SUBMISSION TYPE
Poster

TITLE
How Cues in Diversity Statements are Affected by Diversity Reputation Information

ABSTRACT
We examined how organizational diversity statements using different cues (representation, structure, and both) affected perceptions of honesty and suspicion regarding the organization. We also evaluated how perceptions of diversity statements differed depending on whether the organization had a negative diversity reputation or not. Diversity statements were found to be less effective (less honest and more suspicious) regardless of cue when there was a negative diversity reputation. Our results also suggested that honesty/suspicion regarding these statements were related to attraction and fit.

WORD COUNT
2922

CITATION

*correspondence email: scottwi6@msu.edu

AUTHORS
William Scott, M.A., Michigan State University.
Dr. Ann Marie Ryan, Ph.D., Michigan State University.
Dr. Jasmine Wheeler, Ph.D., Fors Marsh Group.
Dr. Laura Severance, Ph.D., Fors Marsh Group.
How Cues in Diversity Statements are Affected by Diversity Reputation Information

Diversity, equity, and inclusion in organizations have been topics of increasing importance over the past few years, and as such the diversity reputation of an organization is also growing in importance. Diversity reputation is the perception of an organization's ability to manage diverse work environments (Roberson & Park, 2007). Diversity reputation can influence whether jobseekers will be attracted to and apply to work for an organization. For example, a positive diversity reputation may signal that an organization actively recruits women and minorities, and that fair treatment of all employees is important to the organization (Roberson & Park, 2007). Diversity reputation is not only important for attracting applicants to apply to the organization, but it has also been found to be linked to greater firm performance (Cook & Glass, 2014; McMillan-Capehart et al., 2010; Roberson & Park, 2007). While there is empirical support for the benefits of having a positive diversity reputation, less is known about the effects of a negative diversity reputation or how to overcome and improve this reputation. Organizations with a negative diversity reputation may be less likely to attract minority jobseekers than an organization with a positive diversity reputation, suggesting that a negative diversity reputation can be very costly in terms of the organization missing out on talented minority applicants. Applicants in general may perceive that organizations with a negative diversity reputation are less concerned about creating a safe and fair work environment and that harassment and discrimination are tolerated (or not taken seriously) by the organization (Chin, 2009).

Organizations are concerned with changing a negative diversity reputation but doing so can be a significant challenge. Applicants may evaluate the existing demographic make-up of the organization to form their diversity reputation perceptions, and this demographic make-up is not something that can be easily or quickly changed (Wilton et al., 2019). Organizations that have
little demographic diversity that seek to improve their diversity reputation are faced with a dilemma because to increase their diversity reputation, they need to hire more diverse employees, but to attract more diverse applicants, they need to have a stronger diversity reputation. This dilemma is central to our primary question of how organizations can improve their negative diversity reputation to attract applicants and overcome a negative diversity reputation while lacking existing demographic diversity. Cable and Graham (2000) contend that it is possible to change reputation perceptions by successfully managing job seekers’ knowledge about organizational attributes (training programs, diversity programs, etc.). One form of this information that can be provided to applicants are organizational diversity statements.

Organizational diversity statements are written forms of promotional material (most often on the organization’s webpage) signaling that the organization values diversity and the work environment is diverse, fair, and inclusive (Avery & McKay, 2006; Kaiser et al., 2013; Wilton et al., 2015). Diversity statements typically provide expressed cues such as the organization stating its commitment to diversity through a written statement made by the organization itself. Job seekers may also consider evidence-based diversity cues provided through outside information about the actual demographics of the organization or by first-hand reports/reviews of diversity from employees (Wilton et al., 2020). Wilton et al. (2020) found that evidence-based diversity cues can help to reduce perceptions that organizations are being dishonest about their diversity climate, more so than expressed cues. However, it is noted that ethnic and racial minorities will less favorably evaluate organizations when the expressed cues are incongruent with evidence-based cues (Perkins et al., 2000; Unzueta & Binning, 2012). This brings us back to our earlier issue of organizations needing to improve their diversity reputation without having a diverse workforce. In this scenario, organizations need to make expressions that indicate a commitment
to diversity while at the same time potentially countering any negative evidence-based cues (due to a lack of existing demographic diversity or negative diversity reviews).

Thus, expressions in diversity statements must be seen as sincere and credible, otherwise the organization is likely to be perceived as being dishonest about diversity (Wilton et al., 2020). If an organization has a negative diversity reputation, then it is likely that these cues in diversity statements will be perceived as less sincere and credible. Therefore, we propose the following hypothesis:

**H1**: *Expressed cues will be viewed as less honest and met with greater suspicion in the presence of a negative diversity reputation versus a negative reputation on other work aspects*.¹

We can also evaluate the content of expressed diversity cues and separate them into two categories: representation cues and structure cues. Representation cues, as described by Emerson and Murphy (2014), are cues that state that individuals from various groups will be represented in the organization and will feel like they belong. Underrepresentation of individuals from one’s demographic group in an organizational setting can be detrimental to establishing identity safety, as well as increasing concerns about fit/belonging (Emerson & Murphy, 2014; Murphy et al., 2007; Walter & Cohen, 2007). Representation cues focus on stating the organization’s commitment to representing all demographic groups in the workplace to try to alleviate identity safety and fit concerns that applicants may hold. Studies have shown benefits of representation (e.g., pictures) in recruitment contexts, including greater organizational attraction, perceived

¹ We chose not to include a positive diversity reputation condition for several reasons. First, our interest is what organizations can do that have a negative diversity reputation. Second, the impact of a positive reputation is well established. Third, given the complexity of a design to look at various cues, it would have been infeasible to add an additional set of conditions. Lastly, other work aspects refer to aspects such as work/life balance and organizational politics.
compatibility, and website viewing time and recall (Avery, 2003; Avery et al., 2004; Perkins et al., 2000; Walker et al., 2012). Note that here we are talking about expressions of commitment to representation, not an evidence-based cue of actual percentages of workforce demographics.

Another type of cue is a structure cue, which is about the dedicated institutional resources and programs that seek to promote diversity and inclusion (Emerson & Murphy, 2014). Diversity structures can include a variety of programs and resources, such as diversity training programs, employee resource groups, and mentoring programs (Brady et al., 2015; Shubat, 2018; Walton et al., 2015). Diversity structures have previously been shown to be related to organizational fairness perceptions, fit perceptions, and identity safety (Brady et al., 2015; Chaney et al., 2016; Kaiser et al., 2013). Structure cues indicate what the organization is specifically doing to address diversity and inclusion in the workplace. In doing so, applicants are made aware of what diversity resources and programs are available to them if they were to join the organization. Therefore, structure cues may be effective at signaling to applicants that the organization is committed to diversity and inclusion.

In our case of interest, where organizations have a negative diversity reputation and cannot provide evidence-based cues, it is necessary to compare whether representation cues or structure cues will be more effective as expressed cues. We hypothesize that applicants will perceive representation cues more positively than structure cues for two primary reasons. First, representation cues focus on identities, and therefore may be seen as personally relevant to some applicants, but also as a concrete indication of an expressed commitment to diversification. Second, structure cues may simply be providing information that the applicant is already expecting, as diversity programs and resources have become increasingly common in the workplace. On the other hand, representation cues discuss information that the applicant may not
be expecting to be directly conveyed from the organization, particularly when the organization has a more negative reputation for diversity, and thus may be seen as credible evidence of commitment.

**H2:** Expressed structure cues will be viewed as less honest and met with greater suspicion than expressed representation cues in the presence of a negative diversity reputation but will be the cues will be viewed similarly for honesty and suspicion in the absence of diversity reputation information.

However, an organizational diversity statement does not have to be limited to exclusively using representation cues or structure cues and can contain both. Therefore, we pose the following research question:

**RQ:** In the presence of a negative diversity reputation, are expressed representation and structure cues in combination viewed as more honest and less suspicious than either one alone?

Previous research investigating the outcomes of perceptions of trust and suspicion found diversity dishonesty (suspicion) to be negatively related to fit perceptions (Wilton et al., 2020), and sincerity was found to be positively related to company interest while being negatively related to identity threat concerns (Kroeper et al., 2022). We seek to expand the outcomes examined by evaluating the effect of broader honesty and suspicion on attraction, fit, belonging, and identity safety.

**H3:** Perceptions of honesty regarding the cues will be positively related to perceptions of identity safety, belonging, fit, and attraction, while perceptions of suspicion will be negatively related to these outcomes.
Finally, the impact of diversity cues on marginalized group member attraction has consistently been found to be positive (Avery, 2003; Avery et al., 2004; Chaney et al., 2016), whereas prior findings on attraction for majority group members have been a bit more mixed (Avery & McKay, 2006; Chaney et al., 2016; Walker et al., 2012). Thus, we considered whether ethnicity/race and gender moderated any effects.

**Method**

To test our hypotheses and research question, we utilized a 4 (Representation Statement, Structure Statement, Both Statement, No Statement) x 3 (Negative Diversity Review, Negative Other Review, No Review) between-subjects experimental design. However, considering that individuals in a condition with No Statement and No Review would receive no information about the organization, we only used 11 conditions instead of 12.

**Sample**

Participants (N=279) were recruited at a large midwestern university. To be eligible to participate, participants must have been at least 18 years old and signed up to receive credit for an undergraduate psychology course. The demographics of the final sample are shown in Table 1.

**Procedure**

After reading and agreeing to the informed consent, participants were told they would be presented with information regarding an organization (reviews of the organization left by former employees, a statement made by the organization on their webpage, or both a review and a statement) and then would be asked questions about their opinions of the organization after reading the information. Participants were then randomly assigned to one of 11 conditions.

**Manipulations**
Participants were shown either a statement using representation cues, a statement using structure cues, a statement using both representation and structure cues, or not given a statement (See Figures 1-3). Participants also saw either a negative diversity reputation review involving the “Cons” of the organization relating to diversity issues, a negative other review involving the “Cons” of the organization relating to non-diversity issues (e.g., a lack of advancement opportunities), or no review (See Figures 4 and 5).

**Measures**

Study measures are described in Table 2.

**Results**

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations are presented in Table 3. Note that an overall MANOVA examining the effects of cues, reputation, gender, and race/ethnicity\(^2\) and their interactions on the outcomes of attraction, honesty, and suspicion indicated that only the effect of diversity reputation was significant \(F(6, 450) = 4.78, p < .001\) such that a negative diversity review impacted all outcomes. However, our focus was specifically on the impacts of cues in the context of a negative diversity reputation, so we proceeded to test our hypotheses with those hypothesized comparisons.

To assess H1, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate whether conditions that received a cue and a negative diversity review perceived the organization as less honest and more suspicious compared to conditions that received a cue but did not have a diversity review (negative other review and no review conditions were combined). The ANOVA

\(^2\) Gender and race/ethnicity were coded into dichotomous variables to reflect majority/minority ethnic and racial groups and male/female, as these were the predominant identities in the sample.
results found a significant difference between the two groups for both honesty ($F(1, 231) = 39.94, p < .01$) and suspicion ($F(1, 231) = 38.69, p < .01$). The results suggested that the conditions with a cue (representation, structure, or both) and a negative diversity review had significantly lower honesty (M= 3.17) and higher suspicion (M= 5.07), compared to the conditions with a cue and a non-diversity review, which had higher honesty (M= 4.05) and lower suspicion (M= 4.04). Therefore, H1 was supported.

To assess H2, ANOVAs and t-tests were also used to evaluate whether the condition that had representation cues with a negative diversity review had greater honesty and lower suspicion compared to a condition that had structure cues with a negative diversity review. The results of these analyses suggested that there was no statistically significant difference between the groups for honesty ($F(1, 51) = 1.79, p = .187$) or suspicion ($F(1, 51) = 1.20, p = .278$). Comparisons were also evaluated between representation cues with either a negative other/no review and structure cues with either a negative other/no review. The ANOVA results suggested there was no significant difference between the groups for honesty ($F(1, 100) = 0.26, p = .609$) or suspicion ($F(1, 100) = 0.01, p = .939$). Based on these results, H2 was partially supported in that the cues were not distinguished when diversity reputation information is absent.

To assess the research question, ANOVA was also used to evaluate whether the condition that had statements using both cues with a negative diversity review was different from the condition with a representation statement with a negative diversity review or the structure statement with a negative diversity review. Comparing first the representation statement condition with the both statement condition for negative diversity reviews, the results suggested that there was no difference between the groups for suspicion ($F(1, 44) = 2.04, p = .160$) and the difference for honesty was marginally significant ($F(1, 44) = 3.88, p = .055$). Comparing next the
structure statement condition with the both statement condition for negative diversity reviews, the results suggested that there no difference between the groups for honesty ($F(1, 43) = 0.49, p = .489$) or suspicion ($F(1, 43) = 0.19, p = .669$).

H3 was evaluated with correlations. The results suggested a significant positive relationship between honesty and fit, belonging, attraction, and identity safety, respectively, and a significant negative relationship between suspicion and fit, belonging, attraction, and identity safety, respectively (see Table 3). Therefore, H3 was supported.

As noted earlier, we evaluated whether the demographics of the participants had interaction effects with the review and statement conditions on honesty or suspicion, and the results suggested there was no significant interaction for either race/ethnicity or gender for these variables. There were main effects for gender ($F(1,266) = 4.29, p = .04$) and race/ethnicity ($F(1, 266) = 7.39, p = .007$) on identity safety with women and minority group members having more negative perceptions but no differences were observed for other variables.

**Discussion**

Our findings suggest that the use of organizational diversity statements is less effective (i.e., seen as less honest and more suspicious) in the presence of a negative diversity reputation. In comparing the effectiveness of representation cues versus structure cues, the results suggested that the representation cues were perceived similarly compared to structure cues for honesty and suspicion, both when there was and was not evidence of a negative diversity reputation. Interestingly, there were no differences in perceptions of honesty or suspicion between the statement that used both cues and the representation statement or the structure statement when there was a negative reputation. This finding suggests that the addition of having both cues in a
statement compared to only one cue may not be enough to change perceptions of the organization. Lastly, as expected, our results suggested that perceptions of honesty based on the organizational statements were related to greater attraction, fit, belonging, and identity safety, while perceptions of suspicion were related to lower attraction, fit, belonging, and identity safety.

One concern is whether we had sufficient power to detect interactions given the complexity of the design. Upon evaluating the differences using effect size estimates (Cohen’s d), there were small to medium effects of the representation statement having a greater mean for honesty (d=.37) and a lower mean for suspicion (d=.30) compared to the structure statement and the statement with both cues when there was a negative diversity reputation (see Table 4). These results suggest that future exploration of the ability of cues to impact the effects of a negative reputation is warranted with large-scale samples. A similar point might be made for the lack of findings of interactions of demographics and cue types, although prior research also has often found that both majority and marginalized groups respond negatively to negative diversity reputations.

Our study is not without limitations. Although the conditions were based on realistic web materials (diversity statements and employee reviews), our study was not reflective of a job applicant currently applying to jobs. Although many organizations are targeting college students in their recruiting materials, attention to cues might be different in highly motivated contexts. Second, as mentioned above, follow-up research with a larger sample and greater ethnic and racial diversity is warranted to make firm conclusions. In general, practitioners should carefully consider the cues they choose to include in their organizational diversity statements. Future research may help identify strategies that organizations can use to improve their diversity
reputations, which could ultimately help attract a more diverse candidate pool to apply and join the organization.
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Table 1

_Demographic Variables of the Sample_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% Of sample</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-8 years</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 or more years</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student/Unemployed</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed Part-Time</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed Full-Time</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N= 279. 12% (n=34) of participants did not answer the work experience question.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th># Of Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sample item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Honesty      | 21         | Combination of measures from Ferrin et al., 2008 (Trust); Men & Hung-Baesecke, 2015 (Authenticity); Kroper et al., 2020 (Sincerity); Self-developed (Credibility) | I feel that this organization communicates with me honestly (Trust)  
How believable is the organization’s interest in increasing diversity in their workforce? (Sincerity)  
I believe that this organization’s actions are genuine. (Authenticity)  
How credible are this organization’s communications? (Credibility) |
| Suspicion    | 4          | Adapted from Wilton et al., 2020                                       | I suspect that this organization acts like it is better about diversity-related issues than it really is. |
| Attraction   | 8          | Combination of measures from Windscheid et al., 2016 (Attraction); Hentschel et al., 2018 (Intention to Apply) | This organization is attractive to me as a place for employment. (Attraction)  
I would apply to work for this organization. (Intention to Apply) |
<p>| Identity Safety | 6      | Kroper et al., 2020                                                     | How much might you worry that you cannot be your true self at the organization? (Reverse-Coded) |
| Fit          | 6          | Hentschel et al., 2018                                                  | My beliefs correspond to the organization’s beliefs |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th># Of Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sample item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pietri et al., 2018</td>
<td>I would belong in this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>///</td>
<td>Respondent’s sex, race, work experience, employment status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Trust, Sincerity, Authenticity, and Credibility were combined as an exploratory factor analysis suggested that they loaded onto the same factor. Attraction and Intention to Apply were also combined as they loaded onto the same factor. Although Attraction is highly correlated with Fit and Belonging, an exploratory factor analysis suggested that they loaded on separate factors and therefore should be measured separately. Additionally, although Suspicion was highly (negatively) correlated with the combined Honesty measure, an exploratory factor analysis suggested they loaded on separate factors and therefore should be measured separately. Identity Safety and Belonging are measured on a 5-point Likert scale, while the other variables are measured on a 7-point Likert scale.
Table 3

Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M(SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Honesty&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.70(1.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Suspicion</td>
<td>4.43(1.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attraction&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.10(1.15)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identity Safety</td>
<td>3.44(0.85)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fit</td>
<td>3.96(1.11)</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Belonging</td>
<td>3.15(0.67)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gender</td>
<td>0.27(0.44)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.33(0.47)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>Note</sup>. N= 279. Bolded values are significant at p < .05. Cronbach’s alpha is reported on the diagonal. a = Honesty is a combination of the sincerity, trust, authenticity, and credibility measures. b = Attraction is a combination of the attraction and intention to apply measures. Gender was coded as 0 = Female, 1 = Male. Ethnicity was coded as 0 = White, 1 = Non-White.
Table 4  
Means and Standard Deviations by Statement and Review Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Condition</th>
<th>Review Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Honesty</th>
<th>Suspicion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.49(^1)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Diversity *</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.16(^1)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.08(^3)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Diversity *</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.07(^3)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Non-Diversity is the combination of the negative other and none review condition for the respective statement condition. Matching superscripts indicate there was a statistically significant difference between the groups (differences were only estimated between the diversity and non-diversity review conditions for representation and structure cues due to model complexity and our hypotheses).
Figure 1. Structure Statement:

AN UPDATED STATEMENT REGARDING DIVERSITY AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

At our organization, it is a top priority for us to ensure that we have a working environment that incorporates and prioritizes diversity, inclusiveness, collaboration, and understanding. Our recent data suggests that the majority of our employees are satisfied with these initiatives that we have taken and will continue to take towards diversity, equity, and inclusion. We are committed to making changes to reduce biases and increase fairness in recruiting; redesigning diversity, equity, and inclusion training programs to be in-line with best practices and to occur more frequently; and expanding the number of employee resource groups to ensure that employees from all backgrounds are able to discuss diversity, equity, and inclusion-related issues most relevant to them with others in the organization in a safe environment.

Senior HR Manager Alex S. spoke recently about these accomplishments and future directions, stating: “Having managers and employees invested in the prioritization of DEI initiatives is what sets us apart from many of our competitors. Not only is it the right thing to do morally, but it provides us with a critical advantage by having so many efforts and strategies for increasing inclusion in various day-to-day operations and decision-making. In addition to these business advantages, we also believe that inclusion initiatives ensure that every employee feels like they belong and are appreciated in the organization, and we will continue to ensure and prioritize inclusion initiatives.”
At our organization, it is a top priority for us to recruit and hire employees from a diverse set of backgrounds, including but not limited to gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, and disability status. Our recent data suggests that the diversity of our workforce is increasing year over year and that we will continue to have a workforce representative of individuals. We are committed to ensuring equal opportunities for all of our employees and will continue to ensure that our environment is a diverse one in which all groups of individuals are represented.

Senior HR Manager Alex S. spoke recently about these accomplishments and future directions, stating: “Having a diverse and representative workforce is what sets us apart from many of our competitors. Not only is it the right thing to do morally, but it provides us with a critical advantage by having so many different voices, insights, and perspectives being provided in various day-to-day operations and decision-making. In addition to these business advantages, we also believe that having a representative workforce ensures that every employee feels like they belong and are appreciated in the organization, and we will continue to ensure and prioritize having a representative workforce.”
A STATEMENT REGARDING DIVERSITY AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

At our organization, it is a top priority for us to recruit and hire employees from a diverse set of backgrounds, including but not limited to gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, and disability status. It is also a priority to ensure that we have a working environment that incorporates and prioritizes diversity, inclusiveness, collaboration and understanding. Our recent data suggests that the diversity of our workforce is increasing year over year and that the majority of our employees are satisfied with these initiatives that we have taken and will continue to take towards diversity, equity and inclusion. We are committed to ensuring equal opportunities for all of our employees and to making changes to reduce biases and increase fairness in recruiting; redesigning diversity, equity, and inclusion training programs to be in-line with best practices and to occur more frequently; and expanding the number of employee resource groups to ensure that employees from all backgrounds are able to discuss diversity, equity, and inclusion-related issues most relevant to them with others in the organization in a safe environment.

Corporate Executive Sam B. spoke recently about these accomplishments and future directions, stating: “Having a diverse and representative workforce and having managers and employees invested in the prioritization of DEI initiatives is what sets us apart from many of our competitors. Not only is it the right thing to do morally, but it provides us with a critical advantage by having so many different voices, insights, and perspectives being provided and so many strategies for increasing inclusion in various day-to-day operations and decision-making.” Senior HR Manager Alex S. added: “In addition to these business advantages, we also believe that having a representative workforce and having inclusion initiatives ensures that every employee feels like they belong and are appreciated in the organization, and we will continue to ensure and prioritize having a representative workforce and inclusion initiatives.”
Figure 4. Diversity Reviews:

**Pros**
- The pay is fair and is comparable to similar positions at other organizations.
- Flexibility in how the work is done, whether in-person or remotely.

**Cons**
- There is a general lack of diversity in the organization, especially at upper levels of management.
- Minorities employees seem to be passed over for promotions, despite being equally qualified.

---

**Featured Review**

Former Employee
Nov 24, 2021- Administrative Assistant

---

**Pros**
- Training/Development materials are readily available.
- Leaders seem to have long-term plans for growth rather than only reaching immediate goals.

**Cons**
- Leadership in general seem to be out of touch and are often tone deaf when it comes to diversity, equity, and inclusion issues.
- Diversity training seemed it was going through the motions and performative, and there was lack of any real initiative or substance to diversity conversations and directives.

---

**Featured Review**

Former Employee
Jan 2, 2022- Human Resources
Figure 4. Continued. (Diversity Reviews):

Former Employee
Aug 19, 2021- Operations

Pros
• Compensation and other benefits are decent.
• Access to resources such as software and other materials are readily provided.

Cons
• Management is all talk about diversity and rarely seems to put any real effort into increasing diversity and inclusion.
• I consistently feel like I do not fit in or belong because there is a lack of representation of people from my demographic background and it is often hard to bond with coworkers.

Figure 5. Negative Other Reviews:

Taken from an anonymous review website

Former Employee
Nov 24, 2021- Administrative Assistant

Pros
• The pay is fair and is comparable to similar positions at other organizations.
• Flexibility in how the work is done, whether in-person or remotely.

Cons
• Consistently working long hours helps with advancement but can lead to poor work/life balance.
• Management often does not respond to employee needs.
Figure 5. Continued (Negative Other Reviews):

Former Employee  
Aug 19, 2021- Operations

**Pros**
- Compensation and other benefits are decent.
- Access to resources such as software and other materials are readily provided.

**Cons**
- Some leaders focus on what is best for themselves (profits) instead of focusing on what is best for employees.
- Lack of many opportunities for advancement from my position.

Featured Review

Former Employee  
Jan 2, 2022- Human Resources

**Pros**
- Training/Development materials are readily available.
- Leaders seem to have long-term plans for growth rather than only reaching immediate goals.

**Cons**
- Employee morale can get low depending on whether you have an encouraging leader or not
- Organizational politics can make the work environment tense and at times unpleasant

Report