Organizational Identity Safety Cue Transfers

Kimberly E. Chaney[1], Diana T. Sanchez[1],
and Jessica D. Remedios[2]

Abstract

Traditionally, researchers have focused on identity-congruent safety cues such as the effect of gender diversity awards on women's sense of inclusion in organizations. The present studies investigate, for the first time, whether identity safety cues (e.g., organizational diversity structures) aimed at one stigmatized group transfer via perceptions of the organization's ideology (social dominance orientation), resulting in identity safety for individuals with stigmatized identities incongruent with the cue. Across four studies, we demonstrate that White women experience identity safety from organizational diversity structures aimed at racial minorities (Studies 1 and 2), and men of color experience identity safety from organizational diversity structures aimed at women (Study 3). Furthermore, while White men similarly perceive the organization's ideology, this does not promote identity safety (Study 4). Thus, we argue that individuals view organizations commended for diversity as promoting more egalitarian attitudes broadly, resulting in the transference of identity safety cues for stigmatized individuals.

Keywords

Organizational diversity statements can be important components in encouraging and promoting safe, welcoming, and productive environments for individuals with stigmatized identities (e.g., Purdie-Vaughns & Walton, 2011). Diversity structures, an approach to managing diversity, may take the form of diversity training programs, explicit diversity ideologies, or diversity awards, and aim to promote fair treatment and identity safety for stigmatized group members (e.g., Edelman, Fuller, & Mara-Drita, 2001; Kaiser et al., 2013; Purdie-Vaughns & Walton, 2011). Specifically, these structures aim to present the organization as an environment in which diversity is valued and efforts are being taken (or have been taken) to expand the diversity of identities represented in the workplace (e.g., Triana & Garcia, 2009). Termed "identity conscious ideologies" (Plaut, 2010) or "multicultural" approaches (Dobbin, 2009; Plaut, 2002), these diversity structures proclaim to value diversity and create a more welcoming and a safer environment for stigmatized group members.

Diversity structures are thus intended to ameliorate identity safety concerns for stigmatized individuals in a setting that has historically discriminated against or stereotyped their ingroup or in settings where it is ambiguous whether one's identity will be valued (Allport, 1954; Major & O'Brien, 2005). Upon entering new settings, stigmatized individuals monitor the environment for cues to determine whether it is an identity-safe (no threat of stigmatized identity being tied to negative outcomes) or an identity-threatening (threat of stigmatized identity being tied to negative outcomes) environment (Davies, Spencer, & Steele, 2005; Kaiser, Brooke Vick, & Major, 2006; Purdie-Vaughns & Walton, 2011). Perceiving identity-threatening cues can lead stigmatized individuals to disengage from domains in which they may be negatively stereotyped (Davies, Spencer, Quinn, & Gerhardstein, 2002), to separate their workplace identities from their stigmatized selves (leading to greater depression and lower life satisfaction; Settles, 2004; von Hippel, Walsh, & Zouroudis, 2011), and to experience performance impairment when they interact with prejudiced others in threatening domains (Logel, Walton, Spencer, Iserman, von Hipple, & Bell, 2009). Once stigmatized individuals perceive identity safety cues, like those from diversity structures, individuals demonstrate improved performance (Cohen & Steele, 2002), greater organizational trust and comfort (Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby, 2008),

[1]Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA
[2]Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA

Corresponding Author:
Kimberly E. Chaney, Department of Psychology, Rutgers University, 53
Avenue E, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA.
Email: Kimberly.Chaney@rutgers.edu

enhanced psychological engagement (Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009), greater job satisfaction (Mor Barak & Levin, 2002), and greater feelings of acceptance due to lower perceived bias (Meeussen, Otten, & Phalet, 2014).

Past research on identity conscious ideologies has used manipulations ranging from embracing diversity on one identity dimension by, for example, displaying organizational images showing equal numbers of Black and White employees (Avery, 2003), to embracing multiple identity dimensions in organizational language such as the following: ". . . honor employees of all races, religions, genders, sexual orientations, disabilities, and ages" (Dover, Major, & Kaiser, 2016). When employing these ideologies to signal identity safety, past research has only examined the outcomes for individuals with congruent stigmatized identities (e.g., Black participants' perceptions of organization with an image signaling Black employees). Thus, while abundant research has demonstrated that these singularly aimed diversity structures benefit members of the congruent stigmatized group, it is unclear whether these identity safety cues may transfer to members of other stigmatized groups (e.g., White women).

Identity cues transfers have been demonstrated in past research such that signals of identity threat (e.g., sexism) have triggered stigma in other stigmatized groups (e.g., men of color). Specifically, evaluators who were exposed as holding negative attitudes toward one stigmatized group (e.g., White women) were also perceived as holding negative attitudes toward multiple stigmatized groups (e.g., men of color), resulting in stigmatized identity threat for an individual with a nontargeted stigmatized identity (Sanchez, Chaney, Manuel, Wilton, & Remedios, 2016). These transfers occur due to a lay understanding of the *overlapping nature of intergroup attitudes*, such that individuals with biases toward one group are seen as holding a social dominance orientation (SDO), which comprises a general preference for group dominance and inequality (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). Thus, due to a perception that negative intergroup attitudes (e.g., racism and sexism) stem from a general ideology of group inequality (SDO), White women anticipated sexism from racism, and men of color anticipated racism from sexism, resulting in identity threat transfers.

The current research proposes two extensions of cue transfers. First, much like individuals' negative intergroup attitudes are perceived as stemming from an underlying ideology, an organization's *positive* attitudes toward stigmatized groups are also proposed to be overlapping. Specifically, we propose that lay people perceive an organization's positive intergroup attitudes as overlapping, such that positive beliefs and values toward one stigmatized group are revealing of positive beliefs and values toward other stigmatized groups. Thus, organizational diversity structures serve as identity safety cues that can transfer, promoting identity safety for not only the congruent group but also members of other stigmatized groups. Specifically, we propose the *transference of identity safety cues*, such that incongruent identity safety cues can transfer to one's nondirected stigmatized identity due to a lay understanding of the overlapping nature of biases. Second, we propose that identity safety cues transfer due to perceptions of an organization's social dominance orientation (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). Specifically, we propose that stigmatized individuals (e.g., White women) perceive incongruent diversity structures (e.g., diversity structures aimed at racial minorities) as evidence of an organization's ideology (i.e., low SDO) that cues egalitarian values and group equality more generally, allowing the transference of identity safety cues to suggest safety from gender stigma as well as safety from race stigma. We focus on perceptions of the organization's ideology as past research has demonstrated that SDO is a key ideology underlying generalized prejudice (Duckitt & Sibley, 2007). Specifically, if a context or individual has proven its commitment to diversity for one stigmatized group, they may also be viewed as embracing equality more generally. Moreover, prior work on cue transfer has demonstrated that individuals who espouse sexism trigger expectations of racism and vice versa because they are viewed as hierarchy endorsing (Sanchez et al., 2016). Thus, we propose a similar process is at play with identity safety cues, such that an identity safety cue toward any stigmatized group will signal an ideological environment that is less hierarchy endorsing and thus more welcoming to stigmatized groups. Finally, we propose that White men should experience no increase in identity safety from incongruent diversity structures as they do not hold stigmatized race or gender identities.

Current Research

Across four studies, we examine the effects of diversity structures on individuals with incongruent stigmatized identities and propose a model incorporating critical components of cue transfers (i.e., SDO) and identity safety measures. While identity safety can promote a plethora of outcomes, past research has highlighted the importance of a sense of inclusion in enhancing engagement, performance, and satisfaction with one's work (Cho & Mor Barak, 2008; Downey, van der Werff, Thomas, & Plaut, 2015; Jansen, Vos, Otten, Podsiadlowski, & van der Zee, 2015). Thus, the present research focuses on an individuals' feelings of acceptance within an organization and feelings that one could succeed at an organization, as these are critical components of sense of inclusion (Downey et al., 2015). Furthermore, procedural fairness signals that an individual is valued within the organization (e.g., Tyler, 2001) and thus should also promote identity safety for stigmatized individuals. To further demonstrate that incongruent identity safety cues specifically promote identity safety for one's ingroup, we employ a measure of fairness that is identity specific.

In Studies 1 and 2, we examine whether White women report a greater sense of inclusion and greater perceived procedural fairness (identity safety) in an organization after

learning about the organization's gender or racial diversity structures. Similarly, in Study 3, we examine whether men of color report greater identity safety after learning about an organization's gender or racial diversity structures. Further, in Study 4, we test our hypothesis that diversity structures do not influence White men's perceptions of identity safety as they do not hold stigmatized race or gender identities. Lastly, across all studies, we examine whether White women, men of color, and White men perceive organizations with gender or racial diversity structures as lower in SDO than organizations with no diversity structures and whether perceptions of an organization's SDO mediate identity safety cue transfers for White women and men of color in the presence of identity incongruent diversity structures. Specifically, we propose and test a model in which incongruent diversity structures signal low organizational SDO, which in turn promotes perceptions of procedural fairness and a sense of inclusion for stigmatized individuals.

Study 1

Integrating research on organizational diversity structures, stigmatized identities, and perceptions of ideologies (SDO), Study 1 sought to demonstrate that participants hold a lay understanding of the overlapping nature of bias that allows identity safety cues to transfer. As such, White women indicated perceptions of the organization's SDO, procedural fairness, and sense of inclusion at an organization with either a gender diversity training program, a racial diversity training program, or a neutral employee training program.

Method

Participants. In all, 163 White women were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk in exchange for US$0.30.[1] One participant was excluded for incorrectly responding to the two attention check questions, and one participant was excluded for not currently residing in the United States, leaving a final sample of 161. Participants' average age was 40.08 years ($SD = 14.62$). Sample size was given an anticipated stop point between 140 and 160 based on a priori power calculations for a main effect in a three-cell one-way ANOVA with a medium effect size and 80% power.

Procedure and measures. Participants were all presented with basic information about a company, Smith & Simon Corporation, including that it was involved with finance and insurance. Next, based on random assignment, participants learned about one of three training programs the company implemented. In the control condition, this training was titled "Fostering Employee Success" and highlighted fostering improved communication among employees, with no mention of gender or race. In the gender ideology condition, the training program was titled "Fostering Women's Success" and was described as fostering communication between male and female

employees, while rewarding good performance in ways that do not discriminate against women. The racial ideology condition was nearly identical, but was titled "Fostering Racial Minorities' Success" and described as improving communication among racial minority and White employees. The gender diversity training and control training conditions were taken directly from Kaiser et al. (2013), and the racial diversity statement substituted "racial minorities" for "women."

Participants were then asked to answer a series of questions about the company (e.g., "This company is a software firm" [false]), including the goals of the training program, serving as our manipulation check. Participants who incorrectly answered the manipulation check question were again prompted with information about this company, and only those who correctly responded to questions about the company's training programs were allowed to continue.[2]

Next, participants answered a series of questions regarding the company's ideology, perceived fairness, participants' sense of inclusion, trust and comfort at the company, and employee demographics. After completion, participants were fully debriefed and thanked for their time.

Perceived SDO. Participants completed the 16-item SDO-$_{version7}$ Scale (Ho et al., 2015) as they thought a manager at the company would complete it. The measures were responded to on a scale from 1 (*A manager would strongly oppose*) to 7 (*A manager would strongly favor*) and included items such as "Some groups of people must be kept in their place" and "We should not push for group equality." Appropriate items were reverse coded such that higher scores indicated a greater hierarchical mind-set, and this scale was found to be reliable ($\alpha = .81$).

Procedural fairness for women. Five items of perceived procedural fairness (Kaiser et al., 2013) for women at the company were completed on a scale from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*) and included items such as "Women have influence over the outcomes they receive at Smith & Simon Corporation," "Women are able to express their views and feelings about their treatment at Smith & Simon Corporation," and "Smith & Simon Corporation applies personnel procedures consistently across all employees" ($\alpha = .94$).

Anticipated fit. Participants were asked to imagine that they were now employed at this company, and to complete nine items of perceived fit at the company (based on Cook, Purdie-Vaughns, Garcia, & Cohen, 2012) on a scale from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*). This scale taps both the degree to which one believes they would be able to succeed at the company (e.g., "I am the kind of person that would do well in this company") as well as how much they anticipate being accepted by others in the company (e.g., "People in this company would accept me"), two aspects of an individual's perceived connectedness and inclusion to an organization (Walton & Cohen, 2007; $\alpha = .92$).

Anticipated trust and comfort. Again imagining that they were currently employed at Smith & Simon Corporation, participants completed 11 items of trust and comfort at the company (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008) on a scale from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*). Sample items include "I think I would like to work at a company like Smith & Simon Corporation" and "I think that my values and the values of Smith & Simon Corporation are very similar" ($\alpha = .97$).

Employee demographics. Participants were asked to report what percentage of the employees at the company they believed were women and what percentage they believed were racial minorities. These items were included to ensure that an ideology of equality was the main mechanism through which identity safety cues transferred and not perceptions of employee demographics.

Results

Preliminary analyses. As several of the variables measuring sense of fit and trust and comfort were highly correlated, we performed an exploratory principal factor analysis (EFA) using varimax rotation on the 20 items assessing anticipated fit, trust, and comfort. While this analysis revealed two factors with Eigenvalues >1, all but three items loaded on Factor 1 > .40. Specifically, three sense of fit items, "I would feel like an outsider at Smith & Simon Corporation," "I would know what I needed to do to succeed at Smith & Simon Corporation," and "I would not know how to get a boss at Smith & Simon Corporation to like me" were then removed, resulting in one factor with an Eigenvalue = 12.35, which accounted for 72.63% of the variance. The remaining 17 items were thus combined to form a singular measure of anticipated inclusion that was found to be highly reliable ($\alpha = .98$).

Primary analyses. One-way ANOVAs were conducted to determine the effect of condition on all dependent variables. Furthermore, Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) post hoc analyses were conducted for all significant main effects. Last, mediation tests were conducted via a 10,000 sample bootstrapped inferred asymmetrical distribution with the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2012) to test whether incongruent condition effects on anticipated inclusion and procedural fairness were mediated by perceived SDO.

Perceived SDO. There was a main effect of condition on perceived SDO, $F(2, 158) = 7.49$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.09$. The post hoc analyses revealed that compared with a company with no diversity training program ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 1.34$), a company with a racial diversity training program ($M = 2.08$, $SD = 0.98$) was perceived as significantly lower in SDO, $p < .001$, $d = -0.64$, 95% confidence interval (CI) = [−1.09, −0.25]. Similarly, a company with a gender diversity training

program ($M = 2.12$, $SD = 0.84$) was perceived as significantly lower in SDO than a company with no diversity training program, $p = .002$, $d = -0.60$, 95% CI = [−1.13, −0.33]. There was no significant difference in perceived SDO between companies with a gender diversity training program and a racial diversity training program, $p = .75$, $d = 0.07$, 95% CI = [−0.46, 0.33].

Procedural fairness for women. An ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition on procedural fairness for women, $F(2, 158) = 3.52$, $p = .03$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.04$. Critical to the transfer theory, the company with a racial diversity training program ($M = 5.91$, $SD = 1.18$) was perceived as more procedurally fair for woman than the company with no diversity training program ($M = 5.37$, $SD = 1.35$), $p < .02$, $d = 0.43$, 95% CI = [0.08, 1.00]. Furthermore, the company with a gender diversity training program ($M = 5.93$, $SD = 1.09$) was also perceived as more procedurally fair than the company with no diversity training program, $p = .02$, $d = 0.46$, 95% CI = [0.08, 1.04]. There was no significant difference in procedural fairness for women between companies with a gender diversity training program and a racial diversity training program, $p = .92$, $d = 0.02$, 95% CI = [−0.43, 0.47].

Anticipated inclusion. Participants' anticipated inclusion significantly varied by condition, $F(2, 158) = 6.24$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.07$. Of critical importance, the company with the racial diversity training ($M = 5.73$, $SD = 1.06$) promoted greater anticipated inclusion than the company with no diversity training program ($M = 4.99$, $SD = 1.25$), $p = .001$, $d = 0.64$, 95% CI = [0.31, 1.16]. Furthermore, the company with gender diversity training ($M = 5.57$, $SD = 1.07$) programs promoted greater anticipated inclusion than the company with no diversity training program, $p = .01$, $d = 0.50$, 95% CI = [0.14, 1.03]. There was no significant difference in anticipated inclusion between companies with a gender diversity training program and a racial diversity training program, $p = .48$, $d = -0.15$, 95% CI = [−0.29, 0.57].

Employee demographics. The ANOVA revealed a main effect of condition on the perceived percentage of female employees at the company, $F(2, 158) = 3.56$, $p = .03$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.04$. Companies with a gender diversity training program were perceived as having a greater percentage of female employees ($M = 44.57$, $SD = 14.08$) than a company with a racial diversity training program ($M = 37.78$, $SD = 12.14$), $p = .01$, $d = 0.52$, 95% CI = [1.48, 12.08] and the company with no diversity training program ($M = 38.82$, $SD = 16.35$), $p = .04$, $d = 0.38$, 95% CI = [0.17, 11.33]. Critically, there was no significant difference in perceived percentage of female employees at companies with a racial diversity training program (the incongruent condition) compared with the control condition company with no diversity training program, $p = .71$, $d = -0.07$, 95% CI = [−4.33, 6.39].

Furthermore, participants did not perceive a significant difference in the percentage of racial minority employees by condition, $F(2, 158) = 1.71$, $p = .18$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$. Specifically, there was no difference in perceptions of perceived racial minority employees between the racial diversity training ($M = 38.67$, $SD = 18.32$), the gender diversity training ($M = 32.65$, $SD = 14.14$), and the control training programs ($M = 34.20$, $SD = 20.75$).

Mediation. To test the hypothesis that perceiving the organization as having lower SDO (i.e., a more egalitarian culture) mediated the effect of outgroup safety cue on procedural fairness for women and anticipated inclusion, we conducted 10,000 bootstrap sample mediations. The indirect effect of condition (1 = *Racial Diversity Training*; −1 = *Control Training*) on procedural fairness via perceived SDO was significant, $B = 0.26$, $SE = 0.09$, 95% BC CI = [0.11, 0.49], as was the indirect effect of condition on anticipated inclusion via perceived SDO, $B = 0.15$, $SE = 0.07$, 95% BC CI = [0.04, 0.33]. Alternative models switching the order of perceived SDO and the identity safety outcomes (procedural fairness and anticipated inclusion) were also tested. While both of these alternative mediation models also revealed significant indirect effects, additional measures of model fit (e.g., chi-square goodness of fit) supported the causal order of condition → perceived SDO → procedural fairness but were inconclusive for anticipated inclusion as the measures of model fit were similar. All unstandardized parameter estimates, their standard errors, and accompanying CIs, and additional measures of model fit are presented in Table 1.

Discussion

Study 1 provides preliminary support for identity safety cue transfers such that White women perceive companies with gender or racial diversity training programs as more procedurally fair for women, while perceiving those companies as also signaling greater inclusion, if they were to work in those settings. As demonstrated by the mediation models, these identity safety measures were due to lower perceptions of SDO in companies with diversity training programs (gender or racial) compared with a neutral training program. Importantly, perceptions of the percentage of female employees did not differ in the racial diversity training program condition compared with the control condition and were significantly less in the racial diversity training condition than in the gender diversity training program condition. Thus, identity safety cue transfers were not due to a greater perceived percentage of women, but due to perceptions of the company's ideology.

Study 2

The aim of Study 2 was to replicate the results of Study 1 while employing a new diversity structure, specifically, diversity awards. Diversity awards have previously been demonstrated

to cue congruent identity safety (e.g., gender aimed awards cue identity safety for women; Dover, Major, & Kaiser, 2014), and suggest that an organization has already achieved the identity safety of the specified group, whereas diversity training programs or ideologies signal a goal of identity safety and provide no evidence of actual progress toward this goal. Thus, in Study 2 White women were recruited and randomly assigned to read about a company with either gender diversity awards, racial diversity awards, or neutral success-oriented awards. In addition, we included a measure of participants' interest in working for this company.

Method

Participants. In total, 141 White women were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk in exchange for US$0.30. Two participants were excluded for incorrectly responding to the two attention check questions, and two were excluded for not currently residing in the United States, leaving a final sample of 137 White women with an average age of 37.77 years ($SD = 13.00$).

Procedure and measures. Participants were first presented with the same basic company information (i.e., finance and insurance company) as was presented in Study 1. Next, participants viewed a page of awards that the company had received. In the control condition, this information simply contained four awards regarding the company's status as a successful investment company and the company's leadership awards, including "3rd Best U.S. Investment Platform" by *Investment Week* magazine and "One of America's Top Companies for Executive Leadership" by the National Association of Executives. In the gender diversity award condition, the company received two general awards (e.g., "Top 10 Best U.S. Private Investment Company"), as well as "3rd Best Company for Working Mothers" by *Working Mother* magazine and "One of America's Top Companies for Executive Women" by the National Association for Female Executives (Kaiser et al., 2013). In the racial diversity award condition, these two adjusted awards included the "3rd Best Company for Black Workers" by the *Black Network* magazine and "One of America's Top Companies for Black Executives" by the National Association for Black Executives.

As in Study 1, after viewing the company information and the diversity structure manipulation, participants had to successfully complete the manipulation check question to advance.[3] Next, participants completed the same measures of perceived SDO (α = .96), procedural fairness for women (α = .96), sense of fit (α = .95), and trust and comfort (α = .97) as in Study 1. After completion, participants were fully debriefed and thanked for their time.

Results

Preliminary analyses. Again, several items from the sense of fit and trust and comfort scales were highly correlated so we

Table 1. Mediation Models for White Women, Study 1.

	B (SE)	p	BC 95% CI	χ^2	p	CFI	SRMR
Control vs. racial → Perceived SDO → DV							
Procedural fairness							
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.37 (0.11)	.001	[−0.58, −0.15]				
Condition → Procedural fairness	0.01 (0.10)	.90	[−0.18, 0.21]				
Perceived SDO → Procedural fairness	−0.70 (0.08)	<.001	[−0.87, −0.54]				
Indirect effect	0.26 (0.10)		[0.10, 0.48]	0.02	.89	1.00	.00
Anticipated inclusion							
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.37 (0.11)	.001	[−0.58, −0.15]				
Condition → Anticipated inclusion	0.22 (0.11)	.04	[0.01, 0.42]				
Perceived SDO → Anticipated inclusion	−0.42 (0.09)	<.001	[−0.59, −0.24]				
Indirect effect	0.15 (0.07)		[0.04, 0.32]	4.24	.04	0.92	.05
Control vs. racial → DV → Perceived SDO							
Procedural fairness							
Condition → Procedural fairness	0.27 (0.12)	.03	[0.03, 0.51]				
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.21 (0.09)	.02	[−0.38, −0.03]				
Procedural fairness → Perceived SDO	−0.59 (0.07)	<.001	[−0.72, −0.45]				
Indirect effect	−0.16 (0.08)		[−0.35, −0.03]	5.68	.01	0.93	.06
Anticipated inclusion							
Condition → Anticipated inclusion	0.37 (0.11)	.001	[0.15, 0.59]				
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.21 (0.11)	.05	[−0.42, −0.01]				
Anticipated inclusion → Perceived SDO	−0.42 (0.09)	<.001	[−0.59, −0.24]				
Indirect effect	−0.15 (0.08)		[−0.35, −0.05]	4.01	.04	0.92	.05

Note. CI = confidence interval; CFI = comparative fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; SDO = social dominance orientation; DV = dependent variable.

conducted an EFA using a varimax rotation on all items. The analysis revealed two factors with Eigenvalues > 1. However, removing the same three items that were excluded in Study 1 resulted in a single factor with an Eigenvalue = 12.99 that accounted for 76.42% of the variance. The remaining 17 items were combined to form the measure of anticipated inclusion (α = .98).

Perceived SDO. There was a significant main effect of condition on perceived SDO, $F(2, 134) = 16.47$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.20$. Critically, the company with racial diversity awards ($M = 2.66$, $SD = 1.22$) was perceived as significantly lower in SDO than the company with no diversity awards ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.58$), $p < .001$, $d = -0.96$, 95% CI = [−1.87, 0.81]. In addition, the company with gender diversity awards ($M = 2.58$, $SD = 1.06$) was also perceived as lower in SDO than a company with no diversity awards, $p < .001$, $d = -1.05$, 95% CI = [−1.98, −0.85]. Furthermore, there was no significant difference in perceived SDO between the companies with either racial or gender diversity awards, $p = .78$, $d = -0.07$, 95% CI = [0.62, 0.46].

Procedural fairness for women. Perceived procedural fairness for women in the companies significantly varied by condition, $F(2, 134) = 19.19$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.22$. Of critical importance to the identity safety cue transfers hypothesis, the company with racial diversity awards ($M = 5.04$, $SD = 1.25$) was perceived as more procedurally fair for women than a company

with no diversity awards ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 1.56$), $p = .004$, $d = 0.56$, 95% CI = [0.26, 1.31]. Furthermore, participants perceived companies with gender diversity awards ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 1.03$) as significantly more procedurally fair for women than the company with no diversity awards, $p < .001$, $d = 1.32$, 95% CI = [1.19, 2.30]. Last, the company with gender diversity awards was perceived as more procedurally fair for woman than the company with racial diversity awards, $p = .001$, $d = 0.83$, 95% CI = [0.42, 1.49].

Anticipated inclusion. An ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition on anticipated inclusion at the company, $F(2, 134) = 8.50$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.11$. While the company with gender diversity awards ($M = 5.49$, $SD = 1.19$) increased anticipated inclusion more so than the company with no diversity award ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 1.58$), $p < .001$, $d = 0.91$, 95% CI = [0.63, 1.88], there was no significant difference between the company with racial diversity awards ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 1.53$) and no diversity awards, $p = .30$, $d = 0.21$, 95% CI = [0.28, 0.90]. Furthermore, the company with gender diversity awards promoted greater anticipated inclusion than the company with racial diversity awards, $p = .002$, $d = 0.68$, 95% CI = [0.34, 1.54].[4]

Mediation. To determine whether perceptions of SDO mediated the effect of outgroup safety cues on procedural fairness for women and anticipated inclusion, we again conducted 10,000 bootstrap sample mediations. The indirect effect of

Table 2. Mediation Models for White Women, Study 2.

	B (SE)	*p*	BC 95% CI	χ^2	*p*	CFI	SRMR
Control vs. racist → Perceived SDO → DV							
Procedural fairness							
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.67 (0.14)	<.001	[−0.95, −0.38]				
Condition → Procedural fairness	0.05 (0.14)	.69	[−0.22, 0.32]				
Perceived SDO → Procedural fairness	−0.51 (0.09)	<.001	[−0.69, −0.33]				
Indirect effect	0.34 (0.11)		[0.16, 0.59]	0.16	.69	1.00	.10
Anticipated inclusion							
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.67 (0.14)	<.001	[−0.95, −0.38]				
Condition → Anticipated inclusion	−0.25 (0.15)	.11	[−0.55, 0.05]				
Perceived SDO → Anticipated inclusion	−0.62 (0.10)	<.001	[−0.81, −0.42]				
Indirect effect	0.41 (0.11)		[0.23, 0.65]	2.72	.10	0.97	.04
Control vs. racist → DV → Perceived SDO							
Procedural fairness							
Condition → Procedural fairness	0.39 (0.14)	.01	[0.11, 0.68]				
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.47 (0.13)	<.001	[−0.72, 0.21]				
Procedural fairness → Perceived SDO	−0.51 (0.09)	<.001	[−0.69, −0.33]				
Indirect effect	−0.20 (0.09)		[−0.41, −0.06]	12.72	<.001	0.78	.09
Anticipated inclusion							
Condition → Anticipated inclusion	0.17 (0.16)	.31	[−0.16, 0.49]				
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.59 (0.12)	<.001	[−0.83, −0.35]				
Anticipated inclusion → Perceived SDO	−0.48 (0.08)	<.001	[−0.64, −0.33]				
Indirect effect	−0.08 (0.08)		[−0.25, 0.07]	21.64	<.001	0.61	.13

Note. CI = confidence interval; CFI = comparative fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; SDO = social dominance orientation; DV = dependent variable.

condition (1 = *Racial Diversity Awards*; −1 = *Control Awards*) on procedural fairness via perceived SDO was significant, *B* = 0.34, *SE* = 0.11, 95% BC CI = [0.17, 0.59], as was the indirect effect of condition on anticipated inclusion via perceived SDO, *B* = 0.41, *SE* = 0.11, 95% BC CI = [0.23, 0.66]. While the alternative mediation model switching the causal order of perceived SDO and procedural fairness also revealed a significant indirect effect, the same was not true for the alternative model switching the order of perceived SDO and anticipated inclusion. Furthermore, additional measures of model fit (e.g., chi-square goodness of fit) supported the causal order of condition → perceived SDO → procedural fairness and anticipated inclusion. All unstandardized parameter estimates, their standard errors, and accompanying CIs are presented in Table 2.

Discussion

As in Study 1, racial diversity awards cued identity safety for White women. Specifically, organizations with a diversity award were perceived as having less of a hierarchical culture than organizations with no diversity awards, which was associated with greater perceptions of procedural fairness for women and an increased sense of inclusion. Having demonstrated that identity safety cues transferred from racial diversity awards for White women, in Study 3 we recruited men of color to determine whether they would perceive identity safety cue transfers from gender diversity awards.

Study 3

The aim of Study 3 was to determine whether the effects of transferred identity safety cues were specific to White women, or if men of color would report greater identity safety from gender-specific diversity structures due to lower perceived SDO in the awarded organizations. We posit that just as White women perceived a company with a racial diversity structure as cuing identity safety for women, gender identity safety cues should also transfer, signaling greater procedural fairness and anticipated inclusion for men of color (i.e., Latino and Black men). Thus, in Study 3 Black and Latino men were recruited to demonstrate that identity safety cue transfers occur for men of color who learn about a company with gender diversity awards.

Method

Participants. In all, 161 minority men (91 Black, 70 Latino) were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk in exchange for US$0.30. Four Black participants were excluded for incorrectly responding to two attention check questions, and four Latino men were excluded for not currently residing in the United States, leaving a final sample size of 153 men of color with an average age of 33.10 years (*SD* = 10.55).

Procedure and measures. This study was identical to Study 2, except in the racial diversity award condition, the two critical

awards from Study 2 were adjusted to participant's race (Black or Latino). In addition, participants completed the same measures of perceived SDO (α = .94), sense of fit (α = .91), and trust and comfort (α = .97) as in Study 2. Participants also completed the measure of procedural fairness (α = .92) but items were adjusted for participants' race.[5]

Results

Preliminary analyses. Once again, the items from the sense of fit and trust and comfort scales were highly correlated, and we conducted an EFA using a varimax rotation. While this analysis revealed two factors with Eigenvalues > 1, the removal of the same three items from Studies 1 and 2 resulted in a single factor with an Eigenvalue = 12.06 that accounted for 70.94% of the variance. These remaining 17 items were again combined to form the measure of anticipated inclusion (α = .97).

To ensure there were no effects by race, initial 3 (Condition: racial, gender, control award) × 2 (Participant Race: Black, Latino) ANOVAs were conducted. These analyses revealed no significant effects of Participant Race, and thus, we collapsed across Participant Race and conducted one-way ANOVAs with LSD post hoc analyses as in Studies 1 and 2.

Perceived SDO. Participants' perceptions of the companies' SDO significantly varied by condition, $F(2, 150) = 10.33$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.12$. Critical to the transfer hypothesis, the company with gender diversity awards ($M = 2.68$, $SD = 0.93$) was perceived as lower in SDO than the company with no diversity awards ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 1.50$), $p < .001$, $d = -0.89$, 95% CI = [−1.61, −0.61]. Furthermore, the company with racial diversity awards ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.44$) was perceived as significantly lower in SDO than a company with no diversity awards, $p = .002$, $d = -0.57$, 95% CI = [−1.36, −0.32]. Last, there was no significant difference in perceived SDO between companies with gender or racial diversity awards, $p = .30$, $d = 0.23$, 95% CI = [−0.25, 0.79].

Procedural fairness for racial ingroup. Perceptions of procedural fairness for participants' racial ingroup significantly varied by condition, $F(2, 150) = 8.39$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.10$. Importantly, the company with gender diversity awards ($M = 4.87$, $SD = 1.34$) was perceived as more procedurally fair to participants' racial ingroup than the company with no diversity awards ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 1.39$), $p = .05$, $d = 0.37$, 95% CI = [0.001, −1.00]. Similarly, the company with racial diversity awards ($M = 5.44$, $SD = 1.15$) was perceived as more procedurally fair to participants' racial ingroup than a company with no diversity awards, $p < .001$, $d = 0.83$, 95% CI = [0.55, 1.58]. Furthermore, there was a significant difference in perceived fairness to one's racial ingroup between the company with gender and racial diversity awards, $p = .03$, $d = 0.46$, 95% CI = [0.05, 1.08].

Anticipated inclusion. An ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition on inclusion, $F(2, 150) = 7.59$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.09$. Critical to the transfer hypothesis, the company with gender diversity awards ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.40$) increased anticipated inclusion more so than the company with no diversity awards ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 1.41$), $p = .03$, $d = 0.41$, 95% CI = [0.06, 1.08]. Similarly, participants anticipated greater inclusion in the company with racial diversity awards ($M = 5.46$, $SD = 1.17$) than the company with no diversity awards, $p < .001$, $d = 0.80$, 95% CI = [0.06, 1.56]. Furthermore, there was no significant difference in perceived inclusion between the companies with gender or racial diversity awards, $p = .09$, $d = 0.36$, 95% CI = [−0.07, 1.00].[6]

Mediation. To determine whether perceptions of SDO mediated the effect of outgroup safety cues on Procedural Fairness for participants' racial ingroup and anticipated inclusion, we again conducted 10,000 bootstrap sample mediations. The indirect effect of condition (1 = *Gender Diversity Awards*, −1 = *Control Awards*) on procedural fairness via perceived SDO was significant, $B = 0.36$, $SE = 0.10$, 95% BC CI = [0.20, 0.59], as was the indirect effect of condition on anticipated inclusion via perceived SDO, $B = 0.33$, $SE = 0.09$, 95% BC CI = [0.18, 0.53]. While the alternative mediation models switching the order of perceived SDO and anticipated inclusion revealed a significant indirect effect, the same was not true for the alternative model switching the order of perceived SDO and procedural fairness. Furthermore, additional measures of model fit (e.g., chi-square goodness of fit) supported the causal order of condition → perceived SDO → procedural fairness and anticipated inclusion. All unstandardized parameter estimates, their standard errors, and accompanying CIs are presented in Table 3.

Discussion

As predicted, men of color perceived greater identity safety in companies with racial or gender diversity awards, providing evidence that identity safety cue transfers are not limited to White women. Indeed, men of color perceived companies with diversity awards as lower in SDO, resulting in increases in perceived procedural fairness and sense of inclusion.

Study 4

While the purpose of Study 3 was to demonstrate that identity safety transfer cues are not limited to White women, the purpose of Study 4 was to demonstrate that although White men will perceive companies with gender or racial diversity awards as having a less hierarchical culture, they will not experience greater identity safety from either of these diversity cues as they do not hold a stigmatized gender or racial identity. Specifically, due to a lay understanding of the monolithic nature of intergroup attitudes, we hypothesize that White men will perceive an organization with a diversity

Table 3. Mediation Models for Men of Color, Study 3.

	B (SE)	p	BC 95% CI	χ^2	p	CFI	SRMR
Control vs. gender → Perceived SDO → DV							
Procedural fairness							
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.56 (0.12)	<.001	[−0.80, −0.31]				
Condition → Procedural fairness	−0.11 (0.12)	.33	[−0.35, 0.12]				
Perceived SDO → Procedural fairness	−0.65 (0.09)	<.001	[−0.83, −0.48]				
Indirect effect	0.36 (0.10)		[0.20, 0.58]	0.99	.32	1.00	.02
Anticipated inclusion							
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.56 (0.12)	<.001	[−0.80, −0.31]				
Condition → Anticipated inclusion	−0.05 (0.13)	.71	[−0.30, 0.20]				
Perceived SDO → Anticipated inclusion	−0.60 (0.09)	<.001	[−0.78, −0.41]				
Indirect effect	0.33 (0.09)		[0.18, 0.53]	0.15	.70	1.00	.01
Control vs. gender → DV → Perceived SDO							
Procedural fairness							
Condition → Procedural fairness	0.25 (0.13)	.06	[−0.01, 0.51]				
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.42 (0.10)	<.001	[−0.62, −0.22]				
Procedural fairness → Perceived SDO	−0.55 (0.07)	<.001	[−0.69, −0.41]				
Indirect effect	−0.14 (0.07)		[−0.30, −0.01]	16.85	<.001	0.77	.10
Anticipated inclusion							
Condition → Anticipated inclusion	0.28 (0.14)	.04	[0.01, 0.56]				
Condition → Perceived SDO	−0.42 (0.11)	<.001	[−0.63, −0.21]				
Anticipated inclusion → Perceived SDO	−0.47 (0.07)	<.001	[−0.62, −0.33]				
Indirect effect	−0.14 (0.07)		[−0.30, −0.01]	15.22	<.001	0.75	.10

Note. CI = confidence interval; CFI = comparative fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; SDO = social dominance orientation; DV = dependent variable.

structure as having a less hierarchical organizational culture. However, because White men do not hold a stigmatized racial or gender identity, they would not perceive personal or group benefits from this egalitarian ideology. Thus, in Study 4, White men were recruited to demonstrate that due to a lay theory of the overlapping nature of biases, a company with gender diversity or racial diversity awards will be perceived as lower in SDO than a company with no diversity awards, but these diversity structures will not signal identity safety for White men as they hold no stigmatized identity.

Method

Participants. In total, 143 White men were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk in exchange for US$0.30. Four participants were excluded for incorrectly responding to the two attention checks and six were excluded for not currently residing in the United States, leaving a final sample of 133 White men with an average age of 38.37 years (*SD* = 13.45).[7]

Procedure and measures. Procedures were identical to those in Study 2.[8] Furthermore, participants completed the same measures of perceived SDO (α = .95), sense of fit (α = .92), and trust and comfort (α = .96), as well as the measure of procedural fairness, which was adjusted to reflect procedural fairness for men (α = .93).

Results

Preliminary analyses. Several of the sense of fit and trust and comfort items once again were highly correlated. An EFA using a varimax rotation revealed two factors with Eigenvalues > 1. However, removing the same three items as in Studies 1 to 3 resulted in a single factor with an Eigenvalue = 11.93 that accounted for 70.17% of the variance. Thus, the remaining 17 items were combined to form the measure of anticipated inclusion (α = .97).

Perceived SDO. Participants' perceptions of the company's SDO significantly differed by condition, $F(2, 130) = 19.73$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.23$. Specifically, participants perceived the company with no diversity awards (*M* = 4.16, *SD* = 1.11) as significantly higher in SDO than the company with gender diversity awards (*M* = 3.09, *SD* = 1.11), $p < .001$, $d = −0.96$, 95% CI = [−1.52, −0.62] or racial diversity awards (*M* = 2.74, *SD* = 1.07), $p < .001$, $d = −1.30$, 95% CI = [−1.90, −0.95]. Furthermore, there was no significant difference in perceived SDO between companies with racial and gender diversity awards, $p = .14$, $d = 0.32$, 95% CI = [−0.11, 0.82].

Procedural fairness for men. The effect of condition on perceptions of procedural fairness was not significant, $F(2, 130) = 2.37$, $p = .10$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.04$. Specifically, there was no difference

in perceived procedural fairness for men at companies with gender diversity awards ($M = 5.42$, $SD = 1.12$), racial diversity awards ($M = 5.10$, $SD = 1.09$), or no diversity awards ($M = 4.87$, $SD = 1.45$).[9]

Anticipated inclusion. An ANOVA revealed no main effect of condition on anticipated inclusion at the company, $F(2, 130) = 0.83$, $p = .44$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$. Specifically, there was no significant difference in anticipated inclusion at companies with either gender diversity awards ($M = 4.93$, $SD = 1.05$), racial diversity awards ($M = 4.61$, $SD = 1.56$), or no diversity awards ($M = 4.77$, $SD = 1.29$).[10]

Discussion

As predicted, while White men perceived companies with gender and racial diversity awards as lower in SDO, demonstrating a lay understanding of the overlapping nature of biases, this perception of organizations with diversity awards as having a more hierarchical culture did not result in greater identity safety cues as hypothesized. Indeed, White men did not perceive any differences in procedural fairness or anticipated inclusion in companies with diversity awards (gender or racial) compared with a company with neutral success awards.

Internal Meta-Analysis

To test the robustness of the identity safety transfer effect in Studies 1 to 3 (see Phillips & Lowery, 2015, for similar procedure), we conducted an internal meta-analysis, comparing perceived SDO, perceived procedural fairness, and anticipated inclusion between the no diversity cue and outgroup diversity cue conditions across the first three studies ($N = 312$). Each participant's reports of identity safety and perceived ideology were first z scored within each experiment. Data from all three studies were then combined, taking only the scores from the no diversity control conditions and the critical outgroup diversity cue conditions. Results revealed that, across all three studies, those in the outgroup diversity cue conditions ($n = 165$, $M = −0.28$, $SD = 0.80$) perceived the companies as lower in SDO than in the control conditions ($n = 147$, $M = 0.51$, $SD = 1.12$), $t(310) = 7.15$, $p < .001$, $d = −0.82$, 95% CI = [0.57, 1.00]. We then conducted an inverse variance meta-analytic approach that revealed similar results, $z = −6.93$, $p < .001$, $d = −0.82$, 95% CI = [−1.05, −0.59].

Similarly, across all three studies, participants reported greater procedural fairness for their stigmatized identity in the outgroup diversity cue conditions ($n = 165$, $M = 0.04$, $SD = 0.93$) than participants in the control conditions ($n = 147$, $M = −0.41$, $SD = 1.06$), $t(310) = −3.96$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.45$, 95% CI = [−0.67, −0.22]. Again, an inverse variance meta-analytic approach revealed similar results, $z = 3.90$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.45$, 95% CI = [0.22, 0.67]. Last, across all three studies, participants reported greater anticipated inclusion in the outgroup diversity cue conditions ($n = 165$, $M = 0.06$,

$SD = 0.97$) than participants in the control conditions ($n = 147$, $M = −0.37$, $SD = 1.03$), $t(310) = −3.78$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.43$, 95% CI = [−0.65, −0.21]. Again, an inverse variance meta-analytic approach revealed similar results, $z = 3.70$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.43$, 95% CI = [0.20, 0.65].

General Discussion

While previous research had identified the importance of diversity structures on cuing identity safety for stigmatized group members (e.g., Meeussen et al., 2014; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008), the present research transcends previous boundaries of identity safety cues. Specifically, by approaching diversity structures and identity safety cues from the framework of overlapping intergroup attitudes, the transference of identity safety cues demonstrates that individuals perceive diversity structures as reflections of an organization's (specifically its managers') ideology of social dominance that purports group equality for multiple stigmatized groups, not just the specified group. Across four studies, we hypothesized and demonstrated that White women (Studies 1 and 2) and men of color (Study 3) experience identity safety from incongruent diversity structures, in part, due to perceptions of the organization's ideology generalizing across identities. Furthermore, while White men (Study 4) similarly perceive organizations with diversity structures as purporting group equality, they did not experience gains (or losses) in identity safety due to this ideology.

Study 1 provided additional support for perceived ideology as the mechanism through which identity safety cues transfer. Specifically, an alternative explanation for these transfers, perceived employee demographics, was not affected by diversity structures. Participants were no more likely to see organizations with diversity structures as having a greater percentage of the nonspecified stigmatized group (e.g., no more women perceived in racial diversity structures than control), which could have served as an environmental diversity cue. Future research should be conducted to determine whether manipulations of environmental diversity cues (e.g., employee demographics, stereotypical décor; Cheryan, Plaut, Davies, & Steele, 2009) also result in identity safety cue transfers. In addition, the absence of an effect on perceptions of demographic diversity in Study 1 suggests that, though organizations with diversity structures were perceived as having less hierarchical ideologies, this did not actually translate to perceptions of a more diverse workplace.

The identification of the transference of identity safety cues, and thus the expansion of the boundaries of identity safety cues, may be critical in domains in which certain stigmatized identities are highly underrepresented and likely to experience identity threats (i.e., science, technology, engineering, and mathematics [STEM] fields). Specifically, while previous research has highlighted attempts to encourage women to pursue careers in STEM fields, this literature has largely focused on cues that encourage White women via

White female role models (e.g., Stout, Dasgupta, Hunsinger, & McManus, 2011) and nonstereotypically masculine environments (Cheryan et al., 2009). The present research suggests that incongruent diversity cues (e.g., the presence of racial minorities or, potentially, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender [LGBT] diversity cues) may similarly promote women's inclusion in STEM domains.

Notably, past research has found that high-status groups (e.g., Whites) reported expectations of anti-White discrimination from organizations with pro-diversity statements (Dover et al., 2016) while the present work finds no negative effects of diversity structures on White men. It is unclear whether the discrepancy between these findings is due to a difference in the diversity structure manipulation or the difference in outcomes. Specifically, Dover and colleagues' (2016) diversity manipulation highlighted diversity on multiple dimensions (race, gender, age, etc.) that may have created a compounding threat for White men who hold high-status identities on multiple dimensions. In contrast, the present research manipulated diversity by only one dimension at a time. In addition, the present research explored perceptions of inclusion, while Dover et al. (2016) focused on anti-White attitudes and cardiovascular outcomes. Furthermore, past work has suggested that adjusting diversity structures to all-inclusive multiculturalism may alleviate such threats to high-status groups (Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008). Thus, while we acknowledge that White men may experience anti-White threat from certain diversity structures, we would not necessarily view this threat as similar to the cue transfers described in the present studies, given that this would more precisely indicate a threat-from-safety transfer as opposed to a safety-from-safety transfer (or a threat-from-threat transfer; Sanchez et al., 2016). We encourage future work to further explore these nuances.

Furthermore, it should be noted that we do not anticipate all identity safety cues to transfer. Specifically, we hypothesize that cues are likely to transfer between groups who share similar status and stereotypes within the given domain (e.g., White women and men of color are both stereotyped as low in competence and typically underrepresented in leadership positions in the workplace; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Thus, although the identification of identity safety cue transfers is critical in furthering current theorizing of identity safety, it will be essential to identify the limits of these transfers, including limits based on between which groups transfers can occur. Furthermore, future research is needed to determine whether identity safety cues transfer when opposing information from diversity cues (e.g., racial diversity award, but low representation of female employees) are prevalent (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008).

Similarly, while past research has suggested that diversity structures may actually be detrimental as they prevent detection of discrimination (e.g., Kaiser et al., 2013), it is unclear whether an incongruent diversity structure would similarly prevent recognition of congruent discrimination, though we

propose that individuals would be more likely to experience the outcomes of congruent cues over an opposing incongruent cue. Indeed, results from the present studies suggest that congruent diversity structures generally resulted in greater identity safety than incongruent diversity structures, though we do not test conflicting cues. Furthermore, while the average weighted effect size for identity safety cue transfers for White women (Study 1, 2, $d = 0.57$) was comparable with the average effect size for identity safety cue transfers for men of color (Study 3, $d = 0.55$), future research should compare White women and men of color in a single study to examine the magnitude of transfer effects for each group and to examine the unique factors that might make White women or men of color less likely to show transfers (e.g., system justifying beliefs; Dover et al., 2014).

Across four studies, the current research demonstrated that previous research on identity safety cues has been limited in demonstrating the full scope of individuals that may positively benefit from such cues. Specifically, we demonstrate that diversity structures cue identity safety for non-specified stigmatized individuals via cue transfers due to a lay understanding of an ideology that underlies attitudes toward multiple stigmatized groups. Thus, the present research provides novel contributions that contest the previously defined boundaries of identity safety cues.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

Supplemental Material

The online supplemental material is available at http://pspb.sagepub.com/supplemental.

Notes

1. To veil our recruiting intentions, all participants first completed a series of unpaid qualifying questions that asked about not only race and gender but also other demographics, including age, religion, political orientation, and sexual orientation. Only participants who identified as White women were allowed to advance to the study.
2. In all, 16 participants failed on their first attempt and no participants were excluded for failure to accurately respond to this manipulation check question within the first two attempts. Excluding participants who failed the first manipulation check did not significantly affect results.
3. In total, 16 failed the manipulation check on the first attempt. No participants failed the manipulation check question twice. Excluding participants who failed the first manipulation check did not significantly affect results.

4. An additional four-item measure of interest in working at the company (α = .94) revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2,134) = 6.95$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.09$; however, racial diversity awards did not promote greater interest ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 1.81$) than the control condition ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.99$), $p = .30$. Gender diversity awards ($M = 5.18$, $SD = 1.84$) promoted greater interest than the control condition, $p < .001$, and the racial diversity award company, $p = .01$.

5. In total, 14 participants failed the manipulation check on the first attempt. No participants failed both attempts at the manipulation check. Excluding participants who failed the first manipulation check did not significantly affect the results.

6. An additional four-item measure of interest in working at the company (α = .93) revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2,149) = 8.92$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.11$. Gender diversity awards promoted greater interest ($M = 4.81$, $SD = 1.65$) than the control condition ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 1.67$), $p = .02$, as did racial diversity awards ($M = 5.41$, $SD = 1.39$), $p < .001$. There was no significant difference in interest between gender and racial diversity award companies, $p = .06$.

7. Notably, we do not propose that identity safety cue transfers only occur between gender and racial identities though these two stigmatized identities were the focus of the present research. Only six White men identified as nonheterosexual in this study, and thus, we were unable to test transfers from incongruent safety cues (e.g., race or gender) to sexual orientation nor was demographic information collected on other potentially stigmatized identity dimensions.

8. In total, 25 participants failed the manipulation check on the first attempt. One participant failed the manipulation check twice and thus did not complete the survey. Excluding participants who failed the first manipulation check did not significantly alter results.

9. Upon reviewer request, a shortened three-item version of this scale including only the items that specifically mention treatment for men was also examined and also revealed no effect of condition on procedural fairness ($M_{control} = 4.87$, $SD = 1.43$; $M_{race} = 5.04$, $SD = 1.08$; $M_{gender} = 5.42$, $SD = 1.15$), $F(2, 130) = 2.46$, $p = .09$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.04$.

10. An additional four-item measure of interest in working at the company (α = .93) was not significantly affected by condition, $F(2, 130) = 1.008$, $p = .34$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$ ($M_{control} = 4.23$, $SD = 1.52$; $M_{race} = 4.19$, $SD = 1.69$; $M_{gender} = 4.61$, $SD = 1.47$).

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Avery, D. R. (2003). Reactions to diversity in recruitment advertising—Are differences black and white? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 672-679. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.672

Cheryan, S., Plaut, V. C., Davies, P. G., & Steele, C. M. (2009). Ambient belonging: How stereotypical cues impact gender participation in computer science. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*, 1045-1060. doi:10.1037/a0016239

Cho, S., & Mor Barak, M. E. (2008). Understanding of diversity and inclusion in a perceived homogeneous culture: A study of organizational commitment and job performance among Korean employees. *Administration in Social Work*, *32*(4), 100-126. doi:10.1080/03643100802293865

Cohen, G. L., & Steele, C. M. (2002). A barrier of mistrust: How negative stereotypes affect cross-race mentoring. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 205-331). Oxford, England: Academic Press.

Cook, J. E., Purdie-Vaughns, V., Garcia, J., & Cohen, G. L. (2012). Chronic threat and contingent belonging: Protective benefits of values affirmation on identity development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*, 479-496. doi:10.1037/a0026312

Davies, P. G., Spencer, S. J., Quinn, D. M., & Gerhardstein, R. (2002). Consuming images: How television commercials that elicit stereotype threat can restrain women academically and professionally. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*(12), 1615-1628. doi:10.1177/014616702237644

Davies, P. G., Spencer, S. J., & Steele, C. M. (2005). Clearing the air: Identity safety moderates the effects of stereotype threat on women's leadership aspirations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 276-287. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.2.276

Dobbin, F. (2009). Inventing equal opportunity. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Dover, T. L., Major, B., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Diversity initiatives, status, and system-justifying beliefs: When and how diversity efforts de-legitimize discrimination claims. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *17*, 485-493. doi:10.1177/1368430213502560

Dover, T. L., Major, B., & Kaiser, C. R. (2016). Members of high-status groups are threatened by pro-diversity organizational messages. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *62*, 58-67. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2015.10.006

Downey, S. N., van der Werff, L., Thomas, K. M., & Plaut, V. C. (2015). The role of diversity practices and inclusion in promoting trust and employee engagement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *45*, 35-44. doi:10.1111/jasp.12273

Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2007). Right wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice. *European Journal of Personality*, *21*, 113-130. doi:10.1002/per.614

Edelman, L. B., Fuller, S. R., & Mara-Drita, I. (2001). Diversity rhetoric and the managerialization of law. *American Journal of Sociology*, *106*(6), 1589-1641. doi:10.1086/321303

Hayes, A. F. (2012). *PROCESS: A versatile computational tool for observed variable mediation, moderation, and conditional process modeling* [White paper]. Retrieved from http://www.afhayes.com/ public/process2012.pdf

Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Kteily, N., Sheehy-Skeffington, J., Pratto, F., Henkel, K. E., & . . . Stewart, A. L. (2015). The nature of social dominance orientation: Theorizing and measuring preferences for intergroup inequality using the new SDO 7 scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *109*, 1003-1028. doi:10.1037/pspi0000033

Jansen, W. S., Vos, M. W., Otten, S., Podsiadlowski, A., & van der Zee, K. I. (2015). Colorblind or colorful? How diversity approaches affect cultural majority and minority employees. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *46*, 81-93. doi:10.1111/jasp.12332

Kaiser, C. R., Brooke Vick, S., & Major, B. (2006). Prejudice expectations moderate preconscious attention to cues that

are threatening to social identity. *Psychological Science*, *17*, 332-338. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01707.x

Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T. L., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013). Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *104*, 504-519. doi:10.1037/a0030838

Logel, C., Walton, G. M., Spencer, S. J., Iserman, E. C., von Hippel, W., & Bell, A. E. (2009). Interacting with sexist men triggers social identity threat among female engineers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*(6), 1089-1103. doi:10.1037/a0015703

Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *56*, 393-421. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070137

Meeussen, L., Otten, S., & Phalet, K. (2014). Managing diversity: How leaders' multiculturalism and colorblindness affect work group functioning. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *17*, 629-644. doi:10.1177/1368430214525809

Mor Barak, M. E., & Levin, A. (2002). Outside of the corporate mainstream and excluded from the work community: A study of diversity, job satisfaction and well-being. *Community, Work & Family*, *5*, 133-157. doi:10.1080/13668800220146346

Morrison, A. M., & Von Glinow, M. A. (1990). Women and minorities in management. *American Psychologist*, *45*, 200-208.

Phillips, L. T., & Lowery, B. S. (2015). The hard-knock life? Whites claim hardships in response to racial inequity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *61*, 12-18. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2015.06.008

Plaut, V. C. (2002). Cultural models of diversity: The psychology of difference and inclusion. In R. Shweder, M. Minow, & H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Engaging cultural differences: The multicultural challenge in liberal democracies* (pp. 365-395). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Plaut, V. C. (2010). Diversity science: Why and how difference makes a difference. *Psychological Science*, *21*(2), 77-99. doi:10.1080/10478401003676501

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities? *Psychological Science*, *20*, 444-446. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02318.x

Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Ditlmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans

in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*, 615-630. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.4.615

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Walton, G. M. (2011). Is multiculturalism bad for African Americans? Redefining inclusion through the lens of identity safety. In L. R. Tropp & R. K. Mallett (Eds.), *Moving beyond prejudice reduction: Pathways to positive intergroup relations* (pp. 159-177). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/12319-008

Sanchez, D. T., Chaney, K. E., Manuel, S. K., Wilton, L. S., & Remedios, J. D. (2016). Stigma by prejudice transfer: Racism threatens White women and sexism threatens men of color. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Settles, I. H. (2004). When multiple identities interfere: The role of identity centrality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*(4), 487-500. doi:10.1177/0146147203261885

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2001). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the benefits of diversity: All-inclusive multiculturalism and positive organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *44*, 116-133. doi:10.1177/0021886308314460

Stout, J. G., Dasgupta, N., Hunsinger, M., & McManus, M. A. (2011). STEMing the tide: Using ingroup experts to inoculate women's self-concept in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*, 255-270. doi:10.1037/a0021385

Triana, M. D. C., & Garcia, M. F. (2009). Valuing diversity: A group-value approach to understanding the importance of organizational efforts to support diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *30*(7), 941-962. doi:10.1002/job.598

Tyler, T. R. (2001). Public trust and confidence in legal authorities: What do majority and minority group members want from the law and legal institutions? *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *19*, 215-235. doi:10.1002/bsl.438

Von Hippel, C., Walsh, A. M., & Zouroudis, A. (2011). Identity separation in response to stereotype threat. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *2*(3), 317-324. doi:10.1177/1948550610390391

Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*, 82-96. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.82