluation system is fair to historically marginalized employees.
Appendix M

Study 2 Diversity Climate Items (Following Study 1)

Total = 59 items.

Representation and Worth of Employees who are Members of Marginalized Groups [23 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

1. Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by historically marginalized employees.
2. Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.
3. During decision-making, this organization values the input of historically marginalized employees.
4. This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining historically marginalized employees.
5. Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.
6. Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for historically marginalized employees.
7. Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.
8. This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.

Organizational policies and practices

9. In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity.
10. In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.
11. In this organization, there is an old boys' club that makes it hard for historically marginalized employees to get ahead.
12. In this organization, managers and supervisors demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce.
13. In this organization, managers and supervisors value historically marginalized employees.
14. When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.
15. In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels.
16. In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.
17. In this organization, historically marginalized employees can see others who look like them.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines
18. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background.
19. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued for who they are by other workers, regardless of any potential differences.
20. In this organization, people think historically marginalized employees do not bring anything valuable to the table.
21. In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.
22. In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is taken for granted.
23. In this organization, employees receive recognition for valuing and promoting diversity.

Inclusion of Employees who are Members of Marginalized Groups [16 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

24. In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.
25. This organization strives to make it easy for historically marginalized employees to fit in.
26. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees feel like insiders.
27. Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.
28. Top leadership in this organization values historically marginalized employees for who they are as people and not just the jobs they fill.
29. The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.

Organizational policies and practices

30. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage networking for historically marginalized employees.
31. In this organization, there is zero tolerance for workers who exclude historically marginalized employees.
32. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be themselves.
33. In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way for historically marginalized employees to express their full identities.
34. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.
35. In this organization, there are social events where historically marginalized employees are less than welcome.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

36. In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.
37. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to present themselves the way they are.
38. In this organization, historically marginalized employees aren't left out by other workers.
39. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.

Justice Toward Employees who are Members of Marginalized Groups [10 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

40. Fairness for historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.
41. Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for historically marginalized employees.
42. This organization strives to treat historically marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.

Organizational policies and practices

43. In this organization, managers and supervisors give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that historically marginalized employees put to their work.
44. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.
45. In this organization, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for historically marginalized employees.
46. In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of promoting historically marginalized employees objectively.
47. In this organization, there are policies to ensure that historically marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as historically non-marginalized employees.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

48. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated fairly by other workers.
49. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are assumed to be just as competent as everyone else.

Elimination of Discrimination Against Employees who are Members of Marginalized Groups [10 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

50. This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.
51. This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized employees.
52. Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that impact the advancement of historically marginalized employees.
53. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.
54. Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.

Organizational policies and practices

55. In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.
56. In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.
57. In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

58. In this organization, some employees make negative remarks about historically marginalized groups.
59. In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized groups.
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Study 2 Consent

You are invited to participate in a research study titled “Sorting Workplace Diversity Concepts” conducted by Nouran Sakr and Dr. Leanne Son Hing from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph. The results of this study will contribute to Nouran Sakr’s master’s thesis research. The purpose of this letter is to provide you with information to help you make an informed decision on participating in this research. The purpose of this study is to investigate how individuals think about and distinguish between different concepts that are related to how they experience diversity-related issues in the workplace.

As informed consent is paramount in research, it is essential that researchers ensure that participants understand this consent document. If you find any information in this consent document to be inaccessible or unclear, you are encouraged to contact the researchers with any questions or concerns. In addition, if you have any questions or concerns about the research, please contact:

Nouran Sakr, Master’s student, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph; nsakr@uoguelph.ca
Leanne Son Hing, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph; sonhing@uoguelph.ca

Only these researchers will have access to the personal information you provide.

Inclusion Criteria:
The researchers wish to be inclusive in their recruitment process. Participants need be at least 18 years old, full-time employees, proficient in English, and reside in the United States of America or Canada. As well, participants cannot have participated in any other research from this set of studies.

Procedure
Participation in this study involves completing a sort task for which you will be asked to sort individual statements (i.e., questionnaire items) to the appropriate category, choosing among: representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, inclusion of historically marginalized employees, justice toward historically marginalized employees, and elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized employees. We will provide definitions for each of these construct categories when completing the study. This study should take 20 minutes to complete.

Payment for Participation
You will be compensated 40 cents for completing the study for 20 minutes of work.

Potential Risks and Discomforts:
Please note that the researchers do not foresee any risks to you for participating in this study, nor do they expect that you will experience any discomfort or stress. **You are free to skip any questions you prefer not to answer and still remain in the study.**

The data will be used for scientific purposes only. All data is studied at the group level not the individual level (we always look at group means not individual scores) and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity. In addition, you are welcome to contact the researchers to obtain a summary of findings for this study upon its completion. You will be reminded of this option when you are debriefed.

**Potential Benefits to Participants and/ or Society:**
There are no immediate benefits from participating in this study.

**Confidentiality:**
You will **NOT** be asked to provide your name or any immediate identifying information. The information you provide will be available only to the researchers, to the extent allowed by law. However, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the Internet.

**Participation and Withdrawal:**
**You are under no obligation to complete this study,** and your participation is completely free and voluntary. As a participant, it is within your rights to not participate in this study or to withdraw from the study at any time. You may withdraw from this survey at any time by simply closing your Internet browser. You are also free to skip any questions you prefer not to answer and still remain in the study. Once you have submitted the questionnaire you will not be able to withdraw your data, since we will not be collecting any identifying information.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact the researchers listed above.

**Rights of Research Participants:**
You do not waive any legal rights by agreeing to take part in this study. This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants.

If you have questions regarding your rights and welfare as a research participant in this study (REB#: 19-03-014) please contact: Director of Research Ethics; University of Guelph; reb@uoguelph.ca; (519) 824-4120 ext. 56606

**CONSENT OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT**

If you wish to participate in this study, please click the “I agree to participate” button below. If you do **not** wish to participate, please click the “I decline to participate” button below.

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records. You may print this page.

**Do you agree to participate in this study?**

[ ] I agree to participate

[ ] I decline to participate

**PRINT FORM**
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Study 2 Item-Sort Task Instructions

PAGE 1

Please read below before moving on.

On the next page are definitions of four categories or ways to describe workplaces: representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, inclusion of historically marginalized employees, justice toward historically marginalized employees, and elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members. In this study, you will be presented with statements that conceptually belong to one of these four categories. Your task is to indicate which category you feel each statement belongs to.

If you think a particular statement does not belong to any of the categories, select the “other” category. If you feel a particular statement fits into more than one category, select the category that you feel is the best choice.

Please note that some categories have more statements than do others. Therefore, you should not aim to sort the same number of statements to each category.

PAGE 2

Carefully read the four concepts below and their definitions. You will need to remember them throughout the study. These definitions will also appear at the top of the screen, which will make it easier for you to refer to them throughout the study.

Representation and Worth of Historically Marginalized Employees: The degree to which, at work, historically marginalized employees are represented across and promoted to different organizational levels, seen as valuable, and have their perspectives integrated in decision-making. This is reflected by top leadership and organizational values, people's behaviours, and policies to achieve this goal.

Inclusion of Historically Marginalized Employees: The degree to which, at work, historically marginalized employees can be themselves, are made to feel welcome, and are socially accepted, without pressure to conform. This is reflected by top leadership and organizational values, people's behaviours, and policies to achieve this goal.

Justice toward Historically Marginalized Employees: The degree to which, at work, there is justice for historically marginalized employees that includes fairness of: outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions), decision-making procedures, and interpersonal treatment. This is reflected by top leadership and organizational values, people's behaviours, and policies to achieve this goal.

Elimination of Discrimination against Historically Marginalized Group Members: The degree to which, at work, negative or harmful treatment of historically marginalized group members is eliminated. This is reflected by top leadership and organizational values, people's behaviours, and policies to achieve this goal.
Remember to assign the statements to the concept that it fits best based on the definitions. If you do not believe that the statement belongs to any of the concepts, select the “other” category.

Please take your time with the task, as it will not be possible to do the task effectively if you rush.
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Study 2 Debrief

Thank you for your participation in the study “Sorting Workplace Diversity Concepts.” The purpose of this study was to examine how individuals differentiate between concepts related to people’s experiences of the treatment of diversity-related issues in the workplace. The goal was to assess whether participants were able to correctly sort items belonging to each concept to their correct category or whether they were unable to differentiate between the concepts. Specifically, we are interested in the items that you assigned to each of the four categories, as we believe that the four concepts form the overarching concept of workplace diversity climate. The items that participants frequently assigned to each category will be used to design a new scale of diversity climate. The four concepts included were representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, inclusion of historically marginalized employees, justice toward historically marginalized employees, and elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized employees.

The four constructs (representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, inclusion of historically marginalized employees, justice toward historically marginalized employees, and elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members) are similar in that they all have to do with the degree to which diversity-related issues are handled in a positive way by an organization, its leaders, and its people, but there are important differences between them. Therefore, the goal of the present study was to assess if people were able to differentiate between the four concepts, therefore suggesting that diversity climate is comprised of four distinct components, or if in fact, people tend to blend them together, suggesting that diversity climate is not made up of distinct components.

We ensure confidentiality in our treatment of your study responses. Your responses will not be associated with your identity. Only people associated with this research will see your responses. The data will be used for scientific purposes only and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity. Finally, all data is studied at the group level rather than at the individual level. Researchers will not be looking at your individual responses.

If you have any further questions about the study or would like a summary report of the results, please contact Leanne Son Hing at sonhing@uoguelph.ca or (519) 824-4120 x. 54475. If you have any concerns with ethical issues related to this research, please contact the Director of Research Ethics at (519) 824-4120 x. 56606 or reb@uoguelph.ca.

For more information on the topic of the study, see:

## Appendix Q

### Study 2 Item Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Component</th>
<th>Original Item</th>
<th>Revised Item</th>
<th>Rationale for Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation and Worth</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity.</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity throughout the organization.</td>
<td>Enhancing clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation and Worth</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued for who they are as workers, regardless of any potential differences.</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued, regardless of any potential differences.</td>
<td>Reducing verbosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation and Worth</td>
<td>In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is taken for granted.</td>
<td>In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is deeply valued.</td>
<td>Enhancing clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>In this organization, there is zero tolerance for workers who exclude historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>In this organization, there is zero tolerance for workers who ignore historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>Enhancing distinction between discrimination and inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be themselves.</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be their true selves.</td>
<td>Enhancing clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>In this organization, there are social events where historically marginalized employees are less than welcome.</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are always welcome at social events.</td>
<td>Reducing verbosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to present themselves the way they are.</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to not hide their identities.</td>
<td>Enhancing clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Original Text</td>
<td>Enhanced Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of</td>
<td>In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of</td>
<td>Enhancing clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>promoting historically marginalized employees objectively.</td>
<td>paying historically marginalized employees fairly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>In this organization, historically marginalized employees are assumed to be</td>
<td>In this organization, workers support flexibility</td>
<td>Enhancing clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>just as competent as everyone else.</td>
<td>in decision-making procedures to ensure fairness for historically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that</td>
<td>Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that</td>
<td>Reducing verbosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impact the advancement of historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td>impact historically marginalized employees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Study 3 Diversity Climate Items (Following Study 2)

Total = 55 items.

Representation and Worth of Historically Marginalized Employees [20 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

1. Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by historically marginalized employees.
2. Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.
3. During decision-making, this organization values the input of historically marginalized employees.
4. This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining historically marginalized employees.
5. Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.
6. Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for historically marginalized employees.
7. Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.
8. This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.

Organizational policies and practices

9. In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity throughout the organization.
10. In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.
11. In this organization, managers and supervisors demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce.
12. In this organization, managers and supervisors value historically marginalized employees.
13. When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.
14. In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels.
15. In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.
16. In this organization, historically marginalized employees can see others who look like them.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines
17. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background.
18. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued, regardless of any potential differences.
19. In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.
20. In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is deeply valued.

Inclusion of Historically Marginalized Employees [15 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

21. In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.
22. This organization strives to make it easy for historically marginalized employees to fit in.
23. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees feel like insiders.
24. Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.
25. The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.

Organizational policies and practices

26. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage networking for historically marginalized employees.
27. In this organization, there is zero tolerance for workers who ignore historically marginalized employees.
28. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be their true selves.
29. In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way for historically marginalized employees to express their full identities.
30. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.
31. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are always welcome at social events.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

32. In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.
33. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to not hide their identities.
34. In this organization, historically marginalized employees aren't left out by other workers.
35. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.
Justice toward Historically Marginalized Employees [10 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

36. Fairness for historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.
37. Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for historically marginalized employees.
38. This organization strives to treat historically marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.

Organizational policies and practices

39. In this organization, managers and supervisors give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that historically marginalized employees put to their work.
40. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.
41. In this organization, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for historically marginalized employees.
42. In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of paying historically marginalized employees fairly.
43. In this organization, there are policies to ensure that historically marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as historically non-marginalized employees.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

44. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are treated fairly by other workers.
45. In this organization, workers support flexibility in decision-making procedures to ensure fairness for historically marginalized employees.

Elimination of Discrimination against Historically Marginalized Group Members [10 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

46. This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.
47. This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized employees.
48. Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that impact historically marginalized employees.
49. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.
50. Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.

Organizational policies and practices
51. In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.
52. In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.
53. In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

54. In this organization, employees don’t make negative remarks about historically marginalized groups.
55. In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized groups.

INATTENTION CHECK ITEMS
1. In this organization, there are many marginalized employees. Please rate this statement as “Very Strongly Disagree.”
2. In this organization, marginalized employees are treated well. Please rate this statement as “Strongly Disagree.”
3. In this organization, diversity is important. Please rate this statement as “Moderately Disagree.”
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Study 4 Diversity Climate Items (Following Study 3)

Total = 52 items.

Representation and Worth of Historically Marginalized Employees [20 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

1. Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by historically marginalized employees.
2. Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.
3. During decision-making, this organization values the input of historically marginalized employees.
4. This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining historically marginalized employees.
5. Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.
6. Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for historically marginalized employees.
7. Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity.
8. This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.

Organizational policies and practices

9. In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity throughout the organization.
10. In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization.
11. In this organization, managers and supervisors demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce.
12. In this organization, managers and supervisors value historically marginalized employees.
13. When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.
14. In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels.
15. In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.
16. In this organization, historically marginalized employees can see others who look like them.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

17. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background.
18. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued, regardless of any potential differences.
19. In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.
20. In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is deeply valued.

Inclusion of Historically Marginalized Employees [14 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

1. In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.
2. This organization strives to make it easy for historically marginalized employees to fit in.
3. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees feel like insiders.
4. Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.
5. The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.

Organizational policies and practices

6. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage networking for historically marginalized employees.
7. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be their true selves.
8. In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way for historically marginalized employees to express their full identities.
9. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.
10. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are always welcome at social events.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

11. In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.
12. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to not hide their identities.
13. In this organization, historically marginalized employees aren't left out by other workers.
14. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.

Justice toward Historically Marginalized Employees [8 items]

Top leadership and organizational values
1. Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for historically marginalized employees.

2. This organization strives to treat historically marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.

Organizational policies and practices

3. In this organization, managers and supervisors give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that historically marginalized employees put to their work.

4. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.

5. In this organization, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for historically marginalized employees.

6. In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of paying historically marginalized employees fairly.

7. In this organization, there are policies to ensure that historically marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as historically non-marginalized employees.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines

8. In this organization, workers support flexibility in decision-making procedures to ensure fairness for historically marginalized employees.

Elimination of Discrimination against Historically Marginalized Group Members [10 items]

Top leadership and organizational values

9. This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.

10. This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized employees.

11. Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that impact historically marginalized employees.

12. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.

13. Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.

Organizational policies and practices

14. In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.

15. In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.

16. In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.

General attitudes, behaviours and routines
17. In this organization, employees don’t make negative remarks about historically marginalized groups.
18. In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized groups.

INATTENTION CHECK ITEMS
4. In this organization, there are many marginalized employees. Please rate this statement as “Very Strongly Disagree.”
5. In this organization, marginalized employees are treated well. Please rate this statement as “Strongly Disagree.”
6. In this organization, diversity is important. Please rate this statement as “Moderately Disagree.”
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Study 4 Consent Form

Consent:

You are invited to participate in a research study titled “Exploring Perceptions of Workplace Diversity” conducted by Nouran Sakr and Dr. Leanne Son Hing from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph. The results of this study will contribute to Nouran Sakr’s master’s thesis research. The purpose of this study is to validate a new scale of workplace diversity climate.

As informed consent is paramount in research, it is essential that researchers ensure that participants understand this consent document. If you find any information in this consent document to be inaccessible or unclear, you are encouraged to contact the researchers with any questions or concerns. In addition, if you have any questions or concerns about the research, please contact:

Nouran Sakr, Master’s student, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph; nsakr@uoguelph.ca
Leanne Son Hing, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph; sonhing@uoguelph.ca

Only these researchers will have access to the personal information you provide.

Inclusion Criteria:
The researchers wish to be inclusive in their recruitment process. Participants need be at least 18 years old, full-time employees, proficient in English, and reside in the United States of America or Canada. As well, participants cannot have participated in any other research from this set of studies.

Procedure
Participation in this study involves responding to multiple survey items about your experiences of how diversity-related issues are treated in your workplace. At the end of the study, you will be asked to complete a few open-ended questions and a general demographics questionnaire. This study should take less than 30 minutes to complete.

Payment for Participation
You will be compensated 40 cents for completing the study for less than 30 minutes of work.

Potential Risks and Discomforts:
Please note that the researchers do not foresee any risks to you for participating in this study, nor do they expect that you will experience any discomfort or stress. You are free to skip any questions you prefer not to answer and still remain in the study.
The data will be used for scientific purposes only. All data is studied at the group level not the individual level (we always look at group means not individual scores) and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity. In addition, you are welcome to contact the researchers to obtain a summary of findings for this study upon its completion. You will be reminded of this option when you are debriefed.

**Potential Benefits to Participants and/or Society:**
There are no immediate benefits from participating in this study.

**Confidentiality:**
You will **NOT** be asked to provide your name or any immediate identifying information. The information you provide will be available only to the researchers, to the extent allowed by law. However, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the Internet.

**Participation and Withdrawal:**
You are under no obligation to complete this study, and your participation is completely free and voluntary. As a participant, it is within your rights to not participate in this study or to withdraw from the study at any time. You may withdraw from this survey at any time by simply closing your Internet browser. You are also free to skip any questions you prefer not to answer and still remain in the study. Once you have submitted the questionnaire you will not be able to withdraw your data, since we will not be collecting any identifying information.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact the researchers listed above.

**Rights of Research Participants:**
You do not waive any legal rights by agreeing to take part in this study. This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants.

If you have questions regarding your rights and welfare as a research participant in this study (REB#: 19-03-014) please contact: Director of Research Ethics; University of Guelph; reb@uoguelph.ca; (519) 824-4120 ext. 56606

**CONSENT OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT**

If you wish to participate in this study, please click the “I agree to participate” button below. If you **do not** wish to participate, please click the “I decline to participate” button below.

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records. You may print this page.

Do you agree to participate in this study? 

I agree to participate  

I decline to participate 

PRINT FORM
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Study 4 Questionnaire

Historically marginalized groups are those who, either historically and/or currently, are: less accepted, treated as less valuable, and/or discriminated against. Groups may be marginalized based on gender/gender identity, race/ethnicity/national origin, immigrant status, sexual orientation, religious identification, age, disability, socioeconomic status, etc.

Below are several statements concerning your workplace perceptions. Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Very Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>3 Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>4 Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>5 Neither Disagree nor Agree</th>
<th>6 Slightly Agree</th>
<th>7 Moderately Agree</th>
<th>8 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>9 Very Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. | Top leadership in this organization values what is brought to the table by historically marginalized employees. |
2. | Valuing historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture. |
3. | During decision-making, this organization values the input of historically marginalized employees. |
4. | This organization demonstrates a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining historically marginalized employees. |
5. | Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees. |
6. | Top leadership in this organization is committed to eliminating barriers to participation in decision-making for historically marginalized employees. |
7. | Top leadership in this organization demonstrates a visible commitment to diversity. |
8. | This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees. |
9. | In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity throughout the organization. |
10. | In this organization, there is a formal system that monitors progress toward increasing diversity in the organization. |
11. | In this organization, managers and supervisors demonstrate that they want to attract and retain a diverse workforce. |
12. | In this organization, managers and supervisors value historically marginalized employees. |
13. | When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them. |
14. | In this organization, policies and programs promote diversity at all levels. |
15. | In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees. |
16. | In this organization, historically marginalized employees can see others who look like them. |
17. | In this organization, historically marginalized employees are viewed positively by other workers, regardless of their background. |
18. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are valued, regardless of any potential differences.
19. In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.
20. In this organization, having historically marginalized employees represented in senior management positions is deeply valued.
21. In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.
22. This organization strives to make it easy for historically marginalized employees to fit in.
23. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees feel like insiders.
24. Top leadership in this organization is committed to making historically marginalized employees feel included.
25. The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.
26. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage networking for historically marginalized employees.
27. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be their true selves.
28. In this organization, managers and supervisors pave the way for historically marginalized employees to express their full identities.
29. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have access to informal networking opportunities.
30. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are always welcome at social events.
31. In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.
32. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are encouraged to not hide their identities.
33. In this organization, historically marginalized employees aren't left out by other workers.
34. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.
35. Top leadership in this organization is committed to dealing with issues concerning fairness for historically marginalized employees.
36. This organization strives to treat historically marginalized employees with dignity and respect during HR-related decision-making procedures.
37. In this organization, managers and supervisors give opportunities (e.g., assignments, training) based on the effort that historically marginalized employees put to their work.
38. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.
39. In this organization, educational and developmental opportunities are provided for historically marginalized employees.
40. In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of paying historically marginalized employees fairly.
41. In this organization, there are policies to ensure that historically marginalized employees receive the same job opportunities as historically non-marginalized employees.
42. In this organization, workers support flexibility in decision-making procedures to ensure fairness for historically marginalized employees.
43. This organization is committed to eliminating bias and prejudice against historically marginalized employees.
44. This organization strives to eliminate any intentional or unintentional discrimination toward historically marginalized employees.
45. Top leadership in this organization aims to eliminate any barriers that impact historically marginalized employees.
46. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.
47. Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.
48. In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.
49. In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.
50. In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.
51. In this organization, employees don’t make negative remarks about historically marginalized groups.
52. In this organization, employees raise awareness about the dangers of discrimination against historically marginalized groups.

INATTENTION CHECK ITEMS

53. In this organization, there are many marginalized employees. Please rate this statement as “Very Strongly Disagree.”
54. In this organization, marginalized employees are treated well. Please rate this statement as “Strongly Disagree.”
55. In this organization, diversity is important. Please rate this statement as “Moderately Disagree.”
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Study 4 Demographics

6. What do you identify as?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Gender Non-Binary
   d. Identity not listed above (please specify): ____________
   e. Prefer not to disclose

7. What is your age?
   a. ____________
   b. Prefer not to disclose

8. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
   a. Some high school
   b. High school (or equivalent)
   c. Some college
   d. 1-2 year college degree (e.g., Associate’s)
   e. 3-4 year college degree (e.g., BA, BS)
   f. Master’s degree
   g. Doctoral degree
   h. Professional degree (e.g., MD, JD)
   i. Prefer not to disclose

9. What is your current employment status?
   a. Employed full-time
   b. Employed part-time
   c. Unemployed
   d. Prefer not to disclose

10. What is your current annual income? (in dollars) ____________

11. [If employed] In what sector are you currently employed?
   a. Non-for-profit
   b. Public
   c. Private
   d. Other (please specify): ____________

12. [If employed] In what industry are you currently employed? ____________

13. Which of the following groups BEST describe you? Please CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.
   a. Indigenous
   b. White
   c. Black or African American
   d. Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
   e. American Indian or Alaska Native
   f. Asian
g. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander  
h. Identities not otherwise listed (please specify): ____________  
i. Prefer not to disclose  

14. In which country do you currently permanently reside?  
a. Canada  
i. How long have you been residing in Canada? ____________ years  
b. United States  
i. How long have you been residing in the United States? ____________ years  
c. Other (please specify): ____________  
d. Prefer not to disclose  

15. Which sexual orientation do you most identify as? Select all that apply.  
a. Straight  
b. Lesbian  
c. Gay  
d. Bisexual  
e. Identity not listed above (please specify): ____________  
f. Prefer not to disclose  

16. What is your preferred religious identification?  
a. Catholic  
b. Protestant  
c. Orthodox  
d. Other Christian  
e. Muslim  
f. Hindu  
g. Sikh  
h. Buddhist  
i. Jewish  
j. Atheist  
k. Agnostic  
l. Other (please specify): ____________  
m. Prefer not to disclose  

17. Do you identify as a person living with a disability (e.g., physical, cognitive, or psychological)?  
a. Yes  
i. If you would like to, please specify the disability: ____________  
b. No  
c. Prefer not to disclose  

18. [If employed] Think of this ladder as a representation of where jobs and occupations fall within the United States. At the top of the ladder are the jobs that are most respected and prestigious (e.g., judges, doctors). At the bottom are the jobs that are least respected and prestigious (e.g., custodian, kitchen assistant). Where would you place your job or occupation on this ladder?
19. Would you characterize your parents’ socioeconomic status when you were growing up as:
   a. Lower class
   b. Middle class
   c. Upper class
   d. Other (please specify): ____________
   e. Prefer not to disclose

20. [If employed] Which of your identities (e.g., gender identity, ethnic identity, religious identity, etc.) are most salient to you when you are at work? ____________

21. Historically marginalized groups are those who, either historically and/or currently, are: less accepted, treated as less valuable, and/or discriminated against. Groups may be marginalized based on gender/gender identity, race/ethnicity/national origin, immigrant status, sexual orientation, religious identification, age, disability, and socioeconomic status, etc.

   With which group do you identify?

   1. Non-Marginalized Group
   2. Marginalized Group
      a. To what extent do you identify as a marginalized group member?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix W

Study 4 Debrief

Thank you for your participation in the study “Exploring Perceptions of Workplace Diversity.” The purpose of the study was to test how people respond to a newly developed workplace diversity climate scale. We will perform statistical analysis on the data to establish how different items (i.e., questions) were responded to by participants. Through a statistical technique called factor analysis we can determine which items “hang together” and more accurately tap into our construct of interest. Items that do not “hang together” will be dropped from the scale. After this study is complete, we hope to have a version of the scale that is short, reliable, and easy to administer.

We ensure confidentiality in our treatment of your study responses. Your responses will not be associated with your identity. Only people associated with this research will see your responses. The data will be used for scientific purposes only and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity. Finally, all data is studied at the group level rather than at the individual level. Researchers will not be looking at your individual responses.

If you have any further questions about the study or would like a summary report of the results, please contact Leanne Son Hing at sonhing@uoguelph.ca or (519) 824-4120 x. 54475. If you have any concerns with ethical issues related to this research, please contact the Director of Research Ethics at (519) 824-4120 x. 56606 or reb@uoguelph.ca.

For more information on the topic of the study and coping with work stress, see:


Appendix X

Study 5 Diversity Climate Items (Following Study 4)

Total = 18 items.

Interpersonal Worth and Inclusion [7 items]

1. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.
2. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.
3. In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of paying historically marginalized employees fairly.
4. In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.
5. In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.
6. In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.
7. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be their true selves.

Organizational Representation and Inclusion [6 items]

8. When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.
9. This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.
10. In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity throughout the organization.
11. Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.
12. In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.
13. The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.

Organizational Anti-Discrimination [5 items]

14. In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.
15. In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.
16. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.
17. In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.
18. Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.
Appendix Y
Initially Proposed Models for Diversity Climate

Based on our initial conceptualization of diversity climate, there were four possible models that could emerge based on the EFA, as the diversity climate items had been generated to capture four components of diversity climate (i.e., representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, inclusion of historically marginalized employees, justice toward historically marginalized employees, and elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members) and three sources of diversity climate (i.e., top leadership and organizational values, organizational policies and practices, and general attitudes, behaviours, and routines). The models are discussed below.

Model 1: Four-factor Model with a Representation and Worth of Historically Marginalized Employees Factor, Inclusion of Historically Marginalized Employees Factor, Justice Toward Historically Marginalized Employees Factor, and Elimination of Discrimination Against Historically Marginalized Group Members Factor

A possible model that could emerge is a four-factor model, where representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, inclusion of historically marginalized employees, justice toward historically marginalized employees, and elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members come out as four distinct factors. This model would suggest that perceiving one of the aforementioned dimensions of diversity climate does not necessitate the other dimensions will also be perceived, as they are four distinct phenomena. People could perceive that historically marginalized employees are represented and valued where they work but that they are not socially included, do not receive just treatment, and are still subjected to discriminatory experiences. The same arguments hold true for perceiving that historically marginalized employees are included in the organization, receive fair outcomes, procedures, and interpersonal treatment, or that they
are not discriminated against. This model would also suggest that people form holistic
evaluations of diversity climate within each of its component, regardless of its source (i.e.,
what conveys it).

**Model 2: Three-Factor Model with a Top Leadership and Organizational Values
Factor, an Organizational Policies and Practices Factor, and a General Attitudes,
Behaviours, and Routines Factor**

A second model that could result is one where factors emerge along the three different
sources of diversity climate. This model would be in line with Cachat-Rosset et al.’s (2017)
definition of diversity climate as comprising “the intent, programs, attitudes and behaviours
in favour of visible or invisible forms of diversity” (p. 12). This factor solution would suggest
that each diversity climate source is distinct from the other, and that the ways that diversity
climate manifest itself in the organization (i.e., representation and worth, inclusion of
historically marginalized employees, etc.) are not separate factors. In other words, people
could evaluate diversity climate sources differently but form overall perceptions of diversity
climate within each source, regardless of how it manifests itself.

**Model 3: Three-factor Model with a Representation and Worth of Historically
Marginalized Employees Factor, Inclusion of Historically Marginalized Employees
Factor, and a Justice Toward Historically Marginalized Employees and Elimination of
Discrimination Against Historically Marginalized Group Members Factor**

A third model that could emerge is one where representation and worth of historically
marginalized employees form one factor, inclusion of historically marginalized employees
forms a second factor, and justice toward historically marginalized employees and
elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members combine to
form a third factor. This model would suggest that justice toward historically marginalized
employees and the elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group
members at work are evaluated analogously rather as two separate constructs. However, such perceptions would be distinct from perceptions of the representation and worth, and inclusion of historically marginalized employees.

**Model 4: Unidimensional Model with One Diversity Climate Factor**

A fourth potential model is one where there is a single diversity climate factor. This model would imply that representation and worth of historically marginalized employees, inclusion of historically marginalized employees, justice toward historically marginalized employees, and elimination of discrimination against historically marginalized group members, as well as the three sources of diversity climate, are all part of the same underlying factor. Therefore, people could form holistic evaluations of diversity climate in their organization, regardless of how it manifests itself or what conveys it.
You are invited to participate in a research study titled “Assessing Perceptions of Workplace Diversity” conducted by Nouran Sakr and Dr. Leanne Son Hing from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph. The results of this study will contribute to Nouran Sakr’s master’s thesis research. The purpose of this study is to validate a new scale of workplace diversity climate.

As informed consent is paramount in research, it is essential that researchers ensure that participants understand this consent document. If you find any information in this consent document to be inaccessible or unclear, you are encouraged to contact the researchers with any questions or concerns. In addition, if you have any questions or concerns about the research, please contact:

Nouran Sakr, Master’s student, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph; nsakr@uoguelph.ca
Leanne Son Hing, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph; sonhing@uoguelph.ca

Only these researchers will have access to the personal information you provide.

Inclusion Criteria:
The researchers wish to be inclusive in their recruitment process. Participants need be at least 18 years old, full-time employees, proficient in English, and reside in the United States of America or Canada. As well, participants cannot have participated in any other research from this set of studies.

Procedure
Participation in this study involves responding to multiple survey items about your experiences of how diversity-related issues are treated in your workplace. At the end of the study, you will be asked to complete a few open-ended questions and a general demographics questionnaire. This study should take less than 30 minutes to complete.

Payment for Participation
You will be compensated 40 cents for completing the study for less than 30 minutes of work.

Potential Risks and Discomforts:
Please note that the researchers do not foresee any risks to you for participating in this study, nor do they expect that you will experience any discomfort or stress. You are free to skip any questions you prefer not to answer and still remain in the study.

The data will be used for scientific purposes only. All data is studied at the group level not the individual level (we always look at group means not individual scores) and any
publication of these data will not contain references to your identity. In addition, you are welcome to contact the researchers to obtain a summary of findings for this study upon its completion. You will be reminded of this option when you are debriefed.

**Potential Benefits to Participants and/ or Society:**
There are no immediate benefits from participating in this study.

**Confidentiality:**
You will **NOT** be asked to provide your name or any immediate identifying information. The information you provide will be available only to the researchers, to the extent allowed by law. However, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the Internet.

**Participation and Withdrawal:**
You are **under no obligation to complete this study**, and your participation is completely free and voluntary. As a participant, it is within your rights to not participate in this study or to withdraw from the study at any time. You may withdraw from this survey at any time by simply closing your Internet browser. You are also free to skip any questions you prefer not to answer and still remain in the study. Once you have submitted the questionnaire you will not be able to withdraw your data, since we will not be collecting any identifying information.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact the researchers listed above.

**Rights of Research Participants:**
You do not waive any legal rights by agreeing to take part in this study. This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants.

If you have questions regarding your rights and welfare as a research participant in this study (REB#: 19-03-014) please contact: Director of Research Ethics; University of Guelph; reb@uoguelph.ca; (519) 824-4120 ext. 56606

**CONSENT OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT**

If you wish to participate in this study, please click the “I agree to participate” button below. If you do not wish to participate, please click the “I decline to participate” button below.

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records. You may print this page.

---

Do you agree to participate in this study?  

I agree to participate

I decline to participate

PRINT FORM
Appendix AA

Study 5 Questionnaire

Historically marginalized groups are those who, either historically and/or currently, are: less accepted, treated as less valuable, and/or discriminated against. Groups may be marginalized based on gender/gender identity, race/ethnicity/national origin, immigrant status, sexual orientation, religious identification, age, disability, socioeconomic status, etc.

Below are several statements concerning your workplace perceptions. Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree nor Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Very Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.
20. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.
21. In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of paying historically marginalized employees fairly.
22. In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.
23. In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.
24. In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.
25. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be their true selves.
26. When hiring in this organization, to increase the applicant pool of historically marginalized group members, recruitment strategies (e.g., advertisements) specifically target them.
27. This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.
28. In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity throughout the organization.
29. Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.
30. In this organization, a lot of organizational effort is invested to ensure that historically marginalized employees feel included.
31. The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.
32. In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.
33. In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.
34. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.
35. In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.
36. Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.

INATTENTION CHECK ITEMS
56. In this organization, there are many marginalized employees. Please rate this statement as “Very Strongly Disagree.”
57. In this organization, marginalized employees are treated well. Please rate this statement as “Strongly Disagree.”
58. In this organization, diversity is important. Please rate this statement as “Moderately Disagree.”
Thank you for your participation in the study “Assessing Perceptions of Workplace Diversity.” The purpose of the study was to test how people respond to a newly-developed diversity climate scale. We will perform statistical analysis on the data to establish how different items (i.e., questions) were responded to by participants. Through a statistical technique called factor analysis we can confirm which items “hang together” and more accurately tap into our construct of interest. Items that do not “hang together” will be dropped from the scale. After this study is complete, we hope to have a version of the scale that is short, reliable, and easy to administer.

We ensure confidentiality in our treatment of your study responses. Your responses will not be associated with your identity. Only people associated with this research will see your responses. The data will be used for scientific purposes only and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity. Finally, all data is studied at the group level rather than at the individual level. Researchers will not be looking at your individual responses.

If you have any further questions about the study or would like a summary report of the results, please contact Leanne Son Hing at sonhing@uoguelph.ca or (519) 824-4120 x. 54475. If you have any concerns with ethical issues related to this research, please contact the Director of Research Ethics at (519) 824-4120 x. 56606 or reb@uoguelph.ca.

For more information on the topic of study and coping with work stress, see:


Appendix AC

Final Workplace Diversity Climate Scale

Total = 16 items.

Interpersonal Worth and Inclusion [7 items]

1. In this organization, historically marginalized employees have the same opportunity to receive mentoring as historically non-marginalized employees.
2. In this organization, historically marginalized employees are involved in social gatherings by other workers.
3. In this organization, managers and supervisors have a track record of paying historically marginalized employees fairly.
4. In this organization, the different opinions, ideas, and perspectives brought by historically marginalized employees are valued by other workers.
5. In this organization, historically marginalized and historically non-marginalized employees often share and learn about one another as people.
6. In this organization, managers and supervisors draw on the talents of historically marginalized employees.
7. In this organization, managers and supervisors encourage historically marginalized employees to be their true selves.

Organizational Representation and Inclusion [4 items]

8. This organization demonstrates complete commitment to its historically marginalized employees.
9. In this organization, managers and supervisors are held accountable for increasing diversity throughout the organization.
10. Top leadership in this organization strives for the representation, across different levels, of historically marginalized employees.
11. The inclusion of historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization's culture.

Organizational Anti-Discrimination [5 items]

12. In this organization, there are policies to resolve matters of discrimination against historically marginalized group members immediately.
13. In this organization, there are policies that seek to eliminate bias and prejudice against historically marginalized groups.
14. Top leadership in this organization is committed to ensuring that historically marginalized employees are not discriminated against.
15. In this organization, there is work being done so that historically marginalized employees can feel safe from discrimination.
16. Intolerance of discrimination against historically marginalized employees is very much a part of this organization’s culture.