

1

Disentangling the Nuances of Diversity Ideologies

2 Nicole Russell Pascual^{1*}, Teri A. Kirby², Christopher T. Begeny¹

3 ¹University of Exeter, Exeter, Devon, United Kingdom

4 ² Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA

5 *** Correspondence:**

6 Corresponding Author

7 nr312@exeter.ac.uk

8

2 Objectives: Minoritised racial groups typically report greater psychological engagement and
3 safety in contexts that endorse multiculturalism rather than colourblindness. However,
4 organisational statements often contain multiple (sub)components of these ideologies. This
5 research broadens our understanding of diversity ideologies in the real-world by: (1) mapping
6 out the content of real-world organisational diversity ideologies (2) identifying how different
7 components tend to cluster in real-world statements and (3) presenting these statements to
8 minoritised group members (Study 2) to test how these individual components and clusters
9 are perceived (e.g., company interest, value fit).

10 Methods: 100 US university statements and 248 Fortune 500 company statements were
11 content coded, and 237 racially minoritised participants ($M_{age} = 28.1$; 51.5% female; 48.5%
12 male) rated their psychological perceptions of the Fortune 500 statements.

13 Results: While universities most commonly frame diversity ideologies in terms of value-in-
14 equality, companies focus more on value-in-individual differences. Diversity rationales also
15 differ between organisations, with universities focusing on the moral and business cases
16 almost equally, but companies focusing on the business case substantially more. Results also
17 offered preliminary evidence that minoritised racial group members reported a greater sense
18 of their values fitting those of the organisation when considering organisations that valued
19 individual and group differences.

20 Conclusions: These are some of the first studies to provide a nuanced examination of the
21 components and clusters of diversity ideologies that real-world organisations are using,
22 ultimately with implications for how we move forward in studying diversity ideologies (to
23 better reflect reality) and redesigning them to encourage more diverse and inclusive
24 organisations.

25 *Key words:* Diversity, Diversity Rationales, Race

26 **Public significance statement**

27 Minoritised racial groups typically report greater psychological engagement and safety in
28 contexts that endorse a multicultural rather than a colourblind diversity ideology. However,
29 our research shows that organisational statements on diversity ideology are complex in the
30 real-world – often containing multiple (sub)components of these ideologies coupled with
31 particular diversity rationales (moral and business cases) that can also shape minoritised
32 individuals' responses.

Disentangling the Nuances of Diversity Ideologies

Racial diversity in the United States (US) has increased more quickly than previously predicted (Frey, 2020; US Census, 2019). As racial/ethnic demographics shift in US society, as well as within the workplace, it is crucial to understand how people's beliefs about how to approach diversity and difference, or their lay *diversity ideologies* (Rattan & Ambady, 2013), impact minoritised racial groups.

Indeed, people hold a range of beliefs about how to approach diversity and difference, and these ideologies can permeate organisational culture (Plaut, Thomas & Goren, 2009). Two of the most dominant ideologies primarily differ in whether they highlight group differences (i.e., *multiculturalism*) or downplay them (i.e., *colourblindness*; Gündemir, Martin & Homan, 2019). A great deal of scholarship suggests benefits to *highlighting* as opposed to *downplaying* group differences (e.g., Plaut et al., 2009; Wolsko, Park, Wittenbrink & Judd, 2000). However, diversity ideologies are far more nuanced than is captured by this broad distinction between multiculturalism and colourblindness. Embedded within each of these broad ideologies, there can be differing messages about *how* exactly to promote diversity (reflecting different diversity ideology components) and *why* (reflecting different diversity cases, or diversity rationales; for an overview, see Gündemir et al., 2019). Thus, the multicultural versus colourblind distinction does not itself allow us to fully understand which components drive marginalized individuals' reactions to an organisation's ideology, nor the potential beneficial effects of multiculturalism in particular.

In the present research, we document the prevalence of specific components of diversity ideologies and diversity rationales in the real-world to understand the extent to which theoretical understandings of diversity ideologies reflect real-world expressions of ideology (or not). We do so in part by integrating past insights from multiple streams of diversity research, including research on differing diversity ideology components. For example, Gündemir, Dovidio, Homan & De Dreu (2017a) distinguish between an emphasis on value-in-group differences, value-in-individual differences, or value-in-similarities (as potentially distinct and defining features of an ideology). Purdie-Vaughns and Walton (2011) further suggest that ideologies might incorporate multiple components, including both value-in-group differences (between-group variability) and value-in-individual differences (within-group variability; arguably rendering a distinct diversity approach/ideology unto itself).

Moreover, we integrate insights on different diversity rationales, including both the 'moral case' and 'business case' for promoting diversity (Thomas & Ely, 1996). In so doing, we aim to help conceptually bridge these differing streams, offer new insights on how they come together in real organisational settings (100 US universities, 250 companies in the Fortune 500), and more generally highlight the need for more thorough engagement with the nuance and complexity of diversity ideologies – not least to ensure that our understanding of these ideologies does not move forward in a way that is detached from their existence in the real-world.

To ensure our research addressed this gap, we identified components for both how we should navigate diversity (diversity ideology components) and why (diversity rationales) in current research's diversity ideologies (identified through a literature search conducted by two members of the research team). The key diversity ideologies are summarised in Table 1 (see supplementary materials for the full analysis). In every paper reviewed, the ideologies used did not reflect a single component in isolation, but a combination. Therefore, our research will code for both the prevalence of the components but also how they group together in real-world diversity statements in both US universities and companies. To help facilitate a more

1 nuanced understanding of why these ideologies are beneficial and for which outcomes, we
2 will also provide an initial, systematic examination of how minoritised racial group members
3 respond when presented with these real-world components (e.g., level of interest in the
4 organisation, sense of value fit, authenticity).

5 Although colourblindness was once the prevalent ideology in organisations (Plaut,
6 2002), multiculturalism has seen a dramatic increase (Apfelbaum et al., 2016). This shift in
7 ideology aligns with theoretical and experimental discussions supporting multiculturalism as
8 an identity safety cue for minoritised groups (Gündemir et al., 2019). Two key theories in the
9 field highlight the benefits of valuing differences (multiculturalism ideologies) over value-in-
10 similarities (colourblindness) for minoritised groups: acculturation and social identity
11 theories.

12 Acculturation theories propose that contact between members of different cultural
13 groups results in changes in both groups (Graves, 1967; Redfield, Linton & Herskovits,
14 1936). However, minoritised racial groups are particularly responsible for adapting to the
15 majority group and sometimes even suppressing their sub-group identities (Berry, 2001). As
16 cultural and racial identities are a key part of how people perceive themselves (Tajfel &
17 Turner, 1979), particularly for minoritised group members (Gerard & Hoyt, 1974),
18 downplaying those identities—as prescribed by colourblindness—can be detrimental for their
19 self-concept.

20 Multiculturalism is an ideology that enables minoritised racial groups to preserve their
21 cultural identity (Berry & Kalin, 1995). For minoritised groups, multiculturalism can increase
22 group identification and therefore results in more positive ingroup evaluations (Verkuyten,
23 2005). Accordingly, compared to colourblindness, minoritised racial groups tend to prefer
24 multiculturalism (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004). However, there are some important caveats
25 and complexity to this general pattern of findings. When minoritised racial groups are
26 underrepresented in an organisation, multiculturalism (versus colourblindness) increases
27 workplace trust, comfort and engagement for minoritised racial groups (Plaut et al., 2009;
28 Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008), but hurts their performance, persistence, and representation
29 under some circumstances (Apfelbaum et al., 2016). Taken at face value, this might suggest
30 that multiculturalism and colourblindness show discrepant findings for different types of
31 outcomes (e.g., behavioural versus psychological outcomes).

32 A key driver of these discrepant findings, however, may be the ways researchers
33 frame the ideologies. For example, some research has focused on valuing demographic group
34 differences in their multicultural ideologies (Kirby & Kaiser, 2021), but others have focused
35 on individual (trait) differences (Apfelbaum et al., 2016). Similarly, colourblindness has been
36 defined as a focus on *common ingroup identity* (Dovidio, Gaertner & Saguy, 2007), *valuing*
37 *equality* (Apfelbaum et al., 2016), *devaluing group identities* (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008),
38 *assimilationist* (adopting the majority groups' norms and views; Plaut et al., 2009), and *value-*
39 *in-individual differences* (i.e., celebrating uniqueness across individuals; Gündemir et al.,
40 2017a)

41
42 It is perhaps unsurprising that multiculturalism would create more identity safety for
43 minoritised group members when compared to assimilation or group devaluation (see Hahn,
44 Banchevsky, Park & Judd, 2015). However, even more positive components of
45 colourblindness that focus on groups' *value-in-similarities* suggest it can be detrimental for
46 outcomes such as workplace engagement (Plaut et al., 2009; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008).
47 Therefore, it appears that valuing equality (as was the case in Apfelbaum and colleagues'

1 (2016) research) is the only exception to the general pattern of colourblindness being
2 detrimental for minoritised racial groups. This aligns with cultural norms, as equality is
3 widely valued in the US (Hofstede, 1980; Thomas & Ely, 1996). Martin Luther King Jr.’s
4 infamous speech captured this by stating that he wished for a world in which we would judge
5 individuals “not by the colour of their skin but by the content of their character.” (Martin
6 Luther King, Jr, 1963).

7 In terms of multiculturalism, some research focuses on group differences (Kirby &
8 Kaiser, 2021) and some focuses on value-in-diversity (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008;
9 Verkuyten, 2005). As these differing definitions of multiculturalism are being compared to
10 differing definitions of colourblindness, it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions. For
11 example, focusing on value-in-group differences, compared to value-in-similarities, decreased
12 authenticity and increased perceptions of tokenism for Black Americans who were weakly
13 identified with their racial group (Kirby & Kaiser, 2021). However, *both* value-in-group
14 differences and value-in-individual differences increased minoritised groups’ leadership self-
15 efficacy when compared to value-in-similarities (Gündemir et al., 2017a).

16 The distinction between focusing on group differences and value-in-diversity is also
17 key. Purdie-Vaughns and colleagues (2008) found that a multiculturalism ideology, focused
18 on value-in-diversity, increased minoritised groups’ workplace trust and comfort more than a
19 colourblind ideology that devalued group identities. The difference in the valence of these
20 multiculturalism (celebrating) versus. colourblindness (devaluing) framings could explain the
21 discrepancy between this finding and some of those discussed previously (see Hahn et al.,
22 2015). Within multiculturalism, there is also a difference in valence between focusing on how
23 groups differ and going one step further to celebrating this diversity (see Table 1 for
24 examples). Our research aims to explore this difference further through documenting the
25 prevalence of both components and their relationships with minoritised groups’ perceptions.

26 Across the literature, these differences in components of ideologies that are classified
27 under the same or similar terms to multiculturalism versus. colourblindness has made it
28 difficult to understand which components drive different findings. These different
29 components of the ideologies represent at least five distinct ideas about navigating diversity
30 (*value-in-group differences*, *value-in-individual differences*, *value-in-similarities*, *value-in-*
31 *equality*, and *value-in-diversity*). This is the first paper to systematically compare these
32 components, document their presence in the real-world, and provide a better understanding of
33 their effects for the minoritised racial groups they intend to benefit. ¹

34 Not only does diversity rhetoric differ in prescriptions for *how* to navigate diversity,
35 but they differ in notions of *why* diversity is important—often called a “case for diversity” or
36 diversity rationale. The two main diversity rationales are the business and moral case. The
37 business case argues that diversity brings economic or instrumental value to the organisation
38 through increased productivity, whereas the *moral case* argues that promoting diversity is the
39 right thing to do (Noon, 2007). The *business case* has a number of downsides: (a) it is
40 generally less beneficial for minority groups as it can lead to deprioritisation of minority
41 group job applicants b) relate to increased graduation rate disparities between White and
42 Black students (Starck et al., 2021),, (c) it can lead to concerns from minoritised groups about
43 how they will be treated at work (Ely & Thomas, 2001), (d) it reduces minoritised groups’
44 sense of belonging (Georgeac & Rattan, 2023), and (e) it makes companies less appealing as

¹ Research with White people has shown that when colourblindness is treated as a multifaceted construct rather than unidimensional, the different components are associated with different prejudice outcomes (Whitley, Luttrell, & Schultz, 2022).

1 employers (Jansen, Kröger, Van der Toorn & Ellemers, 2021). Despite these downsides, the
2 business case has often been used as the rationale behind multiculturalism (Plaut, 2002). It has
3 even been used as an argument against colourblindness - diversity can be instrumental for the
4 organisation (van Knippenberg, De Dreu & Homan, 2004) and thus the differences that come
5 with diversity should be emphasised rather than downplayed (Gündemir et al., 2019).
6 However, as discussed above, multiculturalism tends to be preferred by minoritised racial
7 groups and therefore, it remains unclear whether the downsides of the business case are also
8 seen in the real-world when coupled with multiculturalism. In practice, multicultural
9 statements can and do make either the business or moral case (or both) and these differences
10 may also contribute to a lack of clarity about why and when multiculturalism versus
11 colourblindness provide identity safety.

12 This research aims to better understand how the different components of diversity
13 ideologies and rationales are perceived by minoritised racial groups. We will document the
14 components present in both university (Study 1a) and company (Study 1b) diversity
15 statements to understand how their rhetoric might differ. In addition to examining the
16 prevalence of individual components, we will also document which components tend to
17 appear together and whether particular combinations are especially beneficial. Diversity
18 ideologies and rationales have often been studied in isolation and our research aims to
19 understand how these two forms of diversity rhetoric appear together in the real-world.

20 In addition, we will examine how these components and their clusters relate to
21 psychological measures (Study 2). Specifically, we will investigate the relationships between
22 the company diversity statement components collected in Study 1b and minoritised racial
23 groups' interest in the company, perceptions of value fit, authenticity and tokenism.
24

25 **Study 1**

26 In Study 1, we assessed the prevalence of different components in real-world
27 university (Study 1a) and company (Study 1b) diversity statements. Specifically, we
28 examined how organisations approach diversity (value-in-group differences, value-in-
29 diversity, value-in-similarities, value-in-individual differences, and value-in-equality) and
30 why diversity matters to them (moral case and business case) in the statements of the top 100
31 US universities and top 250 Fortune 500 companies. We also assessed what components tend
32 to appear together within the same statements. Because previous research has shown that the
33 private sector focuses more on the business case than the public sector in Dutch organisations
34 (Jansen et al., 2021), we also explored the possibility that there are differences in how Fortune
35 500 companies (public sector organisations) versus US universities (private sector
36 organisations) discuss diversity (diversity ideologies) and how different diversity ideologies
37 and rationales cluster together.

38 **Method**

39 ***Study 1a Diversity Statement Coding***

40 We collected diversity statements from the top 100 US universities on the US News
41 and World Report rankings list. Research assistants copied the first block of distinctive text
42 (up until an image or subheading was used) on their diversity and inclusion webpages² and

² For organisations where diversity statements appeared in multiple locations, we used their diversity and inclusion page. For organisations that did not have a diversity and inclusion page, we searched the website for other places where the diversity statement could appear (e.g., careers or about us pages) and used those.

1 two coders³ independently content coded each statement to indicate whether any of the
2 components (*value-in-group differences*, *value-in-individual differences*, *value-in-similarities*,
3 *value-in-equality*, *value-in-diversity*, the *business case* or the *moral case*) were present
4 (summarised in Table 2; 1=present, 0=absent)⁴. Statements could be coded as having multiple
5 components. Once sufficient reliability was achieved (i.e., kappa reliability was at least .41, or
6 “moderate” agreement; see Landis & Koch, 1977)⁵, all discrepancies were discussed by the
7 coders to reach a unanimous decision⁶. These components were our independent variables of
8 interest.

9 ***Study 1b Diversity Statement Coding***

10 We collected diversity statements from the top 250 companies of the Fortune 500
11 companies. Two of these companies had no diversity statement present, so our final sample
12 size was 248. Four research assistants⁷ followed the same coding procedure as Study 1a
13 (summarised in Table 2).⁸⁹

14

³ The two coders were a white British/Spanish woman and an Asian woman who were long-term residents of the United Kingdom. The coding for the business case and moral case were conducted later and included a white French and a white British woman for the business case and two white women for the moral case.

⁴ The subjectivity of the coders may have influenced our results. For example, the interpretation of a white woman may differ from the interpretation of an Asian woman. However, during the first iterations of the coding process, we adapted our coding scheme so that different coders would have similar interpretations (i.e., until we obtained sufficient reliability).

⁵ Value-in-group differences: $\kappa = .66$; coder agreement = 83%, Value-in-individual differences: $\kappa = .54$; coder agreement = 81%, Value-in-similarities: $\kappa = .65$; coder agreement = 84%, Value-in-equality: $\kappa = .60$; coder agreement = 87%, Celebrating diversity: $\kappa = .77$; coder agreement = 89%, Business case: $\kappa = .56$; coder agreement = 78%, Moral case: $\kappa = .52$; coder agreement = 76%.

⁶ After coding the full set, three categories did not have sufficient reliability. After revising the coding scheme and recoding, value-in-similarities, value-in-equality, and celebrating diversity did not have sufficient reliability, but we attained sufficient reliability after one, one, and two more iterations, respectively. The business and moral cases were coded separately and required one iteration of coding the full set.

⁷ The four coders were three white women and one Asian woman. The coding for the business case and moral case were conducted later and included a white French and a white British/Spanish woman.

⁸ Sufficient reliability was achieved for all components: Value-in-group differences ($\kappa = .74$; coder agreement = 91%), Value-in-individual differences: ($\kappa = .50$; coder agreement = 80%), Value-in-similarities: ($\kappa = .51$; coder agreement = 88%), Value-in-equality: ($\kappa = .64$; coder agreement = 82%), Celebrating diversity: ($\kappa = .66$; coder agreement = 88%), Business case: ($\kappa = .53$; coder agreement = 81%), Moral case: ($\kappa = .44$; coder agreement = 77%).

⁹ For all categories, we attained sufficient reliability in one iteration of coding the full set of statements.

1 Study 1 Results

2 We began by examining the prevalence of diversity ideology components in current
3 universities' (Study 1a) and companies' (Study 1b) diversity statements. Next, we examined
4 how these components group together in real-world organisational diversity statements.

5 *Prevalence of Diversity Ideology Components*

6 **Study 1a.** In the university statements, value-in-equality (77%) was the most common
7 diversity ideology, followed by value-in-individual differences (69%), value-in-diversity
8 (63%), value-in-group differences (49%), and value-in-similarities (38%). In terms of the
9 'why' of diversity management, the moral case (52%) was more prevalent than the business
10 case (46%), although both appear in nearly half of statements.

11 **Study 1b.** In the company statements, value-in-individual differences (70.2%) was
12 instead the most common diversity ideology, followed by value-in-equality (53.6%), value-in-
13 diversity (28.6%), value-in-group differences (21.8%) and value-in-similarities (14.5%).
14 Amongst the statements that focus on difference, a focus on value-in-individual differences
15 was more prevalent than value-in-group differences. In terms of the 'why' of diversity
16 management, the business case (79.8%) was more prevalent than the moral case (31.9%) –
17 this pattern was similar to university statements, but much more pronounced.

18 *How Do Diversity Statement Components Group Together?*

19 We performed a hierarchical agglomerative cluster analysis of the diversity statement
20 ratings to understand how the diversity statement components cluster together.¹⁰

21 **Study 1a.** Capturing prominent clusters within university statements, the five-cluster
22 solution is shown in Table 3 and example statements are shown in Table 4. The first cluster –
23 reflecting what we refer to as *Moralistic Value-In-Diversity* – captured 30 statements that
24 were particularly focused on notions of diversity and difference (e.g., *value-in-group*
25 *differences*, *value-in-individual differences*, *value-in-diversity*) and *value-in-equality*, framed
26 within a *moral case* for diversity. The second cluster – reflecting *Instrumental Value-In-*
27 *Diversity* – captured 27 statements that were also focused on notions of diversity and
28 difference (e.g., *value-in-group differences*, *value-in-individual differences*, *value-in-*
29 *diversity*) and *value-in-equality*, but were framed within a *business case* for diversity (rather
30 than the *moral case*). Both of these clusters are similar to multicultural meritocracy
31 (Gündemir et al., 2017b; which also focuses on *difference in addition to* value-in-equality),
32 but further distinguishes between the distinct diversity rationales in which they are embedded.
33 The third cluster – reflecting *Instrumental Equality* – captured 20 statements that were high
34 on *value-in-equality*, *value-in-individual differences*, and the *business case*. The fourth cluster
35 – *Moral Equality* – captured 14 statements that were high on *value-in-equality* and the *moral*
36 *case*. The fifth cluster – *Dual Identity* – see Gaertner & Dovidio (2000) captured 9 statements

¹⁰ This analysis was performed in SPSS using the squared Euclidean distance similarity measure and the Ward's method (Ward, 1963). The Ward's method was selected as it gives more effective solutions than other methods for binary data (Hands & Everitt, 1987; Tamasauskas, Sakalauskas, Kriksciuniene, 2012). The number of clusters was determined through an analysis of the dendrogram and agglomeration schedule following Yim and Ramdeen's (2015) recommendations. Based on Clatworthy, Buick, Hankins, Weinman and Horne's (2005; also see Jolliffe, Jones & Morgan, 1982) recommendation, to assess the validity of the cluster structure, we removed variables and re-ran analyses. This suggested that our clusters were robust.

1 high on *value-in-individual differences*, *value-in-similarities*, and *value-in-equality*, grounded
2 in both the *business case* and *moral case* for diversity.

3 **Study 1b.** Within company statements there were fewer prominent clusters. The three-cluster
4 solution is shown in Tables 4 and 5. The first cluster – *Instrumental Individualism* – captured
5 121 statements (49%) that focused on *value-in-individual differences* and the *business case*.
6 The second cluster – *Moralistic Individualism* – captured 59 statements (24%) that that were
7 particularly focused on *value-in-individual differences*, *value-in-equality* and the *moral case*.
8 The third cluster – *Instrumental Value-In-Diversity* – which also appeared in university
9 statements, captured 68 statements (27%) that were particularly focused on diversity and
10 difference (e.g., *value-in-group differences*, *value-in-individual differences*, *value-in-*
11 *diversity*) and *value-in-equality*, framed within the *business case*.

12 **Study 1 Discussion**

13 Although both universities and organisations focus on value-in-similarities the least,
14 universities most commonly advocate for navigating diversity by focusing on value-in-
15 equality, whereas companies focus on value-in-individual differences. The reasons for why
16 diversity should be valued also differ between the organisations, with universities focusing on
17 the moral case and business case almost equally, but companies focusing on the business case
18 substantially more. This is in line with previous work that has shown that the business case is
19 more prevalent in the private sector (Georgeac & Rattan, 2023; Jansen et al., 2021)—this may
20 be because of differences in goals across sectors, among other potential differences.
21 Organisations may implement diversity ideologies to communicate to potential stakeholders
22 that the organisation is committed to diversity (i.e., a signalling rationale; Dover et al., 2020).
23 These stakeholders may differ between companies and universities (e.g., potential employees
24 versus students) and therefore so will the nature of the signalling rationale.

25 The ways statements grouped together also revealed differences between types of
26 organisations. In universities, statements that focus on diversity and difference commonly
27 cluster with either moral reasons for caring about diversity (Moralistic Value-In-Diversity) or
28 business case justifications (Instrumental Value-In-Diversity). However, in companies, only
29 the instrumental value-in-diversity statements are seen. The university statements also showed
30 a quadrant with statements either being very high (>75%) on value-in-equality (Instrumental
31 Equality and Moral Equality) or value-in-group differences (Moralistic Value-In-Diversity
32 and Instrumental Value-In-Diversity), and either high on the moral case (Moralistic Value-In-
33 Diversity and Moral Equality) or the business case (Instrumental Value-In-Diversity and
34 Instrumental Equality). For companies, we also found that statements were either high in the
35 moral case (Moralistic Individualism) or the business case (Instrumental Individualism and
36 Instrumental Value-In-Equality). However, we did not find the value-in-equality versus value-
37 in-group differences pattern we found for universities, perhaps as a result of the low
38 prevalence of value-in-group differences.

39 Moreover, whilst both focus on value-in-individual differences, in universities it tends
40 to come alongside value-in-equality, whereas in companies it is often paired with the business
41 case. Additionally, in universities but not in companies, we found that there is also a grouping
42 that focuses on dual identities (high in value-in-individual differences and value-in-
43 similarities) – this type of ideology recognises that people belong to individual subgroups
44 whilst also having a shared overarching identity (Glasford & Dovidio, 2011). Overall, these
45 findings suggest much stronger reluctance to focus on group differences in companies as
46 compared to universities and more of a tendency to focus on individualism.

1 In Study 2, we followed up on these clusters to assess how they are perceived by
2 minoritised racial groups, as well as which individual components drive effects. This allowed
3 us to better determine how rhetoric existing in real organisations impacts on underrepresented
4 groups.

5 Study 2

6 Despite numerous studies examining perceptions of multicultural and colourblind
7 ideologies, it remains unclear which components drive these effects. For example, *why* do
8 minoritised racial groups typically support multicultural over colourblind ideologies (Ryan et
9 al., 2007)? We aimed to address this gap by measuring minoritised racial groups' responses to
10 the different components discussed thus far, as well as the clusters identified in the
11 organisational statements. To better understand minoritised racial groups' perceptions of the
12 different components we assessed their perceptions of 248 Fortune 500 statements on a range
13 of different measures used in previous research in the field¹¹
14 (https://osf.io/q5h7f?view_only=c011ad1cec8b4e4a9925b0e8844a75fe)¹². Because of
15 inconsistent operationalisations of diversity ideologies and rationales in the literature, we did
16 not initially have strong hypotheses. However, we did expect that the multicultural
17 components (value-in-group differences, value-in-diversity), value-in-equality and the moral
18 case would be associated with more value fit, interest, and authenticity. We expected that
19 value-in-similarities would be negatively associated with these psychological outcomes.¹³ We
20 focused on these dependent measures because previous research has found effects of diversity
21 rhetoric on authenticity (Kirby & Kaiser, 2021), organisational interest (Kirby, Russell
22 Pascual & Hildebrand, 2023), and value fit (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). Both lack of value
23 fit and inauthenticity play a key role in reinforcing stereotypes and in turn social inequalities
24 (Schmader & Sedikides, 2018). Therefore, it is key to understand how different concepts of
25 diversity ideologies affect these variables. Moreover, diversity ideologies are often
26 implemented with the intent to appeal to minoritised groups and encourage them to apply
27 (Dover et al., 2020) and therefore it is key to ensure they have this intended effect. We
28 measured tokenism because previous research found that value-in-group differences may
29 increase tokenism (as measured by their prototypicality pressure scale; Kirby & Kaiser,
30 2021). This finding appears to contradict the general consensus that multiculturalism is
31 universally beneficial (e.g., for value fit; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008) for minoritised racial
32 groups (Gündemir et al., 2019), so we wanted to better understand if the different framings in
33 the literature might explain conflicting findings like this one. However, this was an
34 exploratory question because the research suggests that tokenism may be more relevant when
35 accounting for individual differences in identification (Kirby & Kaiser, 2021), which was not
36 possible with the present data.

¹¹ We also ran a similar preliminary study with the university statements. However, because it only had 100 statements, it was underpowered. For simplicity, we focus on outcomes for the company statements and only report the study with university statements in the online supplement.

¹² We amended our original pre-registration before data analysis to clarify that we would only include variables that were significantly associated with our dependent variables in the mediation analyses.

¹³ Here, we discuss our original hypotheses, which were somewhat exploratory. However, after some unexpected findings in a preliminary (underpowered study), we pre-registered more specific hypotheses. These hypotheses were mostly in line with the above predictions, with the exception of predicting that value-in-group-differences would predict increased feelings of tokenism. However, we have de-emphasised this hypothesis for the sake of clarity because we did not replicate the preliminary finding – more details and justification for this decision can be found in the online supplement. Some of the pre-registered analyses are also being included in a separate manuscript focused on real-world diversity outcomes (e.g., workplace inclusion indices and representation of minoritised racial groups), rather than the current focus on perceptions of diversity statements.

Methods

Participants

We recruited racially minoritised participants residing in the US via Prolific. Of the original sample of 269 participants, 32 were excluded as they did not identify as a racial/ethnic minority group member. Therefore, the final sample was 237 participants (28.7% Hispanic or Latino/a, 24.5% Black/African American, 19.4% mixed race other, 12.2% East Asian, 7.6% mixed race Black/White, 7.2% South Asian, 0.4% American Indian/Alaskan Native). Participants were aged between 18 to 69 years old ($M = 28.13$; $SD = 9.67$); 51.5% were female and 48.5% were male, 93.2% were native English speakers.¹⁴

Materials and Procedure

This research was approved by the ethics department at the university of the first author, and all participants provided informed consent. Each participant read ten randomly selected diversity statements from the total pool of 248 statements. The names of the organisations were removed from all statements and replaced with Sterfield—a fictitious name—to prevent prior impressions of the companies affecting the results. Each statement was rated between 6 and 11 times ($M = 9.56$). In analyses, the company interest, value fit, authenticity, and tokenism measures were collapsed for each statement, so that each statement had a single index of average company interest, value fit, authenticity and tokenism. For all measures, participants responded on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*).

Company Interest

Participants responded to three items from Kirby and colleagues' (2023): I would be interested in this company; This company would not be a good fit for me (reverse-scored); I would like to work here. Because reliability was low ($\alpha = .66$), we computed company interest as the average of two items (I would be interested in this company; I would like to work here; $r_{SB} = .96$). Higher values indicated stronger company interest.

Value Fit

Participants responded to four items adapted from Purdie-Vaughns and colleagues' (2008) trust and comfort scale¹⁵: I think I would like to work under the supervision of people with similar values as this company; I think I would be treated fairly by my supervisor; I think I would trust the management to treat me fairly; I think that my values and the values of this company are very similar. We computed an average where higher values indicated stronger value fit. Reliability of the measure was excellent ($\alpha = .97$).

Authenticity

Participants responded to two items adapted from Kirby & Kaiser's (2021) authenticity scale¹⁶: I could be my true self at this company; I would feel comfortable at this

¹⁴ SES was not collected due to time and resource constraints.

¹⁵ We excluded any items that measured authenticity or company interest and changed any references to the company they used in their manipulation to 'this company'.

¹⁶ The four items in this measure were very similar to one another so we selected the two most distinct items in the interest of shortening the questionnaire.

1 company. We computed an average where higher values indicated stronger authenticity ($r_{SB} =$
2 .93).

3 ***Tokenism***

4 Participants responded to five items adapted from Apfelbaum and colleagues' (2016)
5 representation-based concerns scale¹⁷: My performance at this company will only reflect on
6 me, not other racial minorities (R); At this company, I will feel like I have to represent all
7 racial minorities; At this company, I would be concerned that people will treat me differently
8 because of my race; If I don't do well at this company, it will be viewed as stereotypic of my
9 race; At this company, I do not want to stand out as a racial minority. We computed an
10 average where higher values indicated stronger tokenism. Reliability of the measure was
11 excellent ($\alpha = .79$).¹⁸

12 Finally, demographic details were collected, and participants were thanked, debriefed,
13 and reimbursed.

14 Research materials, pre-registration (uploaded before data analysis and an analysis plan is
15 included) and data files are available on OSF:

16 https://osf.io/vfdpc/?view_only=c011ad1cec8b4e4a9925b0e8844a75fe

17 **Results**

18 **Analytic Strategy**

19 Participants were randomly assigned to read 10 diversity statements from the total
20 248. Rather than using participants as the level of analysis, we used the statements. To do this,
21 we calculated mean company interest, value fit, tokenism, and authenticity ratings for each
22 organisation. Our dataset included a row for each company, with the coding from Study 1b
23 and the mean ratings of each dependent variable as separate columns.

24 We examined whether any clusters of components are especially beneficial (or
25 detrimental). To do this, we used the clusters obtained in Study 1b as an independent variable
26 in ANCOVAs, controlling for word count, on the outcome variables (company interest, value
27 fit, tokenism, and authenticity). Then, we investigated whether any individual components
28 were related to the outcome variables. To investigate this, we ran bivariate correlation
29 analyses between the components and the outcome variables, followed by multiple regression
30 analyses to investigate the relationships between the components and the outcome variables
31 when controlling for the other components and word count.

32 **Are Particular Ideology Clusters Preferred?**

33 The different clusters were significantly associated with perceptions of value fit and company
34 interest, ($F(2,242) = 4.06, p = .018, \eta_p^2 = .03$) and ($F(2,242) = 3.58, p = .029, \eta_p^2 = .03$),
35 respectively. However, the clusters did not relate to authenticity ($F(2,242) = 1.91, p = .150,$
36 $\eta_p^2 = .02$) or tokenism ($F(2,242) = 1.14, p = .323, \eta_p^2 = .01$). Participants reported greater
37 perceptions of value fit and greater company interest for the Instrumental Value-In-Diversity
38 cluster than the Instrumental Individualism and Moralistic Individualism clusters (see Table

¹⁷ We excluded one item "My [gender/race] would be very important to me at Redstone" that did not capture tokenism – instead identity centrality. We also changed any references to the company they used in their manipulation to 'this company'.

¹⁸ Tokenism was also measured with a single item "At this company, I would be seen as the same as other members of groups to which I belong" for comparison with the university data that is reported in the supplement.

- 1 S10). This tentatively provides support for the notion that value-in-diversity and difference
- 2 fosters fit better than focusing on value-in-individual differences.

1 Which Individual Diversity Ideologies Are Beneficial?

2 *Preliminary Analyses*

3 We checked for any multicollinearity issues by running crosstabulation analyses
4 between all of our independent variables (Table 6). Value-in-group differences and value-in-
5 diversity were strongly associated, $\phi(1, N = 248) = .81, p < .001$, with only an 8% difference
6 between the scores given to them. Due to multicollinearity concerns (Alin, 2010), these two
7 variables were analysed separately in two multiple linear regression models. The moral case
8 and business case were also strongly associated, $\phi(1, N = 248) = -.58, p < .001$, with only a
9 17% overlap between the scores given to them. To avoid issues with multicollinearity, we
10 deviate from our pre-registered analysis plan by including the moral case and business case in
11 separate models. Below we report the models including the moral case and value-in-group
12 differences in the regression models. The supplementary materials include the models with
13 value-in-diversity and the business case.

14 *Company Interest*

15 Correlation analyses revealed that minoritised racial groups were more interested in
16 working for companies with value-in-group differences, value-in-individual differences,
17 value-in-equality, value-in-diversity and the business case in their statements (Table 7). The
18 regression analyses showed that only the value-in-individual differences effect held when
19 controlling for the other components (Tables 8 and S11-13).

20 *Value Fit*

21 Correlation analyses revealed that minoritised racial groups had higher value fit
22 perceptions for companies with value-in-group differences, value-in-individual differences,
23 value-in-equality, value-in-diversity, and the business case in their statements (Table 7). The
24 regression analyses revealed that only the value-in-individual differences and value-in-group
25 differences effects held when controlling for the other components (Tables 8 and S11). It is
26 key to note that the findings for the relationship between value-in-individual differences and
27 value fit are not significant in two of the models that account for multicollinearity issues ($p =$
28 $.072$ when value-in-group differences and the business case are included, and $p = .051$ when
29 value-in-diversity and the business case are included; see S11 and S12).

30 *Authenticity*

31 Correlation analyses revealed that minoritised racial groups felt like they could be
32 more authentic in companies with value-in-group differences, value-in-individual differences,
33 value-in-equality and value-in-diversity in their statements (Table 7). The regression analyses
34 revealed that none of these effects held when controlling for the other components (Tables 9
35 and S11-13).

36 *Tokenism*

37 Correlation analyses revealed that minoritised racial groups felt like they would be
38 tokenised less in companies with value-in-group differences, value-in-individual differences,
39 value-in-equality and value-in-diversity in their statements (Table 7). The regression analyses
40 revealed that none of these effects held when controlling for the other components (Tables 8
41 and S11-13).

42 *Mediation Tests*

1 We ran a parallel mediation model to investigate whether the relationship between
2 value-in-individual differences and company interest was mediated by value fit, authenticity,
3 and/or tokenism (controlling for word count). We found that only value fit showed a
4 significant indirect effect on interest (see Table 9 for statistics).

5 **Study 2 Discussion**

6 This study aimed to disentangle a range of diversity ideologies and examine how their
7 clusters and individual components relate to psychological measures. Racial minority group
8 members reported greater perceptions of value fit and company interest for the Instrumental
9 Value-In-Diversity cluster than the Instrumental Individualism and Moralistic Individualism
10 clusters. When these clusters were broken down into the individual components of diversity
11 ideologies, value-in-individual differences and value-in-group differences were associated
12 with a stronger sense of value fit. However, only value-in-individual differences related to
13 company interest, which was mediated by value fit. We also found that increases in word
14 count relate to more positive perceptions of the statements, irrespective of content.

15 Our research is in line with previous research that began to disentangle the different
16 components in the literature. Gündemir and colleagues' (2017a) research distinguished
17 between a focus on value-in-individual differences or value-in-group differences and found
18 both related to increased leadership self-efficacy. Similarly, we found that both components
19 relate to increased value fit.

20 This increase in value fit resulting from value-in-individual differences is associated
21 with an increase in company interest. These findings enable us to better understand
22 conflicting findings in previous literature. It was unclear whether value-in-individual
23 differences was beneficial for minoritised groups. In one instance it was compared to value-
24 in-equality where it was relatively detrimental for their performance when highly
25 underrepresented (Apfelbaum et al., 2016). In other instances, it was compared to value-in-
26 similarities where it improved minoritised groups' leadership self-efficacy (Gündemir et al.,
27 2017a). When disentangling the components, it continued to signal fit and facilitate
28 organisational interest among minoritised racial groups.

29 **General Discussion**

30 This paper had two key aims. The first was to examine which diversity ideologies are
31 commonly used by organisations. The second was to disentangle a range of diversity
32 ideologies and examine which clusters and components are related to minoritised racial
33 groups' psychological perceptions.

34 In terms of the components used by universities and companies, both types of
35 organisations focus on value-in-similarities the least. However, universities most commonly
36 focus on value-in-equality, whereas companies focus more on value-in-individual differences.
37 Value-in-individual differences is also coupled with value-in-equality in universities but not
38 in companies. The reasons for why diversity should matter also differ between them, with
39 universities focusing on both approaches equally and companies focusing on the business case
40 more. In universities, we also found that statements that focus on diversity and differences
41 commonly cluster with either moral reasons for caring about diversity (Moralistic Value-In-
42 Diversity) or the business case (Instrumental Value-In-Diversity). In companies, a focus on
43 diversity and differences commonly appears alongside the business case (Instrumental Value-
44 In-Diversity), but potentially due to the low prevalence of the moral case the Moralistic
45 Value-In-Diversity ideology was not found. Previous research has suggested that different

1 types of organisations differ in their reasons for caring for diversity (Jansen et al., 2021), and
2 our research suggests they also differ in how they navigate diversity.

3 Most importantly, focusing on both individual and group differences relates to
4 increased value fit. For value-in-individual differences, this increase in value fit also in turn
5 relates to increased company interest. The benefits of focusing on both of these components
6 align with Gündemir and colleagues' (2017a) research which found that both components
7 increase minoritised groups' leadership self-efficacy. This also aligns with the identity safety
8 literature, which has proposed an ideology that goes beyond the focus on group differences
9 (between-group variability) but also acknowledges value-in-individual differences (within-
10 group variability) may foster a sense of belonging amongst minoritised racial groups (Purdie-
11 Vaughns & Walton, 2011).

12 Value-in-group differences increasing value fit also aligns with acculturation and
13 social identity theories. Acculturation theories propose that valuing group differences enables
14 minoritised racial groups to maintain their ethnic identities in cultures where many ethnic
15 groups are present (Berry, 2001). Social identity theory further argues that valuing group
16 differences increases group identification and positive ingroup evaluations among minority
17 groups (Verkuyten, 2005). Our ethnic identities are key to our self-concepts (Tajfel & Turner,
18 1979). Therefore, it is logical that a diversity ideology that enables minoritised racial groups
19 to preserve and strengthen their social identities would align with their values.

20 Similarly, the benefits of value-in-individual differences fit within the current cultural
21 context. In the US, individualism is highly valued and on the rise (Twenge et al., 2013), albeit
22 less so for minoritised racial groups (Vargas & Kimmelmeier, 2013). However, these
23 findings appear to conflict with other research, at least on the surface. When organisations
24 define diversity "broadly", focused on a wide range of individual characteristics, minoritised
25 racial groups report less interest in those organisations (Kirby et al., 2023). However, it only
26 hurts their interest if the organisation neglects to explicitly mention minoritised groups.
27 Similarly, our research showed the Instrumental Value-In-Diversity ideology—which
28 combines value-in-group differences with value-in-individual differences was associated with
29 increased value fit and interest relative to ideologies that did not include group differences.
30 Thus, individual differences has clear benefits for organisational interest, but it may not
31 always be sufficient on its own without acknowledging important social identities. These
32 findings also align with scholarly perspectives suggesting that acknowledging a wide range of
33 disadvantaged groups might harness the benefits of multiculturalism without making
34 individuals feel tokenised (Rios & Cohen, 2023).

35 These detrimental effects of solely focusing on value-in-individual differences
36 (without value-in-group differences) may also explain why we did not find the moral case was
37 positively related to minoritised groups' perceptions of the statements as expected. The moral
38 case tends to cluster with individual differences (Moralistic Individualism) and therefore the
39 downsides of only focusing on individual differences may have prevented the benefits of the
40 moral case from being detected. Investigating whether a Moralistic Individualism ideology
41 that also includes the value-in-group differences component is perceived more positively by
42 minoritised racial groups would be an interesting avenue for future research.

43 We also did not find any effects for our authenticity or tokenism dependent measures.
44 This may be because these effects are moderated by participant level variables. Previous
45 research (Kirby & Kaiser, 2021) found that the relationship between diversity rhetoric and
46 authenticity is moderated by identification. As our data was analysed at the statement level
47 not the participant level, we were unable to test whether identification moderated our

1 findings. Also, participants were only presented with a company diversity statement
2 compared to previous research which has provided more information on the company context
3 (e.g., Apfelbaum et al., 2016). As authenticity and tokenism are more abstract than company
4 interest and value fit, our methodology may not have sufficed for authenticity and tokenism
5 effects to be detected, as they may require a fuller understanding of the company context.

6 **Theoretical and Practical Implications**

7 This research contributes to the field in being the first paper to document the
8 prevalence of diversity ideologies and rationales in real-world diversity statements, as well as
9 how they tend to cluster together. This enabled us to begin to understand how the ideologies
10 and rationales numerous papers have studied are implemented in organisations. For example,
11 researchers tend to define value-in-similarities in terms of similarities between members of
12 the organisation (e.g., Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008), whereas in practice value-in-similarities
13 focused more on having a unified and cohesive culture. Alternatively, this finding could also
14 reflect a shift over time in how organisations frame a focus on similarities.

15 We also assessed how minoritised racial groups perceive these components and the
16 ways they group together. The Instrumental Value-In-Diversity ideology (value-in-group
17 differences, value-in-individual differences, and value-in-diversity, value-in-equality, and the
18 business case), positively related to minoritised groups' psychological perceptions. Most
19 organisations adopt a multicultural approach (Apfelbaum et al., 2016) and our research
20 suggests that organisations should frame multiculturalism in terms of the Instrumental Value-
21 In-Diversity ideology. Our individual components analysis suggested the positive effects of
22 the Instrumental Value-In-Diversity ideology were driven by value-in-individual differences
23 and group differences, so implementation of the Value-In-Diversity ideology should ensure
24 these components are prioritised. However, as this study was correlational, it is important for
25 further research using experimental methods to assess if these effects are causal before
26 implementation.

27 **Constraints on Generality**

28 Whilst this research was the first to disentangle the different diversity ideology
29 components, diversity ideologies are only a proxy of what companies' diversity management
30 is like in practice. Further research should investigate whether diversity ideologies match
31 company diversity practices, as well as how the company's overall diversity climate relates to
32 minoritised racial groups' psychological perceptions. We also used a sample from the US, and
33 these results may differ in other countries with different racial relations. They may also differ
34 across different racially minoritised groups, but we did not have sufficient power to be able to
35 differentiate between different groups. As perceptions of discrimination differ between racial
36 groups (Bonilla-Silva & Dietrich, 2011; Keum, Miller, Lee & Chen, 2018), it is key for
37 further research to investigate this. We also categorised participants as minoritised racial
38 groups by asking them to self-report their race/ethnicity. Although this is typical in
39 psychological research, future studies could confirm that these participants themselves
40 identify as minoritised. Moreover, due to the complex nuances of the components, inter-rater
41 reliabilities were low for some components. Finally, we have not tested these questions
42 experimentally, which means we cannot make strong claims about causality. However, using
43 a large range of real diversity statements is nonetheless a strength of the research.

44 **Conclusion**

1 Universities and companies differ in how they frame their diversity policies, with
2 companies focusing most heavily on celebrating value-in-individual differences and
3 universities focusing on value-in-equality. Companies also focus more heavily on the value
4 diversity adds to the organisation than do universities. This focus on celebrating difference
5 matches well with the needs of racially minoritised people – expressing a value for individual,
6 as well as group, differences facilitates a stronger sense that a company’s values fit with their
7 own. These findings have important implications for the nuances of how organisations should
8 frame their diversity strategies in order to foster identity safety among minoritised groups.

9 **Acknowledgements**

10 With special thanks to Penny Dinh, Lucie Michot, Rosie Chandler-Wilde, Jasmine Sketchley,
11 Masie Douch, Clarrisa Lo, Amelia Lumme, Megan Ashford-Gregory, and Yanzhe Zeng for
12 assistance with research tasks, including content coding.

13 **Funding Statement**

14 This research was funded by a 1+3 studentship from the ESRC, the PGR fund from the
15 psychology department at the University of Exeter and the Economic and Social Research
16 Council [grant number ES/S00274X/1 awarded to the second author]. For the purpose of open
17 access, the author has applied a ‘Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any
18 Author Accepted Manuscript version arising’

19 **Data Availability Statement**

20 Research materials, pre-registration and data files are available on OSF:
21 https://osf.io/vfdpc/?view_only=c011ad1cec8b4e4a9925b0e8844a75fe

22 **Conflict of Interest Disclosure**

23 No financial or non-financial conflict of interest to declare.

24

25

References

- 1
2 Alin, A. (2010). Multicollinearity. *WIREs Computational Statistics*, 2(3), 370–374.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wics.84>
- 4 Apfelbaum, E. P., Stephens, N. M., & Reagans, R. (2016). *Beyond One-Size-Fits-All: Tailoring Diversity*
5 *Approaches to the Representation of Social Groups*. 111(4), 547–566.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000071>
- 7 Berry, J. W. (2001). *A Psychology of Immigration*. 57(3), 615–631. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022->
8 4537.00231
- 9 Berry, J. W., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991
10 national survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du*
11 *Comportement*, 27(3), 301–320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0008-400X.27.3.301>
- 12 Bonilla-Silva, E., & Dietrich, D. (2011). The sweet enchantment of color-blind racism in Obamerica.
13 *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 634(1), 190–206.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027162110389702>
- 15 Clatworthy, Jane., Buick, Deanna., Hankins, Matthew., Weinman, John., & Horne, Robert. (2005). The
16 use and reporting of cluster analysis in health psychology: A review. *British Journal of Health*
17 *Psychology*, 10(3), 329–358. <https://doi.org/10.1348/135910705X25697>
- 18 Dover, T. L., Kaiser, C. R., & Major, B. (2020). Mixed Signals: The Unintended Effects of Diversity
19 Initiatives. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 14(1), 152–181.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12059>
- 21 Dovidio, J., Gaertner, S., & Saguy, T. (2007). Another View of 'We?': Majority and Minority Group
22 Perspectives on a Common Ingroup Identity. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 18, 296–
23 330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280701726132>
- 24 Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on
25 Work Group Processes and Outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229–273.
26 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2667087>

- 1 Frey, W. H. (2020). The nation is diversifying even faster than predicted, according to new census
2 data. *Brookings*. [https://www.brookings.edu/research/new-census-data-shows-the-nation-](https://www.brookings.edu/research/new-census-data-shows-the-nation-is-diversifying-even-faster-than-predicted/)
3 [is-diversifying-even-faster-than-predicted/](https://www.brookings.edu/research/new-census-data-shows-the-nation-is-diversifying-even-faster-than-predicted/)
- 4 Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*
5 (pp. xiii, 212). Psychology Press.
- 6 Georgeac, O. A. M., & Rattan, A. (2023). The business case for diversity backfires: Detrimental effects
7 of organizations' instrumental diversity rhetoric for underrepresented group members' sense
8 of belonging. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *124*(1), 69–108.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000394>
- 10 Gerard, H. B., & Hoyt, M. F. (1974). Distinctiveness of social categorization and attitude toward
11 ingroup members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *29*(6), 836–842.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0036204>
- 13 Glasford, D. E., & Dovidio, J. F. (2011). E pluribus unum: Dual identity and minority group members'
14 motivation to engage in contact, as well as social change. *Journal of Experimental Social*
15 *Psychology*, *47*(5), 1021–1024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.03.021>
- 16 Graves, T. D. (1967). Psychological Acculturation in a Tri-Ethnic Community. *Southwestern Journal of*
17 *Anthropology*, *23*(4), 337–350. <https://doi.org/10.1086/soutjanth.23.4.3629450>
- 18 Gündemir, S., Dovidio, J. F., & Homan, A. C. (2017a). *The Impact of Organizational Diversity Policies*
19 *on Minority Employees' Leadership Self-Perceptions and Goals*. *24*(2), 172–188.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051816662615>
- 21 Gündemir, S., Homan, A. C., Usova, A., & Galinsky, A. D. (2017b). Multicultural meritocracy: The
22 synergistic benefits of valuing diversity and merit. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*,
23 *73*, 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.06.002>
- 24 Gündemir, S., Martin, A., & Homan, A. (2019). Understanding Diversity Ideologies From the Target's
25 Perspective: A Review and Future Directions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 1–14.
26 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00282>

- 1 Hahn, A., Banchevsky, S., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2015). Measuring Intergroup Ideologies: Positive and
2 Negative Aspects of Emphasizing Versus Looking Beyond Group Differences. *Personality and*
3 *Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(12), 1646–1664. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215607351>
- 4 Hands, S., & Everitt, B. (1987). A Monte Carlo Study of the Recovery of Cluster Structure in Binary
5 Data by Hierarchical Clustering Techniques. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 22(2), 235–
6 243. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr2202_6
- 7 Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and Organizations. *International Studies of Management &*
8 *Organization*, 10(4), 15–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.1980.11656300>
- 9 Jansen, W. S., Kröger, C., Van der Toorn, J., & Ellemers, N. (2021). The right thing to do or the smart
10 thing to do? How communicating moral or business motives for diversity affects the
11 employment image of Dutch public and private sector organizations. *Journal of Applied Social*
12 *Psychology*, 51(7), 746–759. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12783>
- 13 Jolliffe, I. T., Jones, B., & Morgan, B. J. T. (1982). Utilising Clusters: A Case-Study Involving the Elderly.
14 *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)*, 145(2), 224–236.
15 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2981536>
- 16 Keum, B., Miller, M., Lee, M., & Chen, G. (2018). Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale for Asian
17 Americans: Testing the Factor Structure and Measurement Invariance Across Generational
18 Status. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 9(2), 149–157.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1037/aap0000100>
- 20 Kirby, T. A., & Kaiser, C. R. (2021). Person-Message Fit: Racial Identification Moderates the Benefits of
21 Multicultural and Colorblind Diversity Approaches. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*,
22 47(6), 873–890. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167220948707>
- 23 Kirby, T. A., Russell Pascual, N., & Hildebrand, L. K. (2023). The Dilution of Diversity: Ironic Effects of
24 Broadening Diversity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 01461672231184925.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672231184925>

- 1 Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data.
2 *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>
- 3 Martin Luther King, Jr. (1963). *I have a dream speech*.
- 4 Noon, M. (2007). The fatal flaws of diversity and the business case for ethnic minorities. *Work*,
5 *Employment and Society*, 21(4), 773–784. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017007082886>
- 6 Plaut, V. C. (2002). Cultural models of diversity in American: The psychology of difference and
7 inclusion. In *Engaging cultural differences: The multicultural challenge in liberal democracies*
8 (pp. 365–395). Russell Sage Foundation.
- 9 Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is Multiculturalism or Color Blindness Better for
10 Minorities? *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 444–446. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467->
11 [9280.2009.02318.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02318.x)
- 12 Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Ditlemann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social Identity
13 Contingencies: How Diversity Cues Signal Threat or Safety for African Americans in
14 Mainstream Institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(4), 615–630.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.4.615>
- 16 Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Walton, G. M. (2011). Is multiculturalism bad for African Americans?
17 Redefining inclusion through the lens of identity safety. In L. R. Tropp & R. K. Mallett (Eds.),
18 *Moving beyond prejudice reduction: Pathways to positive intergroup relations*. (pp. 159–177).
19 American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12319-008>
- 20 Rattan, A., & Ambady, N. (2013). Diversity ideologies and intergroup relations: An examination of
21 colorblindness and multiculturalism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(1), 12–21.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1892>
- 23 Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation.
24 *American Anthropologist*, 38(1), 149–152. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1936.38.1.02a00330>

- 1 Richeson, J. A., & Nussbaum, R. J. (2004). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on
2 racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*(3), 417–423.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2003.09.002>
- 4 Rios, K., & Cohen, A. B. (2023). Taking a “multiple forms” approach to diversity: An introduction,
5 policy implications, and legal recommendations. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 17*(1), 104–
6 130. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12089>
- 7 Ryan, C. S., Hunt, J. S., Weible, J. A., Peterson, C. R., & Casas, J. F. (2007). Multicultural and Colorblind
8 Ideology, Stereotypes, and Ethnocentrism among Black and White Americans. *Group*
9 *Processes & Intergroup Relations, 10*(4), 617–637.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430207084105>
- 11 Schmader, T., & Sedikides, C. (2018). State Authenticity as Fit to Environment: The Implications of
12 Social Identity for Fit, Authenticity, and Self-Segregation. *Personality and Social Psychology*
13 *Review, 22*(3), 228–259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868317734080>
- 14 Starck, J. G., Sinclair, S., & Shelton, J. N. (2021). How university diversity rationales inform student
15 preferences and outcomes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118*(16),
16 e2013833118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2013833118>
- 17 Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In *The Social Psychology*
18 *of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks.
- 19 Tamasauskas, D., Sakalauskas, V., & Kriksciuniene, D. (2012). Evaluation framework of hierarchical
20 clustering methods for binary data. *2012 12th International Conference on Hybrid Intelligent*
21 *Systems (HIS), 421–426*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HIS.2012.6421371>
- 22 Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making Differences Matter. *Harvard Business Review, 74*(5), 79–90.
- 23 Twenge, J. M., Campbell, W. K., & Gentile, B. (2013). Changes in Pronoun Use in American Books and
24 the Rise of Individualism, 1960-2008. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 44*(3), 406–415.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022112455100>

- 1 US Census. (2019). *National Population by Characteristics: 2010-2019*. Census.Gov.
2 <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-national-detail.html>
- 3 van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work Group Diversity and Group
4 Performance: An Integrative Model and Research Agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,
5 89(6), 1008–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.1008>
- 6 Vargas, J. H., & Kimmelmeier, M. (2013). Ethnicity and Contemporary American Culture: A Meta-
7 Analytic Investigation of Horizontal–Vertical Individualism–Collectivism. *Journal of Cross-*
8 *Cultural Psychology*, 44(2), 195–222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022112443733>
- 9 Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic Group Identification and Group Evaluation Among Minority and
10 Majority Groups: Testing the Multiculturalism Hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social*
11 *Psychology*, 88(1), 121–138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.121>
- 12 Ward, J. H. (1963). Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. *Journal of the American*
13 *Statistical Association*, 58(301), 236–244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1963.10500845>
- 14 Whitley, B. E., Luttrell, A., & Schultz, T. (2022). The Measurement of Racial Colorblindness.
15 *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 49(11), 1531–1551.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672221103414>
- 17 Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of
18 multicultural and color-blind perspectives on judgments of groups and individuals. *Journal of*
19 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 635–654. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.635)
20 3514.78.4.635
- 21 Yim, O., & Ramdeen, K. T. (2015). Hierarchical Cluster Analysis: Comparison of Three Linkage
22 Measures and Application to Psychological Data. *The Quantitative Methods for Psychology*,
23 11(1), 8–21. <https://doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.11.1.p008>

24

25

Table 1*Examples of Diversity Statement Components*

	Key Citation	Definition	Example of this component
Multiculturalism			
Value-in-group differences	Kirby & Kaiser (2021)	Valuing differences between marginalized social groups	"While other consulting firms mistakenly focus on their staff's similarities, we train our ethnically diverse workforce to embrace their differences. Focusing on our differences creates a more exciting and collaborative work environment."
Value-in-diversity	Gündemir, Homan, Usova & Galinsky (2017b)	Celebrates people of different marginalized racial groups	"Our employees benefit from our dedication to this diversity-focused policy: their own diverse backgrounds are recognized and celebrated through our many diversity initiatives and programs."
Colourblindness			
Value-in-individual differences ¹⁹	Gündemir et al. (2017a)	Focuses on differences at the individual level, such as qualities, experiences or skills	"focusing on individual characteristics creates an exciting work environment"
Value-in-similarities	Purdie-Vaughns, Steel, Davies, & Dittmann (2008)	Focuses on similarities between people	"While other consulting firms mistakenly focus on their staff's diversity, we train our diverse workforce to embrace their similarities. We feel that focusing on similarities creates a more unified, exciting, and collaborative work environment."

¹⁹ Value-in-individual differences has also been included under the multicultural categorisation (e.g., Gündemir et al., 2017b); "We foster an inclusive and open-minded workplace that values diverse backgrounds and experiences").

Value-in-equality	Apfelbaum, Stephens & Reagans, 2016	Focuses on equality or prevention of discrimination	"All employees, regardless of background, are treated equally and fairly. Equal opportunity further ensures that our employees are recruited, hired, and promoted without regard to race, sex, age, gender, gender identity or expression, religion, national origin, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, veteran status, or other. "
-------------------	---	--	---

Table 2*Content Coding of Diversity Statement Components*²⁰

Components	Definition	Universities Example	Companies Example
<i>Diversity Ideology</i>			
1. Value-in-group differences	Emphasizes differences between any form of social category (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation, class, age).	“We recognize and value the unique experiences drawn from differences in race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, and veteran status and welcome all students of diverse backgrounds.”	“we define diversity as the range of differences that make individuals unique, including ability, age, ethnicity, gender identification, race, sexual orientation, religious belief and veteran's status. Inclusion is how we leverage these differences to form a genuine community and expand business opportunities.”
2. Value-in-individual differences	Emphasizes differences between people or individuals (in a way that is not explicitly about a social group, such as race, gender, sexual orientation, class, age). It focuses on differences in individual qualities and skills.	“By embracing diverse people, ideas, and perspectives we create a vibrant learning and working environment.”	“we take an active, strategic approach to appreciate our individual and collective experiences, different ways of thinking, and various communication styles.”
3. Value-in-similarities	Emphasizes similarities between people.	“The University of Sterfield is committed to blending our cultures into a harmonious	“we are united by a culture that cultivates a workplace like no other.”

²⁰ All example statements are anonymised - the company/university name is replaced with “Sterfield”.

		family atmosphere and accepting each as a vital link in our mission.”	
4. Value-in-equality	Discusses equality or prevention of discrimination. Equality relates to fairness in terms of equal opportunity for all and ensuring that procedures treat everyone the same way.	“The University of Sterfield is an equal opportunity employer and educator, proudly pluralistic and firmly committed to providing equal opportunity for outstanding men and women of every race, creed and background.”	“We are an equal opportunity employer and strive to build balanced teams from all walks of life.”
5. Value-in-diversity	Acknowledges or celebrates people of different social groups (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation, class, age).	“The Council celebrates cultural identities and diversity on campus by fostering awareness and mutual understanding through increased communication.”	“By celebrating diversity across all spectrums, including but not limited to race, national origin, religion, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, veteran/military status, and age, we are a stronger company and culture.”
<i>Diversity Rationale</i>			
6. Business case	Focuses on the benefits diversity brings for the organization itself	“At The Sterfield University, we recognize that every competitive advantage begins with people. By valuing, celebrating and leveraging the differences and similarities of our students, faculty and staff, we inspire an environment of innovation and passion - one that enables us to create a teaching, research and service environment that better reflects the needs of our students, faculty, staff, customers, constituents, communities and other key stakeholders.”	“we know that diverse teams improve our performance, drive our growth and enhance engagement among ourselves and with our customers and suppliers.”

7. Moral case

Focuses on valuing diversity and/or equality because it is the right thing to do.

“In an organization so reliant on its people, creating a diverse and inclusive community isn't only the right thing to do; it's critical to the successful implementation of our mission. The greatest challenges facing us in the century ahead are incredibly complex and will require diverse teams who can work collaboratively and innovatively. Actively seeking a student body and a faculty and staff who represent the diversity of our region, nation and world is necessary to prepare our students for an increasingly globalized and connected world.”

“We do the right thing by treating everyone with respect.”

Table 3*Percentage of University Statements Containing each Diversity Ideology by Cluster (Study 1a)*

Cluster	Value-in-group differences	Value-in-individual differences	Value-in-similarities	Value-in-equality	Value-in-diversity	Business Case	Moral Case
Moralistic Value-In-Diversity	90.00	70.00	26.70	76.70	100.00	6.70	93.30
Instrumental Value-In-Diversity	77.8	88.9	40.70	70.40	96.30	81.50	0.00
Instrumental Equality	0.00	50.00	25.00	85.00	25.00	65.00	5.00
Moral Equality	0.00	35.70	42.90	92.90	0.00	0.00	100.00
Dual Identity	11.10	100.00	88.90	55.60	22.20	100.00	100.00

Note. Bolded percentages reflect those at or above 50% (i.e., the majority of the statements in that cluster contain the components of interest).

Table 4*Example Statements for Each Cluster*

Cluster	Universities Example	Companies Example
Moralistic Value-In-Diversity	<p>“We envision a Sterfield University where people of all identities & experiences are understood, appreciated, and fully included in the community and where equitable treatment and outcomes prevail.”</p>	N/A
Instrumental Value-In-Diversity	<p>“Sterfield University’s founders opened its doors to all students without regard to religion, race, or gender. Building and sustaining a vibrant community of scholars, students, and staff remains essential to our mission of contributing to, and preparing students to thrive in, an increasingly interconnected world. We strive to create environments for learning, working, and living that are enriched by racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity. We seek to cultivate an atmosphere of respect for individual differences in life experience, sexual orientation, and religious belief, and we aspire to be free of intellectual parochialism, barriers to access, and ethnocentrism. Success in a competitive, global milieu depends upon our ongoing commitment to welcome and engage the wisdom, creativity, and aspirations of all peoples. The excellence we seek emerges from the contributions and talents of every member of the Sterfield University community.”</p>	<p>“We believe achieving success begins with people, and we're focused on building a team with a rich diversity of perspectives, experiences and ideas. As one of the nation's premier energy companies, Sterfield is committed to recruiting, developing and retaining great people at all levels. A key part of that commitment is to attract and maintain a diverse and multi-generational workforce that can help us meet the continually evolving needs of our customers. To reinforce our commitment, we continue to develop and implement corporate-wide diversity and inclusion training for all of our employees and further strengthen our Corporate Diversity Council and Employee Resource Groups. At Sterfield, we define diversity broadly. We provide an inclusive work environment that is free from discrimination and harassment on the basis of race, color, age, sex, national origin, religion, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, genetics, disability or protected veteran status. We also</p>

		appreciate diversity of thought, style, technical and functional capabilities or leadership. When talented employees from varied backgrounds are engaged and contributing to our business success, we all benefit.”
Instrumental Equality	“Everything about our academic mission—teaching, learning, scholarship, research, engagement, and creative activity—is made better by the exchange of ideas and diverse experiences and perspectives of our students, faculty, and staff. We value the contributions and inherent worth of all individuals, and treat others with mutual respect and understanding. And when we’re in the field as professionals, we are devoted to understanding the varied historical and social contexts where we work.”	N/A
Moral Equality	“The primary objectives of the programs and services for underrepresented and minority students at Sterfield are to support the outreach, recruitment, and retention of Native American, African American, Hispanic American and those of Pacific Islander heritage. These objectives support the overall campus goal of building a safe, supportive and inclusive community for all students.”	N/A
Dual Identity	“The Office of Institutional Diversity seeks to ensure a University of Sterfield where people of many different backgrounds and perspectives join together to actively advance knowledge. As a community dedicated to scholarship, research, instruction, and public service and outreach, we recognize the importance of respecting, valuing and learning from each other's differences while seeking common goals.”	N/A
Instrumental Individualism	N/A	“When you bring a variety of perspectives to the table, it creates a culture of innovation—essential to facing the

Moralistic
Individualism

N/A

world's healthcare challenges. We have been widely regarded as an employer of choice, with numerous local and global awards recognizing our commitment to fostering an extraordinary workplace.”

“We celebrate the diversity and uniqueness of each employee and believe that everyone has the right to be treated with fairness, dignity, and respect. Our diversity makes us stronger”

Table 5*Percentage of Company Statements Containing each Diversity Ideology by Cluster (Study 1b)*

Cluster	Value-in-group differences	Value-in-individual differences	Value-in-similarities	Value-in-equality	Value-in-diversity	Business Case	Moral Case
Instrumental Individualism	0.00	69.40	21.50	48.80	0.80	100.0	2.50
Moralistic Individualism	0.00	52.50	10.20	52.50	5.10	35.60	91.50
Instrumental Value-In-Diversity	79.40	86.80	5.90	63.20	98.50	82.40	32.40

Note. Bolded percentages reflect those at or above 50% (i.e., the majority of the statements in that cluster contain the components of interest).

Table 6*Cramer's Phi Values for Associations Between Independent Variables*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Value-in-group differences	-						
2. Value-in-individual differences	.22***	-					
3. Value-in-similarities	-.13*	-.06	-				
4. Value-in-equality	.01	.14*	-.03	-			
5. Value-in-diversity	.81***	.18**	-.11	.09	-		
6. Business case	.05	.20**	.04	<.01	-.02	-	
7. Moral case	-.05	-.12	-.04	.15*	.03	-.58***	-

Note. * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

Table 7*Correlations Between Diversity Ideology Components and Outcome Variables*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Value Fit	Authenticity	Tokenism	Value-in-group differences	Value-in-individual differences	Value-in-similarities	Value-in-equality	Value-in-diversity	Business Case	Moral Case
Company Interest	5.19	.55	.93***	.90***	-.63***	.22***	.25***	-.04	.24***	.26***	.14*	.03
Value Fit	5.21	.51	-			.25***	.23***	-.05	.23***	.25***	.15*	.03
Authenticity	5.06	.56	.91***	-		.21***	.18**	-.07	.21***	.23***	.10	.05
Tokenism	3.48	.44	-.63***	-.64***	-	-.15*	-.13*	.06	-.21***	-.18**	-.07	-.08
Word Count	100.90	65.98				.24***	.20***	-.05	.41***	.37***	.16*	.10
<i>Percentage</i>						21.8	70.2	14.5	53.6	28.6	79.8	31.9

Note. * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

Table 8*Relationship Between Diversity Statement Components and Psychological Measures with Value-in-Group Differences and Moral Case in Model*

Predictor	Interest			Value Fit			Authenticity			Tokenism		
	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	$R^2 = .23, F_{6,241} = 11.64, p < .001$			$R^2 = .20, F_{6,241} = 10.19, p < .001$			$R^2 = .17, F_{6,241} = 8.47, p < .001$			$R^2 = .14, F_{6,241} = 6.66, p < .001$		
Value-in-group differences	.10	1.65	.101	.14	2.26	.025	.11	1.79	.075	-.05	-.82	.412
Value-in-individual differences	.15	2.49	.013	.12	2.04	.043	.09	1.40	.162	-.06	-.88	.381
Value-in-similarities	<.01	.01	.993	-.01	-.11	.912	-.04	-.60	.548	.03	.49	.622
Value-in-equality	.06	.98	.326	.08	1.19	.234	.05	.77	.442	-.06	-.96	.336
Moral Case	<.01	.08	.939	.01	.08	.937	.03	.46	.646	-.05	-.79	.433
Word Count	.35	5.45	<.001	.31	4.71	<.001	.32	4.73	<.001	-.30	-4.47	<.001

Table 9*Indirect Effects from Parallel Mediation Model in Study 2*

Mediator	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	95% CI
Value Fit	.11	.04	[.02, .19]
Authenticity	.04	.02	[<.01, .09]
Tokenism	<.01	<.01	[<.01, .01]