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Abstract

Previous research suggests that discrimination is still a prevalent problem within organizations even with the current laws and policies in place in the United States to ensure equality of opportunity for minority groups. Therefore, people of color continue to report experiencing inequality and exclusion in the workplace. The broad purpose of the current investigation is to provide guidance to organizations regarding proactive strategies for mollifying the deleterious consequences that people of color often experience as a result of enduring numerous incidences of subtle discrimination in the workplace. Specifically, I proposed that when people of color report having trusting, supportive relationships with individuals outside their department or relatively-immediate work group, they will be fortified to some extent against feelings of ostracism and inclinations to leave the organization that result from regularly experiencing racial discrimination. Participants were recruited through Prolific and Amazon’s Mechanical Turk and had to identify as a person of color, work at least part time, and live in the United States. The sample included 288 participants with a mean age of 32 years old, nearly equal representation of males and females (50% and 48%, respectively), and the majority of participants were born in the United States (78%). Participants represented a variety of ethnicities with no single ethnicity representing more than twenty-six percent of the total sample. It was hypothesized that holding behaviors will mitigate the negative relationship between discrimination and inclusion as well as the positive association between discrimination and turnover intentions. Results indicated that holding behaviors did not moderate the relationship between discrimination and inclusion (\( B_{\text{microaggressions*holding behaviors}} = .11, p = .46; B_{\text{ambient discrimination*holding behaviors}} = .01, p = .72 \)) nor the relationship between discrimination and turnover intentions (\( B_{\text{microaggressions*holding behaviors}} = .27, p = .26; B_{\text{ambient discrimination*holding behaviors}} = .01, p = .80 \)). The results of this study provide
organizations with practical, effective strategies for fostering inclusive work environments, in which people of color feel like they can express their unique and authentic selves.

*Keywords:* discrimination, inclusion, turnover intentions, social support, holding behaviors
CHAPTER I

Introduction

Within the United States there has been a history of discrimination based on an individual’s race, gender, disability, age, or combination of these traits which has resulted in laws and polices being put in place to help these individuals (Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018). Even with these policies in place, racial discrimination within the workplace continues to be a critical issue for organizations. According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), discrimination based on race had the most filings with the EEOC in 2017, more than sex, religion, age, national origin, and disability (EEOC, 2017; Ragins, Ehrhardt, Lyness, Murphy, & Capman, 2017).

Furthermore, the unemployment rates in 2017 were higher for Blacks (7.5%), American Indians/Alaska Natives (7.8%), Multiracial individuals (6.7%), Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders (6.1%), and Hispanics/Latinos (5.1%) in comparison to Whites (3.8%) or Asians (3.4%; US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018). These statistics show that there are still patterns of inequity in the workplace (Perry & Picket, 2016). Researchers state that the workplace is one of the most frequent places where discrimination occurs (De Castro, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2008; Chou & Choi, 2011). In an analysis of Fortune 500 companies, only 5.2% of CEOs were people of color (Zweigenhaft & Domhoff, 2014), which suggests that systemic discrimination persists in American society. These findings indicate that discrimination is a prevalent problem within the workplace and research suggests that employees continue to experience economic inequality and social exclusion within the workplace (Mor Barak, Findler, & Wind, 2001; Shore et al., 2018). Consequently, these discrimination-related trends, together with the unique interpersonal challenges that people of color are experiencing in organizations, compose the backdrop for the
current study. Specifically, I believe it is essential to identify practical, effective strategies for fostering inclusive environments in which employees of color feel increasingly comfortable to express their authentic selves.

While fully acknowledging that organizations must continue working to eliminate discrimination and prejudice within the workplace, it is also essential to employ relatively immediate tactics to buffer their deleterious effects on feelings of inclusion and turnover intentions. Disrupting these negative associations is an essential first step to promoting the well-being of employees of color and the organization, holistically. One way to mitigate against the negative impacts of discrimination is to create a safe environment in which employees feel a sense of belonging and acceptance, instead of merely hiring more people of color with the expectation of automatically reaping the benefits of a diverse workforce (Offerman & Basford, 2014).

One purpose of this study was to examine the factors that impact turnover intentions, as the loss of employees can result in significant costs for organizations. Although researchers have done some work on positive outcomes of an inclusive workplace (Shore et al., 2018), there is currently a dearth of research on predictors of inclusion and detailed strategies for diversity practitioners (Shore et al., 2011). Thus, another purpose of this study was to identify factors that negatively impact inclusion for people of color and explore strategies that could serve to safeguard individuals from feeling the full weight of those effects. In particular, having individuals in the workplace who provide people of color a relational space where they can express their full range of emotions, with the assurance that they will be truly heard and unconditionally accepted, may give them resources to navigate the stressful experiences. Therefore, in the current study, I examined the relationship between experiencing racial
discrimination in one’s department or relatively-immediate work group and perceptions of inclusion in the workgroup as well as an individual’s turnover intentions. Furthermore, I explored the moderating role of a specific type of social support (holding behaviors) on these negative associations. It is my hope that the study’s results will provide guidance for practitioners in identifying and implementing realistic strategies for increasing feelings of belonging in the workplace by combating the negative effects of racially prejudiced behavior.

In the following sections, I provided a review of the current literature examining the proposed effects of racially discriminatory behaviors on the health of an organization and its employees. I also outlined the theoretical and empirical evidence that informs the research hypotheses and discuss the strategy for testing these propositions (for an overview of variables see Figure 1 in Appendix A).

**Literature Review**

**Why People of Color Experience Discrimination and Exclusion**

In this section, I will provide a broad overview of the various reasons why racial prejudice and discrimination are such entrenched and problematic phenomena in organizations. I will begin by discussing comprehensive theories about in-groups and out-groups that stem from the social psychology literature. Then I will delve into theoretical and empirical evidence demonstrating that Eurocentric practices/values have been the norm or default to which everyone else is compared, and how this existing state-of-affairs has impacted people of color and their everyday experiences of racism. Then I will discuss the historical context of racism, and how it has shown up in the United States generally and in corporate/organizational culture specifically. Finally, I will discuss the nature of discrimination and how it presents itself on an everyday basis
in terms of racial microaggressions, the resulting health outcomes experienced by people of color, and its broader impact on organizations.

Social identity theory. As the workforce continues to diversify along the lines of race and ethnicity, it is likely that polarized views will manifest in the workplace (Winters Group, 2016). Winters (2017) surmised that this polarization tends to create an “us” versus “them” mentality among individuals, which impedes attempts at inclusion and may result in feelings of exclusion for marginalized individuals. Social identity theory (SIT) provides insight into the role discrimination plays in exclusion. SIT posits that people tend to classify themselves into social categories that have meaning to them based on easily identifiable characteristics like gender, age, or race (Hebl & Avery, 2013; Tajfel, 1982). These classifications impact the way people interact with individuals from their own identity group (similar) and individuals from other identity groups (dissimilar). For example, a person of color described their experience the following way: “most of the time, I get the feeling that others do not feel that I belong. That the only reason I am there is to fill a quota. I have overheard comments about the concern for my lack of ability to perform as others. This is nothing new” (Torres, Driscoll, & Burrow, 2010, p.1085). This example highlights the negative impact that in-group/out-group dynamics can play in the everyday experience of a person of color.

Unfortunately, this categorization of individuals, even using the most surface-level of characteristics, is all that is required to foster favoritism for the in-group and discrimination for the out-group (Billig & Tajfel, 1973). By identifying with a group, individuals feel a sense of belonging with the group members, as opposed to an outsider. When employees feel like they are part of the in-group, they are more likely to accept and include others who are similar to themselves while excluding those who are perceived to be “other” (Mor Barak, 2017). Kalev
(2009) found that through work restructuring focusing on alleviating job segregation, ascriptive inequality declined for minority groups. These changes in work structures helped weaken the differentials between the minority and majority group and resulted in new career opportunities for the minority group (Kalev, 2009). This suggests that when changes are made to how work is structured, it can help alleviate the negative impacts of in-group/out-group dynamics. Additionally, Bernstein, Sacco, Young, Hugenberg, and Cook (2011) found that distinctions based on group status (i.e., in-group or out-group) do matter when predicting inclusion and exclusion. Because categorization of individuals into groups impacts inclusion, it is important to examine practices that could help people of color mitigate the negative effects of being regarded and treated as a minority group member.

**Social comparison theory.** According to social comparison theory, individuals have a tendency to base feelings or moods on how they believe they compare to others (Festinger, 1954). This theory sheds light on why individuals may feel ostracism in their daily work life. For example, the process of social comparison may be seen in the workplace when it comes time for performance appraisals or in learning who is invited to group outings outside of work. When employees compare themselves to other organizational employees it can result in feelings of exclusion if they do not feel they are being treated fairly or are being treated differently due to their minority group membership (Greenberg, Ashton-James, & Ashkanasy, 2007). Therefore, this comparison between individuals and groups can result in people feeling excluded in their organization.

**The sociological lens: Power and privilege.** Power and privilege are two social forces that often determine who gets invited to the leadership conversations, who has access to information, and who gets to participate in decisions that impact individuals and organizations.
Power and privilege are typically based on an individual’s group and social status, which determines the extent of influence and impact they can have on other individuals or groups (Winters, 2017). Typically, power resides with individuals regarded as belonging to majority groups who benefit from the extant social and economic hierarchies. Social dominance theory suggests that humans have a general tendency to create and maintain social hierarchies based on group membership (Haley & Sidanius, 2005). The individuals who find themselves at the top of the hierarchy (as a result of merit, inheritance, or some combination thereof) do not want to lose their position and social advantages; and this results in oppression of others to maintain their position in the hierarchy. People who favor maintaining social hierarchies tend to oppose programs and policies that are supportive of equality for social groups (Pratto, Sidaniuss, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Additionally, factors predicting the extent to which a person favors maintaining existing social hierarchies are associated with opposition to (a) social welfare policies, (b) humanitarian practices, and (c) affirmative action policies (Federico & Sidanius, 2002; Pratto & Glasford, 2008; Sidanius, Mitchell, Haley, & Navarrete, 2006; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Social dominance theory suggests that because these social hierarchies exist in U.S. society, it is likely that people of color experience increased stress due to discrimination by those above them in the hierarchy. This difference in power and privilege due to group membership at the broader societal level is likely to contribute to people of color feeling less inclusion within their workplace.

**Pressure to assimilate.** People of color have been expected to assimilate to the dominant group’s norms, values, and practices instead of questioning the underlying systems that impact society and organizations (Green, 2005; Nkomo, 1992). Assimilation is conceptualized as a one-way process that sends signals to people of color that they must conform to the expectations of
dominant culture (Feagin, 1987; Nkomo, 1992). Assimilation has traditionally been viewed as the logical solution to racism (Nkomo, 1992; Omi & Winant, 1986), and has likely impacted the way that institutions currently tend to create and maintain a workforce in which employees behave and think in similar ways (Prieto et al., 2016; Suarez-Orozco, 2002). In summary, assimilation permits the dominant group to maintain their status in the hierarchy, and this can cause damage to those who are expected to sacrifice various parts of their identities in order to be regarded as legitimate and accepted in mainstream culture.

There are many ways that the expectations for people of color to assimilate can play out in the workplace context. For example, Jasmine is a Black woman who works in a predominantly white organization. When she attempts to discuss her feelings with Martha, her white female supervisor, about being the only person of color in her particular role and the resulting feelings of alienation from being dismissed by her co-workers, her supervisor immediately responds with, “I’m sure they don’t intend to make you feel that way; are you sure you’re not reading more into the situation than what is actually there?” (Sue et al., 2007). Jasmine leaves the meeting feeling that Martha did not truly believe her and was quick to bestow the benefit-of-the-doubt to her white co-workers rather than to Jasmine’s experience. Although from Martha’s perspective, she was attempting to be helpful and comforting, she did not give a lot of weight to Jasmine’s concern, leaving Jasmine feeling invalidated and, to some degree, alienated.

This example is not uncommon to hear from people of color, which suggests that racist practices are a part of everyday life and are regarded as “normal” by individuals in the dominant group (Essed, 1991). Nkomo (1992) argued that when racism becomes integrated into everyday experiences, it activates and entrenches the underlying power relations within society broadly and filters down to the day-to-day interpersonal interactions within the workplace setting.
Because discrimination is part of the fabric of everyday life for people of color, it is vital to identify practices that will interrupt longstanding paradigms in order to realize diversity and inclusion goals.

**Group conflict theory.** When individuals, in subtle or obvious ways, question or refuse to assimilate to group norms, a power struggle may ensue (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). Group conflict theory suggests that gains experienced by one group are often perceived as a loss to another group (e.g., minority group), which results in the majority group members feeling threatened and heightened levels of prejudice towards the out-group (Brief et al., 2005; Levine & Campbell, 1972). Zárate, Garcia, Garza, and Hitlan (2004) demonstrated that prejudice was intensified when individuals perceived intergroup similarity on work-related traits (e.g., organized, motivated, hardworking, punctual). Thus, when there is competition for scarce resources, the more similar the outgroup is to the in-group the more threatened they feel, which then leads to more prejudice (Zárate et al., 2004). Since the competition between groups is for things such as power, status, and money and contributes to discrimination against the minority group, it is important to consider the impact these threats can have on people of color.

**Historical context.** Taking various social psychology theories into consideration is necessary to understand why people of color feel excluded in the workplace. However, it is vital to acknowledge the historical context of racism as it is typically not taken into consideration when studying people of color (Nkomo, 1992). Within the United States, race has impacted an individual’s political rights, their access to medical care, and their location in the labor market (Nkomo, 1992; Omi & Winant, 1986). The expansion of European powers and polices, Christianizing of Native peoples, and capitalism have contributed to the invention and maintenance of race and racism in today’s culture (Carter & Pieterse, 2005; Pieterse & Powell,
2016). Furthermore, fueled by a highly-coordinated social and scientific eugenics movement in the United States, the pervasive beliefs about the inferiority of the characteristics and abilities of racial groups was a key element in justifying segregation and the limiting of economic opportunities for people of color (Black, 2012), and has impacted their job prospects for generations (Nkomo & Hoobler, 2014; Pieterse & Powell, 2016). For example, they faced discrimination and exclusion as they searched for jobs (Roediger, 1999), they have found themselves confined to the most dangerous and lowest-paid jobs (Foner & Lewis, 1989; Takaki, 1990), and they were less likely to fill supervisory or managerial roles within organizations (Nkomo & Hoobler, 2014). These examples highlight the impact the historical context of race has had on economic opportunity for people of color and their experiences within American society and the workplace.

In summary, the White power structure in the United States has created a social system that preserved white people’s dominance and engrained the idea of racial superiority for decades (Pieterse & Powel, 2016; Smedley & Smedley, 2012). Thus, racism is a part of the U.S. culture and does not occur as isolated events by a certain type of person (Essed, 1991); instead, it is pervasive and must be taken into consideration when investigating ways to foster inclusion for people of color. The empirical evidence, social psychology theories, and the historical context come together to warrant a sense of responsibility for organizations to be implementing comprehensive solutions for stopping the harm of discrimination and fostering flourishing and wellbeing of all employees.

**Impact of Discrimination on Individuals and Organizations**

Unfortunately, discrimination is a part of the day-to-day life experience of many people of color in the workplace, and there is evidence demonstrating that it can have harmful
consequences for both the individual and the organization. For example, discrimination has negative impacts on an employee’s psychological well-being (e.g., self-esteem, negative affect, and distress), mental health, and physical health (e.g., self-reported poor health, hypertension, breast cancer, and risk factors for disease like drug and alcohol use, high blood pressure, and obesity; Hebl, Ruggs, Martinez, Trump-Steel, & Nittrouer, 2016; Major & Dover, 2016). Additionally, discrimination negatively impacts organizational outcomes, such as lower performance, lower satisfaction with one’s supervisors and coworkers, lower job satisfaction, increased turnover intentions (Hebl et al., 2016), and lower job attitudes and organizational citizenship behaviors (Triana et al., 2015).

Experiences of discrimination can also predict the extent to which an employee feels they are being excluded within their work team (Otten & Jones, 2015). For example, a person of color may experience exclusion when they are not invited into coffee break conversations by coworkers and colleagues (Otten & Jansen, 2015). Furthermore, feelings of exclusion may be exacerbated when the day-to-day operations at an organization are heavily dictated by pre-established values and norms (Cox, 2001; Sabharwal, 2014) because this kind of situation makes it harder for different, non-conforming perspectives to be heard, taken seriously, and mutual respect and trust to be fostered (Cox, 2001; Sabharwal, 2014). If these exclusionary behaviors, in the aggregate, help maintain the dominant hierarchy in the United States, it may result in lasting negative impacts for people of color and anyone else who does not conform to white, male, and hetero norms. When individuals feel excluded, they tend to not feel valued, are not engaged or involved in their work group, do not feel like they can be their authentic selves at work, and do not feel safe (Ferdman, Avigdor, Braun, Konkin, & Kuzmycz, 2010; Sabharwal,
2014). Therefore, researchers must continue to investigate practices that could help foster inclusion and reduce the harmful effects of discrimination for people of color.

**Defining Discrimination**

Discrimination has been a continuous problem in the United States, but the way discrimination is experienced has changed over time (Hebl & Avery, 2013). Previously discrimination was classified as overt behaviors that excluded minority group members from workplace opportunities. Examples of these discriminatory behaviors are not being hired or promoted, experiencing derogatory language, physical or verbal abuse due to an individual’s membership to a minority group (Hebl, Foster, Mannix, & Dovidio, 2002). However, these overt behaviors are not as prolific in the workplace as they once were, due to federal laws being passed that prohibit these behaviors in the workplace (Hebl et al., 2016). Even though overt behaviors are less common, this does not mean that discrimination is not still widespread in the workplace. Discriminatory behaviors are simply showing up differently in today’s organizations.

**Racial microaggressions.** Discrimination is frequently manifested in organizations through subtle forms, which makes it harder to detect (Hebl et al., 2002; Jones, Arena, Nittrouer, Alonso, Lindsay, 2017). Although there are federal laws in place to protect individuals from overt discrimination, there are no such laws in place for subtle discrimination. Therefore, these discriminatory behaviors can have serious consequences for minority individuals since these subtle forms often go undetected and underestimated by majority group members (Hebl & Avery, 2013). Research suggests that subtle forms of discrimination may negatively impact organizations and employees to a greater extent than overt forms of discrimination (Jones, Peddie, GIlrane, King & Gray, 2016; Jones et al., 2017).
One type of subtle discrimination that has been studied is racial microaggressions, which are conceptualized as: “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group” (Sue et al., 2007, p. 273). For people of color, racial microaggressions are everyday experiences that send belittling messages to them because of their racial minority group membership (Sue et al., 2007). The following scenario is an example of a racial microaggression in the workplace: Keisha often braids her hair and wears traditional African prints to work. She was recently passed up for a promotion and was told she did not receive the director position because they needed a director who would share similar values and perspectives with the employees they oversaw (Green, 2005). This example highlights that work culture is traditionally structured around White norms and suggests that people of color need to conform to these norms in order to be successful in the workplace (Green, 2005; Wingfield, 2010). Research has shown that racial microaggressions result in a negative perspective of the world, depressive symptoms (Nadal, Griffin, Wong, Hamit, & Rasmus, 2014), increased stress, anger, anxiety (Huynh, 2012), and negative impacts on workplace climate (Cartwright, Washington, & McConnell, 2009; Lai & Babcock, 2013; Nadal, 2018). It is evident that discriminatory behaviors that are directed towards people of color are harmful and must continue to be addressed in the workplace.

**Ambient discrimination.** As society becomes more aware of discrimination in the workplace, it is important to take into consideration the consequences of observing discriminatory behavior as a third party. Although individuals may not experience discrimination directly, if they hear about or witness these behaviors; they report experiencing harmful effects (Ragins et al., 2017). Therefore, discrimination can be experienced in two forms: one in which
an individual is the intended direct target and the other in which the individual is a third-party witness to the behavior. The latter circumstance has been identified in the literature as ambient discrimination, and it is “defined as the knowledge or awareness of discrimination aimed at others” (Ragins et al., 2017, p. 212). Ambient discrimination has been demonstrated to yield negative effects on psychological and work outcomes for individuals in the workplace, regardless of racial identity (Chrobot-Mason, Ragins, & Linnehan, 2013; Ragins et al., 2017). For example, people’s awareness of racial discrimination occurring in their vicinity predicts lower job satisfaction, greater turnover intentions, and increased work-related depression (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2013).

Research focusing on ambient discrimination is in its infancy; but the limited number of extant studies have consistently demonstrated that whereas people of color report more ambient discrimination, the negative impact of ambient discrimination does not vary by racial group (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2013, Low, Radhakrishnan, Schneider, & Rounds, 2007; Ragins et al., 2017). However, only one study looked at more than one non-white racial group and this study had statistical power limitations due to unequal group sample sizes (Ragins et al., 2017). This suggests that more research is needed to determine if the impacts of ambient discrimination differ across racial groups. Additionally, Low et al. (2007) found that individuals who experienced both ambient and direct discrimination reported the lowest health, psychological, and occupational related outcomes. Therefore, it is important to continue to examine the potential impact of ambient discrimination on feelings of inclusion for people of color in their workplaces.

Because racial microaggressions and ambient discrimination both have been shown to have negative consequences and are contributing to a potentially toxic workplace for individuals,
it is important that researchers continue to explore ways to alleviate these effects. Thus, for the purposes of this study, I examined the potential effects of both racial microaggressions and ambient discrimination on feelings of inclusion. Mor Barak (2000) surmised that discrimination is one of the biggest barriers to creating inclusion within the workplace. So, when people of color either directly or indirectly experience discrimination in the organization, they will likely feel a concomitant reduction in inclusion.

**Why Does Inclusion Matter?**

Although it is clear that experiencing discrimination can have negative impacts on inclusion, it is important to consider the rationale for why organizations should focus on inclusion. It can be argued that organizations should care about inclusion, as an end in itself, simply because it is the moral and right thing to do (Ferdman, 2014). Inclusion should be integrated into a company’s values, because effective leadership cultivates the well-being of its people through its efforts in supporting employees in reaching their full potential and removing barriers to opportunity for historically marginalized groups (Ferdman & Brody, 1996). How can organizations expect employees to be dedicated and invest the time, energy, and resources needed for successful work performance if they do not feel a basic level of acceptance for who they are when they enter the organization?

**Whose Voices Have Traditionally Been Prioritized?**

Davidson (1999) argued that members of different groups (majority or minority) have different expectations as to whether they will be included, due to the differing histories of privilege and oppression. Historically, dominant group members could more likely assume that when they join organizations/groups, they would be fully accepted and valued members (Ferdman, 2014). This suggests that it may be more difficult for people of color to feel inclusion
within the workplace, due to the inequality and hierarchical aspects that exist in American organizations (Ferdman, 2014). Therefore, organizations should be striving to create an environment where people of color feel a sense of belonging based on who they are, without having to feel constant pressure to conform to the dominant group’s norms.

Furthermore, having greater diversity within a group or workplace does not automatically result in high performance outcomes. Organizations need to understand that desirable performance outcomes are contingent on how diversity is addressed through group processes and organizational context (Ferdman, 2014; Kochan et al., 2003). In other words, meeting quotas for increasing demographic diversity will not, in and of itself, increase productivity, profitability, and creativity (Mannix & Neale, 2005). Instead, there is deeper work that is needed to confront underlying norms and assumptions of corporate culture in the U.S. For example, organizations can foster a culture that emphasizes the practice of the “platinum rule,”—treating individuals the way they wish or ask to be treated (Mor Barak, 2000), rather than assuming this for them. If organizations value inclusivity, those whose voices have not been traditionally heard (both in single organizations and broader society) must be amplified and empowered.

**Organizational Benefits of Inclusion**

Organizations have been attempting to increase the diversity of their employees; however, as aforementioned, this practice does not always yield the desired outcomes. Research findings by Mannix and Neale (2005) suggest that diversity based on surface-level characteristics (e.g., race, gender) does not automatically result in inclusion or positive group functioning. However, when individuals feel a strong sense of inclusion within their organizations, there are several benefits that the organization may reap. First, when organizations commit to inclusion of diverse individuals, employees who are people of color are more likely to stay (Hom, Roberson,
& Ellis, 2008; Shore et al., 2018), which will help the organization save costs due to turnover. Second, when individuals feel a sense of inclusion at work it can help drive engagement (Gallup, 2013; Winters, 2017), contribute to productive work outcomes such as innovation and organizational creativity (Jansen, Otten, van der Zee, & Jans, 2014), performance (Pearce & Randel, 2004), and reduce employee absenteeism (Jansen, Vos, Otten, Podsiadlowski, & Van der Zee, 2016). Finally, Mor Barak (2000) reasoned that when organizations value inclusion and incorporate it within all aspects of the organization, their public-facing images are enhanced, which may help increase recruitment of high-quality employees, especially diverse individuals.

Employees use organizational signals or cues to draw conclusions on the organization’s characteristics, intentions, and actions to help determine what the organization values (Rynes, 1991; Suazo, Martínez & Sandoval, 2009). The signals that organizations use to show what they value matter to employees and demonstrate that the organization is a desirable employer (Celani & Singh, 2009). These signals help organizations create a public identity and image, which impacts what current and future employees believe about the organization (Keller, 2003). When organizations are known for having a workplace that is inclusive it could impact their public image and whether or not individuals choose to join or stay with the organization. For example, if the organization truly values inclusion, they are going to attract and select people who care about inclusion and about uplifting and amplifying voices that have not been traditionally heard. So, once inclusion becomes a part of the organizational practices, it will demonstrate to both internal and external stakeholders that inclusion is part of their values system and that the organization truly embraces equal opportunity for all employees (Shore et al., 2018). Although organizations should be striving for inclusion based on moral standards, research has demonstrated that inclusion can potentially drive desired organizational outcomes. However, this
should not be the primary reason the organization prioritizes inclusion, rather the secondary reason.

**Distinguishing Diversity and Inclusion**

It is common for diversity and inclusion to be conflated within organizational culture and nomenclature (Shore et al., 2018); however, these two practices are different and have slightly different emphases. Diversity focuses on the number of diverse individuals who are represented in the organization (Ferdman, 2014) whereas inclusion focuses on how to make a diverse organization work for its members (Winters, 2014). Another way to conceptualize the difference between diversity and inclusion is that there are HR-related legislative mandates regarding diversity (e.g., Title VII’s prohibition on employment discrimination against protected groups); whereas inclusion is fostered largely by voluntary actions taken by management (Winters, 2014). In summary, although diversity and inclusion are two concepts that are often lumped together in everyday HR language, it is important to recognize both the conceptual distinction and preserve an openness to the possibility that they have different predictors and outcomes. Consequently, additional studies are needed to identify practices that cultivate a culture of inclusion within diverse organizations.

**Defining Inclusion**

Even though inclusion is a trending topic among researchers and practitioners, there is still a need for consensus concerning the definition of inclusion (Shore et al., 2011). The inclusion literature consists of several different constructs, such as inclusion climate, leader inclusion, organizational practices inclusion, perceived organizational inclusion, and work group inclusion (Shore et al., 2018). Although there is a lack of consensus there are still some consistencies throughout the inclusion literature. According to Ferdman (2017), inclusion within
the workplace has been defined more broadly as providing ways for individuals to contribute to the larger organization as full and valued members while remaining true to who they are. Thus, individuals who are included should feel a part of the workplace while maintaining their identity.

Given the variety of conceptualizations and measures of inclusion, for the purposes of the current study, I will focus on work group inclusion, which consists of an individual's experiences within a group setting. Shore et al. (2011) provided a framework to define work group inclusion and help synthesize the inclusion literature by building upon Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (ODT). This theory suggests that individuals have a need to balance a desire to find belonging and similarity with others and maintain their sense of uniqueness (Brewer, 1991). ODT is useful in conceptualizing inclusion as it takes into consideration uniqueness, which is vital to helping organizations focus on increasing inclusion for diverse individuals. An individual will feel included when they have a sense of belongingness within the group and are treated as an insider; and at the same time, experience freedom to be unique and true to who they are. This is relevant to people of color since they will likely bring unique skills, experiences, and frames of reference to a workgroup. Therefore, in order for the organization to capitalize on the benefits of inclusion, people of color need to feel a sense of belonging within the workplace.

For the purposes of this study, inclusion was conceptualized as “the degree to which an individual perceives that the group provides him or her with a sense of belonging and authenticity” (Jansen et al., 2014). For the purposes of the current investigation, I conceptualized group as an individual’s department or relatively-immediate workgroup within the workplace, as this will focus on the daily experiences an individual has with both their peers and managers in the more immediate vicinity. I focused on the department or relatively-immediate workgroup
because the degree of proximity will provide the best opportunity for discrimination to manifest. Moreover, when people are able to interact with each other more frequently, there may be a greater likelihood that inclusion could be fostered. Larkey (1996) and Mor Barak (2017) surmise that people of color may not experience inclusion within their department due to the manifestation of discrimination. Thus, I predicted that when individuals experience discrimination in their relatively-immediate work groups, based on their minority group status, they will be less likely to feel a sense of belonging and acceptance within the work group.

**Hypothesis 1a:** There will be a negative relationship between racial microaggressions experienced and an individual’s perceived inclusion level with their department.

**Hypothesis 1b:** There will be negative relationship between ambient discrimination experienced and an individual’s perceived inclusion level with their department.

**Supportive Relationships as an Antidote for Discrimination’s Effects**

There is a current gap in the diversity and inclusion literature in identifying and examining specific human resource practices that foster inclusion within organizations (Shore et al., 2018). Therefore, I proposed when an organization’s culture is marked by many high-quality interpersonal interactions among employees, feelings of inclusion will be enhanced for people of color who are also experiencing the stresses of everyday acts of discrimination in the workplace. When individuals do not feel like they are part of the “in-group,” feel like they are being denied access to information, are not being included in work conversations and decisions they are less likely to report feelings of inclusion (Bernstein et al., 2011; Mor Barak, 2017; Pelled, Ledford, & Mohrman, 1999). Positive relationships can be a means to help people of color feel integrated and included in the organization if these relationships help support fairness, remove obstacles, provide access to information, and ensure minority members’ perspectives are being heard and incorporated into the workplace (Nair & Vohra, 2017). When employees are experiencing
discrimination and exclusion at work, they are more likely to experience stress (Triana et al., 2015); and positive relationships are a potential means to provide individuals the resources to cope with these stressful experiences.

**High-quality relationships.** When individuals have relationships and interactions in the workplace that bring life and positive energy to them it could help them be strong under stress and help them be their best selves. Dutton and Heaphy (2003) described high-quality relationships as being characterized by positive energy, experiences of vitality, and the ability to express one’s emotions, whether positive or negative. Research suggests that high-quality relationships in the workplace help facilitate learning processes which enhance team performance (Brueller & Carmeli, 2011) and can lead to team resilience (Stephens, Heaphy, Carmeli, Spreitzer, & Dutton, 2013). Additionally, research by Carmeli, Brueller, and Dutton (2009) showed that high-quality relationships are important for developing and cultivating psychological safety in organizations. These findings show that high-quality relationships can have positive impacts on organizations and are worth pursuing. Furthermore, high-quality relationships allow people to receive care during stressful times (Ragins, 2016), which could effectively help people of color deal with acts of discrimination in the workplace.

According to relational mentoring theory, the importance of relationship quality is highlighted, and takes into consideration that this relationship is a mutually beneficial relationship and “meets members’ needs while providing experiences of relational closeness [such as] care, concern, responsiveness, vulnerability, emotional connection, and commitment” (Ragins, 2016, p. 229). These high-quality relationships are more likely to help individuals facing discrimination feel included as the focus in these relationships is not on career
development, but rather on creating a relationship that allows people of color to process stressful workplace experiences.

Furthermore, relational systems theory is a framework used to explain the role of relationships in the workplace (Kahn, 2001). Behaviors exhibited by supportive individuals could help people of color deal with anxiety provoking events at work, such as discrimination (Ragins et al., 2017). There are two components that inform this theory, anchoring relationships and holding behaviors. Anchoring relationships are seen as positive relationships within the workplace that help employees remain attached to the organizations during stressful times (Kahn, 2001). Thus, if high-quality relationships are considered to be an anchoring relationship, these relationships could create a safe harbor for individuals experiencing discrimination and help them get through these stressful experiences by feeling cared for by others (Ragins et al., 2017). If high-quality relationships can provide support to people of color this could mitigate the negative effects of discrimination, help them feel more included, and less likely to leave the organization.

**Holding behaviors.** Kahn (2001) defined holding behaviors as intentional actions that are used to help other individuals deal with stressful experiences at work. Holding behaviors are comprised of three dimensions: (a) *containment* which suggests that supportive individuals are accessible and provide a safe space for people of color to share their thoughts and feelings; (b) *empathic acknowledgement* which demonstrates that individuals are able to validate and accept the person of color’s feelings of confusion, conflict, and inadequacy; and (c) *enabling perspectives* which provide a nonjudgmental context where people of color can make sense of the experience and restore their ego integrity (Kahn, 2001; Ragins et al., 2017). The extent to
which high-quality relationships are providing holding behaviors to people of color is likely going to help these individuals overcome the negative effects of discrimination.

For the purposes of this study, I specifically examined the extent to which holding behaviors were provided by individuals who are inside the target person’s organization but outside his/her department. The reason individuals within the department was not the primary focus in this study is if an individual is experiencing discrimination in their work group, they may feel more comfortable bringing these concerns to someone with whom they do not frequently work or report to. However, I measured within-group support for exploratory purposes. To help individuals who are dealing with discrimination at work experience greater inclusion within their department, it is important for these individuals to have relationships with people who they trust and feel safe talking with about these negative experiences and feelings.

**The Role of Holding Behaviors on the Relationship Between Discrimination and Inclusion**

When people of color experience the harmful effects of a discriminatory workplace, they may seek out support from individuals in the workplace. Social support is a diversity management practice that has been used with diverse employees to incorporate inclusion into organizational structures (Mor Barak et al., 2016). Ragins (2016) suggested that high-quality relationships are crucial for all employees, but they are especially important for employees who are people of color. These high-quality relationships can be useful in fostering a culture of inclusion within organizations. Therefore, if people of color have high-quality relationships where individuals display holding behaviors it could help them cope with the discrimination they may be experiencing in the workplace. These holding behaviors could mitigate the negative impacts of discrimination (Blake-Beard, Murrell, & Thomas, 2007; Ragins, 2002), specifically
the negative impact it may have on an individual’s perceived group inclusion (see Figures 2, 3, and 4 in Appendix A).

_Hypothesis 2a:_ The extent to which people of color are the recipients of holding behaviors, will buffer the negative relationship between their experience of racial microaggressions and feelings of inclusion with their department.

_Hypothesis 2b:_ The extent to which people of color are the recipients of holding behaviors, will buffer the negative relationship between their experience of ambient discrimination and feelings of inclusion with their department.

**Turnover Intentions**

Feelings of exclusion can have negative impacts, not only for the target person, but also for the organization; as it can result in a loss of talent. Research has shown that when people of color experience mistreatment and rudeness within their organizations, they are more likely to consider leaving their job (Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Leskinen, Huerta, & Magley, 2013; Lim, Cortina, & Magley, 2008). When this occurs, not only will the organization be moving further from its goals for diversity and representation (Mannix & Neale, 2005), but it will face financial implications for replacing the individuals who leave (Cortina et al., 2013). Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner (2000) demonstrated that turnover intentions are a strong predictor of voluntary turnover, therefore, it is important to understand how discrimination is impacting people of color in organizations, so we can identify practices that may help rectify this situation. Even though there are many factors that impact turnover intentions (e.g., job satisfaction, health), it is still important to capture the impact discrimination has a person of color’s turnover intentions.

_Hypothesis 3a:_ There will be a negative relationship between racial microaggressions experienced and an individual’s turnover intentions.

_Hypothesis 3b:_ There will be negative relationship between ambient discrimination experienced and an individual’s turnover intentions.
When people of color experience discrimination at work, there is evidence demonstrating that there are consequences to both individuals and organizations (Jones et al., 2016; Pascoe & Smart Richman, 2009; Triana et al., 2015). Racial discrimination has been linked to turnover intentions, which can result in significant costs to organizations (Jones et al., 2016; King, Hebl, George, & Matusik, 2010; Triana et al., 2015). Specifically, research suggests that both racial microaggressions and ambient discrimination lead to increased turnover intentions (Chrobot-Mason et al, 2013; Jones et al., 2016). Because holding behaviors are beneficial in helping individuals deal with the stress of discrimination, these behaviors might be helpful in reducing the negative impact of discrimination on turnover intentions (see Figures 5, 6, and 7 in Appendix A).

Hypothesis 4a: The extent to which people of color are the recipients of holding behaviors, will buffer the positive relationship between their experience of racial microaggressions and turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 4b: The extent to which people of color are the recipients of holding behaviors, will buffer the positive relationship between their experience of ambient discrimination and turnover intentions.
CHAPTER II

Method

Participants

The sample included 288 participants with the age range of 19 - 65 years of age ($M = 32, SD = 8.99$) and nearly equal representation of males and females (50% and 48%, respectively). Participants represented a variety of ethnicities with no single ethnicity representing more than 26% of the total sample (see Table 1 for the ethnic makeup of the sample) and 78% of participants were born in the United States. Participants had an average of nine years of work experience and approximately 88% of participants indicated that they were working in their current organization for less than 10 years. A wide variety of industries were represented, including education, medical/dental/healthcare, wholesale/retail/distribution, and business services/consultant. No one industry comprised more than 14% of the total sample.

Inclusion criteria. The focus of the current study was on the relationship between racial discrimination and perceived inclusion with one’s workgroup and the relationship between racial discrimination and turnover intentions. Thus, there are five criteria that participants had to meet in order to qualify for the study. At the most basic level, participants needed to be at least 18 years of age, live in the United States, and identify as a member of a racial minority group. Finally, they needed to be employed at least part-time and work from a central location at least part of the time. The latter criteria were in place to ensure that participants work within an organization and will be likely to interact with employees in their department.

Recruitment. Data were collected through Prolific and Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk), two crowdsourcing platforms that are often used for psychological research (Callan, Kim, Gheorghiu, & Matthews, 2016; Palan & Schitter, 2018). Crowdsourcing platforms allow
researchers to post computerized tasks that can be completed by participants who meet the minimum requirements for the task (Paolacci & Chandler, 2014). Participants are then paid by the researcher for successful completion of the task.

With the increasing popularity in using crowdsourcing platforms to collect data, researchers have investigated the benefits of these platforms. According to Gosling and Mason (2015), using MTurk can result in having a more diverse sample than traditional student samples, without compromising the quality of the data. Additionally, MTurk participants tend to be more representative of the population when compared to other online participants or student participants (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). MTurk workers tend to be female, white, more educated, and younger which could pose a challenge when trying to collect minority group members (Buhrmester et al., 2011; Springer, Vezich, Lindsey, & Martini, 2016). However, MTurk is being used by researchers to take advantage of the increased diversity and to target specific samples (Chandler & Paolacci, 2017). Using MTurk has been shown to provide both representative and reliable data (Behrend, Sharek, Meade, & Wiebe, 2011; Buhrmester et al., 2011) and hundreds of studies were published in 2015 alone that used MTurk data (Chandler & Palacci, 2017). Therefore, MTurk was a valuable collection method for this study as it would provide targeted access to specific minority group members.

Although MTurk is the most widely-used crowdsourcing platform, Prolific has grown in popularity over the past few years (Palan & Schitter, 2018) and was another viable option for this study. Even though MTurk has a more diverse sample than traditional student samples; when compared to Prolific, it offers a less-diverse sample in terms of ethnicity (Peer, Brandimarte, Samat, & Acquisti, 2017). Because this study focused on people of color, it made sense to use Prolific for data collection as well. Chandler, Paolacci, Peer, Mueller, and Ratliff (2015)
demonstrated that effect sizes can be significantly reduced when participants have a high rate of non-naivety (defined as a participant’s level of familiarity with research methods commonly used on crowdsourcing platforms). However, Prolific tends to have a sample that is more naïve to common research tasks and still provides high-quality data, comparable to MTurk (Peer et al., 2017).

A major challenge with using MTurk for data collection is that it relies on participant self-report (Chandler & Paolacci, 2017) and participants are willing to distort their responses to gain access to a study (Sharpe Wessling, Huber, & Netzer, 2017). Prolific alleviates the issue of researchers managing dishonest participants by gathering participant characteristics independently of specific studies (Palan & Schitter, 2018). Thus, one key advantage to using Prolific is the capacity for researchers to post questions on Prolific that pre-screen participants (Palan & Schitter, 2018). This built-in feature allows researchers to pre-screen participants based on the study qualifications before they are invited to take the survey. Due to these added benefits of Prolific was a feasible crowdsourcing platform to use when focusing on a sample consisting of people of color.

Due to the advantages of Prolific, I had intended to collect all the data on Prolific but was unable to obtain the final 9% of the requisite sample size. Thus, MTurk was used to collect the remainder. To help overcome the drawbacks associated with MTurk, I used participants who had been granted the MTurk Masters Qualification, hoping that they would be honest in reporting their demographic information when self-selecting into the study. Individuals who have received the Masters Qualification are considered to be top workers of the MTurk marketplace by consistently demonstrating a high degree of success in performing tasks and submitting high-quality results.
Procedure

Prior to deploying the survey on Prolific, I selected the prescreen criteria (location of residence, age, race, employment status, and work remotely) in the platform settings to filter the participants that were eligible for the study. After the study was officially posted, Prolific sent an email to a random subset of eligible participants, notifying them that the study was available. Those who chose to participate, were directed to Qualtrics, an online survey software, to complete the survey.

The survey was available on Prolific for four weeks, during which time, approximately 90% of the targeted N size was collected. Then the decision was made to remove it because it was generating little to no additional participant interest. Shortly thereafter, I listed the survey as a Human Intelligence Task (HIT) for master qualified workers only on MTurk until the desired sample size was reached.

From a participant point of view, the survey was estimated to take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Before individuals could proceed with the survey, they had to confirm that they met the inclusion criteria and provide informed consent.

After the screening questions, they continued with the survey and were asked to respond to a scale about their experiences with discrimination in their workplace. To better understand the potential impact of the behaviors of supportive individuals, participants responded to the Holding Behaviors Index scale (Ragins et al., 2017). Next, participants were asked to rate how included they feel within their workgroup. Then they were asked to respond to questions regarding their racial and ethnic identity, followed by demographic questions. After completion of the survey, participants were compensated $1.67, which was based on a wage of $10.00 per hour.
Sample Size and Power

According to Shieh (2009) it is recommended to have a sample size of 150-200 for a moderated multiple regression (MMR) analysis. However, it is more realistic to find a small effect size if there is a sample size of 250-300. Due to the likelihood of losing participants through the data cleaning process, data from a total of 328 participants was collected.

Measures

Racial microaggressions. Racial microaggressions were measured using a modified version of the Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (REMS) developed by Nadal (2011). The REMS consists of six subscales. But for the purposes of this study, only three of the six subscales (Assumptions of Inferiority, Microinvalidations, and Workplace Microaggressions) were used as these items were most pertinent to the workplace context and lacked overlap with perceived group inclusion. The other three subscales (Second-Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality, Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity, and Environmental Microaggressions) were not included due to their lack of relevance to the workplace context. Thus, a total of 22 items from the REMS were included in study. Example items include: “I was told that people of all racial groups experience the same obstacles” and “An employer or co-worker treated me differently than White co-workers.” Participants were asked to report if they had experienced each microaggression in the past six months (0 = I did not experience this event, 1 = I have experienced this event at least once in the past six months). Scores were aggregated by taking the mean of the items to create a composite microaggressions score for each participant. In the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was .92.

Additionally, the REMS was validated on both college- and internet-based samples of Asian Americans, Latina/os, African Americans, and multiracial participants. The REMS
consists of six subscales which demonstrated Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranging from .71 to .86, with an overall Cronbach alpha of .88 in the validation study. In the validation study by Nadal (2011) the REMS correlated with both the Daily Life Experiences Scale (DLE; Harrell, 2000) and the Racism and Life Experiences Scale-Brief (RaLES-B; Utsey, 1998). These two scales are commonly used to measure discrimination and racism; therefore, these findings support the concurrent validity of the REMS (Nadal, 2011).

**Ambient discrimination.** Ragins et al. (2017) introduced the Ambient Racial Discrimination Index (ARDI) which assesses participants’ overall experience with ambient discrimination. The scale originally contained questions asking participants about their experiences with ambient racial discrimination in the past 24 months. This timeframe was reduced to six months for the study to make it consistent with the timeframe for microaggressions and allow sufficient time for prejudice to manifest, but not too much time, such that the participant worked on a different team or would not recall details accurately. The scale consists of four items that are measured on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (very often). Example items include: “I have witnessed racial or ethnic discrimination in my workplace” and “I have heard racist comments and jokes in my workplace.” Responses to these statements were aggregated by taking the mean of each response to create a composite score for ambient discrimination. Within the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was .91.

This scale was developed on a sample of full-time workers who were predominately white (81%). A Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of greater than .90 was reported in the initial validation study. Convergent validity test revealed that the ARDI was positively related to the exclusionary and discriminatory behaviors subscale of the ambient racial harassment measure.
created by (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2013), and to the Workplace Prejudice/Discrimination Inventory 10-item subscale called awareness of discrimination (James, Lovato, & Cropanzano, 1994; Ragins et al., 2017). Furthermore, the ARDI demonstrated discriminant validity with social desirability and measures of diversity climate (Ragins et al., 2017).

**Holding behaviors.** The extent to which participants felt that they received unconditional support was captured using the Holding Behaviors Index (HBI) developed by Ragins et al. (2017). This scale consists of 9-items. Example items include: “The individuals give me a “safe space” to share my fears and concerns about things that happen at work” and “I can go to these individuals for support when I am faced with upsetting or stressful workplace experiences.” Participants were asked to rate the extent to which their supportive individuals demonstrate the holding behaviors using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*to a great extent*). Scores were aggregated by taking the mean of the items to create a composite holding behaviors score. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .97 in the current study.

This 9-item scale was developed on a sample of full-time workers who were predominately white (81%) and demonstrated a Cronbach’s alpha greater than .90. Convergent validity tests showed that the HBI was positively related to the Inclusion of Others in Self scale (Aron, Aron, & Smolan, 1992) and to mentor quality/satisfaction (Eby et al., 2013). Discriminant validity tests also showed that the HBI was distinct from four related mentoring behaviors (acceptance, friendship, protect, and counsel) from the Mentor Role Index (Ragins & McFarlin, 1990; Ragins et al., 2017).

**Perceived group inclusion.** To assess participants’ feelings of inclusion within their work departments, I used the Perceived Group Inclusion Scale (PGIS) developed by Jansen et al. (2014). The scale consists of 16-items that are measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1
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*(strongly disagree)* to *(strongly agree)*. Example items include: “This group gives me the feeling that I belong” and “This group allows me to express my authentic self.” Responses to these statements were aggregated by taking the mean of each response to create a composite score for inclusion. Within the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha was .98.

This scale was validated on both college- and employee-based samples. The scale consists of four, four-item subscales that fall under two components (belonging and authenticity). In the validation study, the subscales had a Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .94 and .95 respectively, with an overall coefficient alpha of .97. The PGIS demonstrated convergent validity by meeting the following criteria: (a) the average variance extracted (AVE) was larger than 0.50 and the composite reliability was larger than the AVE (Jansen et al., 2014; Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). Furthermore, discriminant validity was demonstrated by having an AVE that was greater than the average and maximum shared variance with items making up other factors (Hair et al., 2010). Finally, authenticity was predictive of expected, positive outcomes (i.e., group learning behavior, creativity, and group performance) and belonging was predictive of affective outcomes (i.e., interpersonal trust, mood within the group, group conflict, and work satisfaction; Jansen et al., 2014).

**Turnover intentions.** Turnover intentions were measured using a scale developed by Xu & Payne (2014). The measure consists of 3-items and demonstrated a Cronbach’s alpha .87. Example items include: “I often think about quitting this job” and “I am actively looking for another job.” Participants were asked to rate their agreement with the statements using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *(strongly disagree)* to 5 *(strongly agree)*. The Cronbach’s alpha was .91 in the current study. As mentioned previously, turnover intentions positively predict voluntary turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000).
**Covariates.** Because the purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which a person of color is the recipient of holding behaviors from individuals outside of their department, it was important to control for the extent to which they receive support from within their department. There was one item that was used to capture within-group support: “In addition to the group of supportive individuals outside your department, do you also have at least one person in your immediate work group who provides these behaviors?” Participants were asked to respond to the item using a yes/no scale. This item was developed for the purposes of this study.

To the degree that people of color have a strong sense of their ethnic identity it is more likely that they are aware and vulnerable to experiences of discrimination (Jones & Galliher, 2015; Quintana, 2007). An increased ethnic identity could result in individuals reacting more poorly to discrimination due to being more aware of their position in the social hierarchy. I collected ethnic identity because in previous studies it was found to moderate the association between discrimination and other outcome variables, such as mental health and traumatic stress symptoms (Khaylis, Waelde, & Bruce, 2007; Pascoe & Smart Richman, 2009; Torres & Taknint, 2015; Yip, Gee & Takeuchi, 2008). However, if ethnic identity fails to moderate any of the proposed relationships in the current study, it will be excluded as a covariate unless it is related to any of the outcome variables.

Ethnic identity was measured using the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R) developed by Phinney and Ong (2007) using a university sample that consisted of Asian Americans, European Americans, Latina/os, and mixed heritage/other. Participants were asked to indicate their degree of ethnic identity on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). In the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was .88.
CHAPTER III

Analyses

Prior to conducting analyses to test the aforementioned hypotheses, I prepared and cleaned the dataset. First, I checked the degree of missingness in the data to determine how many cases and variables had too much missingness and would need to be removed. Then, I examined the data for noticeable patterns of missingness, and used Little’s Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) Test to test for missingness mechanisms (Enders, 2010) to determine why data are missing and whether the data was missing completely at random or not. Finally, I created aggregated scales for each variable, dummy coded where needed, and coded binary items (e.g., gender) as 0, 1.

Before testing the focal hypotheses, I conducted several preliminary analyses. First, I checked whether the data met the statistical assumptions prior to running the primary analyses. According to Aguinis and Vandenberg (2014), control variables should not be considered for inclusion in the analyses unless they are correlated with the dependent variables and fail to act as moderators in the model. Therefore, I checked to see if the covariates were related to the dependent variables and ran a moderation analysis to rule out ethnic identity as moderator.

Hypotheses 1 and 3, were tested by observing the bivariate correlations. For Hypotheses 2 and 4, I conducted four moderation analyses using Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro for SPSS, which utilizes ordinary least squares regression as the estimation method. For exploratory purposes, first an ANOVA was conducted to determine if people of various racial groups experience ethnic identity, microaggressions, and ambient discrimination differently. Second, two hierarchical regressions were conducted to determine if holding behaviors uniquely
predicted inclusion and turnover intentions while controlling for microaggressions and ambient discrimination.

**Results**

**Data Preparation and Cleaning**

Originally, data were collected from a total of 328 individuals through Prolific and MTurk. In the first stage of data cleaning, three participants were removed for being duplicate cases (e.g., identical IP address or ID number), and two participants were removed due to failure to satisfy the screening criteria (e.g., self-identified as white only). This resulted in a sample size of 323.

**Missing data.** A visual inspection of missing value patterns indicated minimal missingness that might be characterized as a univariate pattern, which means that the missingness was likely isolated to a single variable and is not a problematic pattern of missingness (Enders, 2010). Next, I conducted Little’s MCAR Test, which is used to determine if the data are missing completely at random. When the MCAR Test is significant, the missing values are either: (a) related to the participants’ true standing on the focal variables themselves, (b) related to other non-focal variables in the study, or (c) a combination of the two possibilities (Schlomer, Bauman, & Card, 2010). In cases b and c, multiple imputation will be helpful. However, multiple imputation cannot overcome the limitations associated with non-random missingness (i.e., MNAR) that characterizes case a. The missingness in the sample produced a statistically significant Little’s MCAR Test, which violates the MCAR assumption, indicating the missingness was correlated with a person’s standing on a specific variable. It is noteworthy that 30 participants in the study did not respond to the holding behaviors measure. It is possible that these participants could not identify someone who provides them support and thus opted out.
of responding to the holding behaviors scale. Under circumstances like these, the results are typically biased because experiencing holding behaviors (or lack thereof, in this case) predicts the missingness on that variable (Schlomer et al., 2010).

In a study conducted by Olinksy, Chen, and Harlow (2003), the researchers provided a guideline that missingness beyond 24% in a data set needs to be eliminated as it will bias the results even when using imputation. An analysis of the missingness at the case-level was conducted in the current study and revealed that five cases had greater than 24% missingness. Thus, those five cases were removed from the sample, bringing the sample size to 318. Next, I checked to see if there was enough data for each primary variable. An examination of the remaining cases revealed that most variables had complete data, expect for the holding behaviors measure. There were 30 cases that had too much missingness on the primary variables in the model, which resulted in not being able to compute composite scores for those variables. Thus, several imputation and deletion approaches were considered and tested to try and address the missingness.

I tested two methods for handling the missing cases that were due to the omission of the holding behaviors measure. First, I used listwise deletion and removed all the cases that had more than 24% missing and analyzed the remaining data. Second, I employed a multiple imputation approach to generate estimates for the missing values and used those estimates in the subsequent analyses. Because the missingness is likely correlated with the participants’ standing on a variable, it is not generally desirable to use a listwise deletion approach because it could bias the results due to non-random missingness. Additionally, listwise deletion reduces sample size and power, making it more difficult to detect significant effects. Thus, for the sake of completeness and to compare the parameter estimates generated, I used both methods and found
that the results were not meaningfully different from one another. Thus, for simplicity and parsimony, I removed the 30 individuals who omitted the holding behaviors variable, bringing the final sample size to 288. For reference, the steps I employed for the process of multiple imputation are located in Appendix C.

Assumption Testing and Preliminary Analyses

Before conducting the focal analyses, I checked assumptions, tested if the covariates were related to the outcome variables, and examined if ethnic identity was a potential moderator. The assumptions for regression include having: (a) normally distributed predictors and outcome variables; (b) normal distribution of residuals in the relationships between predictors and outcome variables; (c) linearity between the predictors and outcome variables; and (d) homoscedasticity in the relationships between predictors and outcome variables.

The first three assumptions were assessed visually by examining histograms of predictors and outcome variables, histograms of residual values, and scatterplots between predictors and outcome variables. While most visual inspections revealed sufficiently normal distribution and linear relationships, there were some deviations from normality. Specifically, microaggressions and ambient discrimination did have slight deviations from normality, which could be problematic. However, these deviations were not enough to warrant corrections, such as transforming the dependent variables.

To assess homoscedasticity which is the spread of the distribution of the errors around the best fitting line across all values of the predictor, I plotted the unstandardized residuals on the y axis and the predictor variables on the x axis. When I examined these scatterplots visually, there was insufficient reason to suspect that there were problematic levels of heteroscedasticity between the predictors and outcome variables. Internal consistency reliability estimates were
calculated with Cronbach’s alpha for each variable in the study and are included along with descriptive statistics and correlations in Table 2. The Cronbach’s alphas were between .88 and .98 indicating strong internal consistency across all measures. To identify the noteworthy relationships, I examined the bivariate correlations (see Table 2). It is important to note that holding behaviors was significantly correlated with inclusion \((r = .45, p < .001)\) and turnover intentions \((r = -.25, p < .001)\). This suggests that holding behaviors may be an important factor in fostering inclusion and retention.

**Justifying the Use of Covariates**

To determine if the covariates (i.e., within-group support and ethnic identity) should be included in the primary analyses, I first, I examined their bivariate correlations with the outcomes. Within-group support was significantly correlated with inclusion \((r = .31, p < .001)\), but was not significantly correlated with turnover intentions \((r = -.11, p = .06)\). Therefore, within-group support was included in the analyses in which inclusion was the outcome variable but not turnover intentions.

Next, I tested ethnic identity as a moderator to rule out the possibility that the relationship between discrimination and the outcomes was more pronounced for those with high ethnic identity. Four moderations were run utilizing the SPSS macro, PROCESS (Hayes, 2013; Model 1), to determine if ethnic identity was a moderator. First, ethnic identity failed to moderate the relationship between microaggressions and inclusion \((B_{\text{microaggressions}*\text{ethnic identity}} = -.06, p = .80)\). The second analysis revealed that ethnic identity failed to moderate the relationship between ambient discrimination and inclusion \((B_{\text{ambient discrimination}*\text{ethnic identity}} = -.01, p = .79)\). The third analysis demonstrated that ethnic identity failed to moderate the relationship between microaggressions and turnover intentions \((B_{\text{microaggressions}*\text{ethnic identity}} = .22, p = .56)\). The fourth
analysis revealed that ethnic identity failed to moderate the relationship between ambient discrimination and turnover intentions ($B_{\text{ambient discrimination} \times \text{ethnic identity}} = .03, p = .73$). Full results from these four moderations are reported in Tables 3-6; overall, ethnic identity failed to moderate in all relationships tested.

Given that ethnic identity was ruled out as a moderator, it was necessary to determine if ethnic identity was related to the outcomes by examining the bivariate correlations. Results revealed that ethnic identity was unrelated to both inclusion ($r = .11, p = .08$) and turnover intentions ($r = -.04, p = .47$). In summary, because ethnic identity neither correlated with the dependent variables nor served as a moderator in any of the analyses; it was not included as a covariate in the primary analyses.

**Primary Analyses**

In Hypothesis 1, it was proposed that both (a) microaggressions and (b) ambient discrimination would be negatively associated with inclusion. The findings supported this hypothesis ($r = -.22, p < .001$; $r = -.26, p < .001$, respectively).

In Hypothesis 2, I proposed holding behaviors would buffer the negative effects of discrimination proposed in Hypothesis 1. Utilizing the SPSS macro PROCESS (Hayes, 2013: Model 1), I tested Hypothesis 2 with a specified model predicting inclusion. The focal predictor was either (a) microaggressions or (b) ambient discrimination and the moderator was holding behaviors. The models also included within-group support as a covariate. Results are displayed in Tables 7 and 8 and revealed that holding behaviors did not moderate the relationship between (a) microaggressions and inclusion ($B_{\text{microaggressions} \times \text{holding behaviors}} = .11, p = .46$), or the relationship between (b) ambient discrimination and inclusion ($B_{\text{ambient discrimination} \times \text{holding behaviors}} = .01, p = .72$).
The simple slopes are displayed in Figures 8 and 9. These results demonstrate that Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

In Hypothesis 3, I predicted that both (a) microaggressions and (b) ambient discrimination would be positively associated with turnover intentions. The findings supported this hypothesis ($r = .28, p < .001; r = .33, p < .001$, respectively).

In Hypothesis 4, I proposed that holding behaviors would buffer both of the associations proposed in Hypothesis 3. Utilizing the SPSS macro PROCESS (Hayes, 2013: Model 1), I tested Hypothesis 4 with a specified model predicting turnover intentions. The focal predictor was either (a) microaggressions or (b) ambient discrimination and the moderator was holding behaviors. Results are displayed in Tables 9 and 10 and revealed that holding behaviors did not moderate the relationship between (a) microaggressions and turnover intentions ($B_{microaggressions*holding behaviors} = .27, p = .26$), or the relationship between (b) ambient discrimination and turnover intentions ($B_{ambient discrimination*holding behaviors} = .01, p = .80$). The simple slopes are displayed in Figures 10 and 11. These results demonstrate that Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

**Exploratory Analyses**

Finally, I conducted two exploratory analyses. Because the moderations were not supported, I wanted to rule out the possibility that there was one particular racial group that was over-represented in the sample and that other racial groups were not underrepresented. If the sample included under representation of certain racial groups and those groups commonly have more or less exposure to discrimination in comparison to other groups, this could have caused an indirect truncation on the predictor variables resulting in range restriction on the variable. For example, in the current study if there was range restriction on racial group, one racial group
might experience more microaggressions than others or have a different ethnic identity than the other groups. By extension, this would result in failing to capture the full range of microaggressions or ethnic identity. Thus, I wanted to rule out the possibility that range restriction in racial group could be an indirect reason for why I was unable to detect the hypothesized effects.

So, the first exploratory analysis conducted was a one-way analysis of variance to better understand if people from various racial groups experience ethnic identity, microaggressions, or ambient discrimination differently. The independent variable, racial group, included 10 groups: African, Black/African American, Caribbean, East Asian, Latino/Hispanic, Middle Eastern, Mixed, Native American or Alaskan Native, South Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. The dependent variables were ethnic identity, microaggressions, and ambient discrimination. Results are displayed in Table 11 and revealed a significant effect of racial group on ethnic identity ($F[9, 278] = 2.00, p = .04$), and non-significant effects of racial group on microaggressions ($F[9, 278] = 1.86, p = .06$) and ambient discrimination ($F[9, 278] = 1.59, p = .19$). Post-hoc tests revealed that there were no significant differences among groups, but there may be differences trending for Black/African Americans. Since racial group did not predict any of these correlations, I ruled out the idea that range restriction might have been due to these relationships.

Additionally, I was interested in examining the importance of holding behaviors. Given that this variable was not acting as a moderator, I wanted to understand its importance in predicting outcomes uniquely when controlling for experiences of discrimination. Therefore, a second exploratory analysis was run to determine if holding behaviors uniquely predicted inclusion and turnover when microaggressions and ambient discrimination were included in the
model. I conducted two hierarchical multiple regression analyses. In the first regression, in which inclusion was the outcome variable, I entered microaggressions and ambient discrimination in step 1, followed by holding behaviors in step 2. Results of the regression analysis are displayed in Table 12 and revealed that both holding behaviors \((B = .33; p < .001)\) and ambient discrimination \((B = -.13; p = .004)\) explained unique variability in inclusion whereas microaggressions \((B = -.32; p = .17)\) did not. Furthermore, microaggressions and ambient discrimination together explained 7.5% of the variance in inclusion, and holding behaviors explained an additional 19% of the variance in inclusion above and beyond the variance accounted for by discrimination.

In the second regression, in which turnover intentions was the outcome variable, I entered microaggressions and ambient discrimination in step 1, followed by holding behaviors in step 2. Results of the regression analysis are displayed in Table 13 and revealed that both holding behaviors \((B = -.25; p < .001)\) and ambient discrimination \((B = .25; p < .001)\) explained unique variability in turnover intentions whereas microaggressions \((B = .67; p = .06)\) did not. Furthermore, microaggressions and ambient discrimination together explained 12% of the variance in turnover intentions, and holding behaviors explained an incremental 5% of the variance in turnover intentions above and beyond the variance accounted for by discrimination.
CHAPTER IV

Discussion

The results of this study lend support to the importance of holding behaviors for fostering inclusion in the workplace. Although efforts to understand the positive outcomes of an inclusive workplace have been conducted (Shore et al., 2018); currently, there is a lack of research focusing on the predictors of inclusion and detailed strategies for diversity practitioners (Shore et al., 2011). This study comprises a meaningful contribution to the literature on diversity and inclusion in two primary ways. First, the results are consistent with prior evidence (e.g., Chrobot-Mason et al., 2013; Hebl, et al., 2016; Major & Dover, 2016; Sue et al., 2019; Triana et al., 2015) demonstrating the harmful effects of microaggressions and ambient discrimination. Second, holding behaviors was positively associated with inclusion instead of serving as a moderating, mitigating factor that lessened the negative impacts of discrimination and desired outcomes. Consequently, the results paint a simpler, more straightforward picture that can better-inform strategies for practitioners.

Additionally, I will discuss the importance of holding behaviors as unique and essential predictors of inclusion, even after accounting for individuals of color’s experiences with workplace microaggressions and ambient discrimination. These results suggest several implications for both practice and theory, which will be described in the subsequent pages, along with a discussion of directions for future research. Finally, I will conclude this chapter with a discussion of the current study’s limitations.

Implications for Practice

As discrimination persists and employees continue to experience economic inequality and social exclusion in the workplace (Mor Barak et al., 2001; Shore et al., 2018), several
suggestions for both organizations and individuals stem from the current study’s findings. It is essential to recognize that although these strategies are important steps for organizations to take to help reduce discrimination, organizations and individuals need to be prepared for the potential backlash of others (Sabat, Martinez, & Wessel, 2013; Sue et al., 2019). The current system defaults to automatically reproducing racial inequality (DiAngelo, 2018), and White individuals who choose to combat discrimination may be labeled as troublemakers or White liberals and may experience isolation or avoidance from fellow White co-workers (Sue et al., 2019). Whereas implementing strategies to reduce discrimination are vital, circumstances may get worse before they improve. Nonetheless, this may be a critical first step to the process of facilitating the emergence of authentically inclusive workplaces. Therefore, the following strategies are offered as ways to capitalize on the benefits of diversity while minimizing the costs.

Organizational level strategies. At the organizational level, evidence is documented above as to the harmful effects of microaggressions and ambient discrimination on inclusion and intent to leave. If organizations are not striving to reduce discriminatory behaviors in the workplace, potential consequences are increased costs due to turnover and missing out on the benefits of enhanced feelings of inclusion and resultant gains in employee engagement (Gallup, 2013; Winters, 2017), performance (Pearce & Randel, 2004), and innovation (Jansen et al., 2014). Overall, organizations need to focus more efforts on fostering cultures and implementing policies that prioritize the support of employees of color by taking steps to meaningfully reduce discrimination.

Recruitment. The first strategy that organizations can use to foster a culture of inclusion is to increase the transparency of the recruitment process. The attraction-selection-attraction (ASA) model suggests that the culture of an organization impacts an individual’s attraction,
willingness to join, and intent to leave the organization (Kravitz, 2008; Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995). When individuals are seeking employment, they are trying to identify which organizations they will fit best with (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). If organizations are not clear about how they view diversity and inclusion and what the organizational culture is like, it makes it difficult for employees to select-in to an organization that aligns with their personal values (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Specifically, management and leadership can choose to be clear in the recruitment and selection processes as to how future employees can expect values to manifest in daily organizational life. For example, managers who conduct the interviews should clearly communicate the team and organizational values, specifically, their stance on discrimination and inclusion in the workplace (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Additionally, managers and interviewers should provide a realistic job preview for applicants by providing insight into both the positives and negatives of the organizational culture (Gardner, Reithel, Foley, Cogliser, Walumbwa, 2009). The primary objective is that applicants come away with an understanding of what the organization and its leaders stand for, the ways inclusion is being fostered, and expectations for behavior toward minority coworkers. These strategies can help individuals make more informed decisions prior to joining an organization (Wanous, 1992). Thus, individuals whose values align with the organization will select-in and those who are hesitant in promoting the wellbeing of people of color can self-select out and find an organization with better value congruence.

Furthermore, organizations can foster an inclusive culture through the signals they send to current and future employees (Rynes, 1991; Suazo et al., 2009). Organizational impression management theory refers to purposeful actions that organizations take to influence an individual’s perceptions of their organization (Avery & McKay, 2006; Elsbach, Sutton,
Principe, 1998). Additionally, signal theory is commonly used during the recruitment process to help reduce information asymmetry between applicants and organizations (Connelly, Certo, Ireland, & Reutzel, 2011; Spence, 2002). A common area of recruitment research has focused on how communication, regarding an organization’s workforce diversity and their diversity policies/affirmative action, impacts the recruitment of diverse individuals (Breaugh, 2013; Lievens & Slaughter, 2015). Therefore, the impressions and signals that organizations send to applicants through their diversity and inclusion cues can influence the individuals who decide to join the organization.

Changing individual’s hearts and minds regarding the value of diversity is an uphill battle. Therefore, some have suggested an easier strategy, namely changing how the system operates and the messages it sends, is vital for attracting the right people in the organization and limiting the number of individuals who are surprised by the organization’s environment once they are hired (e.g., Burrell, 2016; Morse, 2016). Thus, a second strategy that organizations could implement is scrutinizing the language they use in job advertisements or job descriptions (Morse, 2016). The language that is used to attract applicants to an organization has the potential to impact the attributes of the individuals who choose to apply (Breaugh, 2013). Therefore, organizations can be more conscious and proactive in using language that encourages people of color to apply (Morse, 2016). For example, using the following language in recruitment advertising: “We believe that inclusion and diversity are keys to our success. By fully leveraging our diverse experiences, backgrounds and insights, we inspire innovation, challenge the status quo and create better outcomes for our people and our clients. Making inclusion and diversity a competitive advantage is front and center for us” (Flory, Leibbrandt, Rott, & Stoddard, 2018, p. 27). By focusing on inclusive language during the recruitment process, it may signal to people
that this organization is different and does not tolerate discrimination, which may impact the people who apply and are hired at organizations (Suazo et al., 2009). By being conscious about the language used during the recruitment process, it may help send the right signals to applicants, thus, increasing the talent pool and attracting the best candidates for the role and the organization (Morse, 2016). Although there are strategies that organizations can begin implementing, more research is needed to draw better conclusions about these strategies. There will be specific next steps provided in the future research section. Perhaps training strategies would be more effective if applicants have an understanding of the company’s culture and values from the beginning, and self-select in or out based on perceived fit, thereby reducing the likelihood of backlash.

**Training.** The results of this study demonstrated that ambient discrimination uniquely predicted inclusion and turnover intentions, whereas microaggressions did not. Thus, organizations need to prioritize the reduction of ambient discrimination, considering its potential for both direct and indirect harm (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2013; Ragins et al., 2017). Organizations can strive to reduce the acts of discrimination that are witnessed by a third party by focusing on creating a culture that is intolerant of discrimination. Thus, a third strategy organizations can implement is providing training that focuses on increasing awareness of what discrimination looks like and developing practical skills that employees can use to intervene during acts of discrimination (Sue et al., 2019; Thurber & DiAngelo, 2018). During these trainings, organizations could educate employees on different skills they could use depending on whether they were a witness, perpetrator, or target of the discrimination, and then allow time for employees to practice these skills based on various scenarios (Thurber & DiAngelo, 2018). For example, as a witness of discrimination one could ask themselves “What would be lost if I don’t
act?”; and ensure that when they intervene, they are grounding their actions in the ethic of care (Thurber & DiAngelo, 2018).

Furthermore, these trainings should teach individuals how to confront the discrimination and prejudice directly as research has demonstrated that confronting these behaviors is effective in changing behaviors and attitudes (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006, Hyers, 2010, & Sabat et al., 2013). A specific content area of the training could be teaching employees ways to make the “invisible” visible and how to disarm the act of discrimination in the moments when it is occurring (Sue et al., 2019). A couple of examples of how to make the “invisible” visible are to: (a) challenge the stereotype by saying something similar to “It is too bad that in our society black people always have to prove their competence and intelligence to White people. Let’s be aware of this bias and try to combat it” and (b) undermine the metacommunication by saying “Don’t worry, John is fully qualified for this role” (Sue et al., 2019). Two examples for how to disarm the discriminatory act are: (1) express disagreement by saying “I don’t agree with what you said” or (2) interrupt and redirect the conversation by saying “Let’s not go there. Maybe we can focus on the task at hand” (Sue et al., 2019, p. 136-137). By training employees on how to appropriately intervene when experiencing acts of discrimination, organizations can create an environment that does not tolerate discrimination and can move towards creating a safe and inclusive environment for all employees.

A fourth strategy is providing training on how to engage in allyship behaviors. According to Sue et al. (2019), allies are people “who belong to dominant social groups (e.g., Whites, males, heterosexuals) and, through their support of nondominant groups (e.g., people of color, women, LGBTQ individuals), actively work toward the eradication of prejudicial practices they witness in both their personal and professional lives” (p. 132). Individuals who want to engage in
allyship behaviors seek to learn about one’s privilege, but also need to understand power, domination, and the process of colonialism (Erskine & Bilimoria, 2019; Max, 2005). If organizations help individuals increase their understanding around these topics it should equip them to step in and educate individuals who are displaying discriminatory behaviors. Some specific strategies that could be included in the training are: (1) distinguishing intent from impact by saying “I know you didn’t realize that comment you made was demeaning to Maryam because not all Arab Americans are a threat” or (2) appealing to the offender’s principles and values by saying “I know you really care about representing everyone at work, but acting in this way undermines your intentions to be inclusive” (Sue et al., 2019, p. 137).

Additionally, allyship behavior training should cover the potential harm of White silence. When White individuals remain silent it protects whiteness and the white dominant culture (Mura, 1999; Picca & Feagin, 2007). According to DiAngelo (2012), when White individuals are silent, people of color and the few White individuals who always speak, are left with the weight of the conversation. This silence can suggest to others that no one challenges their views and can imply agreement with their views. Specific allyship behavior strategies that can be used to combat white silence are to challenge the dominant Whites when they are expressing hostility and to support other White allies or people of color when they take risks and speak up (DiAngelo, 2012). Providing training on how to fight White silence, may help organizations reduce discrimination and foster inclusion.

Furthermore, leaders need to show that they value diversity and inclusion by modeling these previously mentioned behaviors in the workplace. According to social learning theory individuals learn how to behave by observing role models (Bandura, 1977; Brown & Trevino, 2014). Bandura (2001) contended that behaviors modeled by individuals with admirable
characteristics are seen as desirable. Additionally, behaviors modeled by supervisors were found to influence subordinate ethical behavior more than peer behavior (Arlow & Ulrich, 1988; Sumpter, Gibson, & Porath, 2017; Vitell & Festervand, 1987). This suggests that behaviors modeled by supervisors have an impact on how employees decide to behave (Sumpter et al., 2017). Therefore, having leaders that model these behaviors may help create a workplace that supports allyship behaviors and a culture of inclusion (Detert & Bruno, 2017; Erskine & Bilimoria, 2019; Hannah & Avolio, 2010; Koerner, 2013).

While striving to create a culture that does not tolerate discrimination, it is vital for organizations to focus their efforts on encouraging and increasing the use of holding behaviors in the workplace. Additionally, even when discrimination is occurring in the workplace, the results of the current study are consistent with the conclusion that holding behaviors contribute to positive outcomes for employees of color. A fifth strategy that organizations should implement is providing training for employees on how to display holding behaviors. For example, this training should focus on empathetic communication, active listening, and perspective taking (Ragins, 2016). By providing training on these skills, organizations can hopefully increase the number of individuals in the organizations who are providing holding behaviors and help foster a culture of inclusion in the workplace.

In addition to training on skills that bolster holding behaviors, organizations should provide training on the racial history of the U.S. Diversity in the workplace is commonly positioned as a new feature of the workplace, which ignores the historical impact discrimination has had on people of color (Nkomo & Hoobler, 2014). When studying diversity, the historical roots of racial diversity and the historical dominance of majority groups at the expense of minority groups members is not discussed (Nkomo, 2014). This results in an ignorance of the
impact this context has on people of colors’ economic opportunities and experiences within American society and the workplace. White individuals need to invest time in understanding power disparities between majority and minority groups (Erskine & Bilimoria, 2019; Max, 2005). Historically, the educational institutions have excluded the experiences of people of color (Nkomo, 1992), which create an opportunity for organizations to help fill in this knowledge gap. Thus, organizations could provide training for their employees (both whites and people of color) to help increase the understanding of the impact historical context has on the lives of people of color. While organizations need to make strides to reduce discrimination and increase holding behaviors, there are also strategies that individuals can use to help achieve those same goals. In summary, it may be important to keep researching and implementing a holistic, comprehensive, and multidisciplinary approach to diversity and inclusion that goes beyond the implicit bias training that is often implemented in organizations today (Hewlett, Rashid, & Sherbin, 2018).

Part of the reason why diversity initiatives are generally ineffective might be due to organizations not taking a more holistic approach similar to the one I am suggesting through this research.

**Individual level strategies.** The results of this study support the importance of holding behaviors in the workplace. However, several participants (almost 9% of the sample) where not able to identify any individuals in the workplace who provide holding behaviors for them. This suggests that there are not enough people in organizations who are providing these behaviors to others. Therefore, individuals need to educate themselves on the skills needed to provide holding behaviors and begin providing these valuable behaviors to fellow employees. By increasing the number of individuals providing holding behaviors in the workplace, hopefully employees will start to feel more included while at work.
One way individuals can start to increase the holding behaviors they display is to develop their listening skills (Ragins, 2016). According to Winters (2017) it is important for individuals to listen for understanding. Typically, a person’s intentions when listening to others is to reply and not to listen for understanding (Winters, 2017). Therefore, individuals should start to incorporate the following strategies to listen for understanding: (1) stop and ask themselves why they find themselves disagreeing with what is being said and commit to exploring and reflection in this later and then quickly return to listening; (2) if they do not understand something that is being said make a mental note to do their own research later; and (3) ask only clarifying questions such as “I did not understand your last point, could you elaborate?” (Winters, 2017, p. 95). Implementing these strategies can help individuals approach conversations with people of color with a different level of listening than they may have previously employed.

In addition to listening for understanding, it is also important to strategically approach White silence when having racial discussions as this can sometimes be a beneficial move (DiAngelo, 2012). If White individuals are not careful and participate too much in inter-racial conversations, it can simply reinforce the White dominate culture. DiAngelo (2012), recommends the following inter-racial situations as times when it is generally a good time for White individuals to remain silent and just listen: (1) when minority group members are talking about sensitive issues around racial oppression; (2) when White individuals have already spoken the most during the conversation; (3) when a White individual feels compelled to add-on, re-clarify, or re-explain their own viewpoint after a person of color has spoken. White individuals need to pay attention and learn when it is helpful for them to speak up and when it is better for them to remain silent and listen during inter-racial conversations.
Even though organizations have a responsibility to eradicate discrimination in the workplace, individual employees also need to put forth the effort to rid organizations of discrimination. Thus, employees should be increasing their awareness of how they may be contributing to discrimination and how they can help interrupt workplace discrimination. Since microaggressions are commonly unintentional and unaware, individuals need to look at their own behaviors and be willing to receive and consider feedback regarding their discriminatory behaviors (Thurber & DiAngelo, 2018). According to DiAngelo (2016), one question individuals can ask themselves is: “How is oppression appearing in this context?” instead of: “Did oppression occur?” This approach introduces employees to the idea of adopting the underlying assumption that systemic injustice, stereotyping, and discrimination are always at work in daily interactions; and it is everyone’s responsibility to identify it and mitigate resulting harm.

Additionally, individuals need to hold themselves accountable for their actions, which is a long-term commitment in which they fully assume responsibilities for their actions and the associated consequences (Thurber & DiAngelo, 2018). One strategy that individuals can use is to identify someone who can help them process their feelings and think through their actions and options for making amends for their discriminatory behavior (Thurbur & DiAngelo, 2018). Although it is not easy or comfortable to admit and take responsibility for our wrong behaviors, it is an important stride that individuals can take to personally reduce the discrimination occurring in the workplace.

Learning and practicing allyship behaviors is a lifelong journey and it can take its toll on an individual, thus, it is vital for individuals to find a support system that can encourage and nurture them (Sue et al., 2019). One strategy that individuals can use is to find a race-based caucus to join. Race-based caucuses are groups of people from the same racial group that
regularly meet to discuss privilege, oppression, and racism in their organization (Blitz & Kohl, 2012). Typically, there is at least one group for people of color and one group for White individuals, who meet on their own to discuss issues of race (Blitz & Kohl, 2012). These groups allow people of color to have a safer space to discuss and process the racial issues they are facing. Additionally, these groups allow White individuals to support each other in antiracism work without having to burden people of color in helping them process the impacts of racism. These race-based caucus groups not only provide a space for White allies to gain support from other White allies, but they may help advance organizational change, promote antiracist practices, and support growth of the group members (Blitz & Kohl, 2012). In sum, there are several practical implications as a result of this study that can be used to increase holding behaviors in the workplace, reduce workplace discrimination, and help foster an inclusive organizational environment.

Implications for Theory and Future Research

A primary purpose of this study was to extend the focus of holding behaviors to contexts outside of mentoring relationships and immediate workgroup relationships. This study built upon the work of Ragins et al. (2017) by examining how holding behaviors impact important organizational outcomes, but focused on work relationships that were outside of one’s immediate workgroup. Ragins et al. (2017) found that holding behaviors did not buffer the negative impacts of ambient discrimination in immediate workgroup relationships. The results of the current study also showed that holding behaviors were not enough to overcome the negative effects of discrimination. In the future, researchers could explore if there are other ways organizations can buffer these relationships and reduce the negative consequences of discrimination in the workplace. In addition to examining potential buffers, researchers could also look at mediation
models. This study did not include any mediators that might relate to inclusion or turnover intentions. Thus, future research on discrimination and inclusion may benefit from taking this into consideration.

Additionally, the results of this study demonstrated the impact of receiving holding behaviors from individuals outside of one’s immediate workgroup. Increases in the amount of holding behaviors an individual received were associated with increases in an individual’s feelings of inclusion. Furthermore, the results showed that holding behaviors had a significant, negative relationship with turnover intentions. Therefore, future research should continue to look at how support individuals receive from people outside of their immediate workgroup impacts other organizational outcomes. These findings could help shed light on the importance of building relationships with people one may not work with on a daily basis.

Prior to this study, research on inclusion has typically focused on demonstrating the benefits of inclusion. Thus, one purpose of this study was to expand upon current inclusion research by examining the antecedents of inclusion. The results of this study suggest that if individuals are striving to feel more included within their workplace, they may benefit from identifying individuals who display holding behaviors and build relationships with them. Specifically, receiving holding behaviors can enhance feelings of inclusion, even after taking different types of discrimination into account. These findings help expand the diversity and inclusion work by exploring the impact holding behaviors have on important organization outcomes, such as inclusion. Therefore, future diversity and inclusion research needs to continue to explore different methods individuals and organizations can use to help foster an inclusive environment for people of color.
This study demonstrated the importance of holding behaviors, however, research on these behaviors is still in its infancy. Allyship is similar to holding behaviors in the sense that both areas are about creating high-quality, supportive relationships which can be helpful in reducing discrimination. Allyship has little research on specific coping strategies when faced with racial discrimination (Sue et al., 2019). Thus, a theoretical implication of the current study is the field of allyship research may benefit from considering holding behaviors as a valuable practice to encourage allies to engage in. Future research, could examine the impact training allies on how to engage in holding behaviors has on reducing workplace discrimination.

Furthermore, this study supported prior research that discrimination has negative consequences for people of color and organizations (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2013; Hebl, et al., 2016; Major & Dover, 2016; Sue et al., 2019; Triana et al., 2015). Trying to combat racial discrimination is not a responsibility that only falls on individuals, but organizations have a responsibility to reduce discrimination as well. As previously mentioned, one way organizations can strive to reduce discrimination and foster inclusion is through the individuals they hire. Realistic job previews have been used as means to help create better person-organization fit, which has been shown to reduce costs associated with turnover (Gardner et al., 2009). However, realistic job previews as a means to foster inclusion are not common. Future research should examine whether a realistic job preview including clear expectations of what the organization stands for, how they foster inclusion, and what they are doing to combat discrimination is related to the type of people who select-in to or select-out of the organization and if this impacts inclusion and turnover. If organizations can provide a clear enough picture of what applicants can expect from the organization, it makes sense that organizations that strongly oppose
discrimination and have a culture of inclusion, may not attract the type of individuals who may be perpetrators of discrimination.

Finally, the consequences of workplace discrimination could have been too strong for holding behaviors to mitigate their deleterious effects, which is why I did not find an effect. Therefore, future researchers should propose a mediation model in which holding behaviors impact desired outcomes through the reduction of discrimination. It might be that the more holding behaviors an individual receives, the less likely they are to experience discrimination in the workplace, thus impacting their levels of inclusion and intentions to leave their organization. Research into this mediation model might be able to increase the understanding of what factors specifically influence inclusion and turnover intentions and through which variables. In sum, this study points to several avenues for future research that could lead to meaningful differences in fostering a culture of inclusion in the workplace and in the lives of employees who are experiencing discrimination in their organizations.

Limitations

There are some limitations that should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results of the current study. First, it is not possible to make causal conclusions, since this study did not utilize an experimental design (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). One of the issues with causation is that it may result in individuals pulling the wrong lever when deciding to implement a given intervention, resulting in failure to attain the intended outcomes. However, it is unlikely within the context of the current study, that wrongly inferring causation will lead to a deleterious conclusion. Increasing supportive behaviors in the organization is a worthy goal, regardless of whether it causally impacts the specific outcomes in this study.
Next, several participants had to be removed from the study due to not providing responses to the holding behaviors measure. These individuals could have chosen to not respond to this measure due to having low support or not being able to identify individuals who provide support for them. Removing these individuals could have resulted in range restriction on the holding behaviors measure, by removing individuals who were at the lower end of this measure, resulting in truncation on that variable (Aguinis, Edwards, & Bradley, 2017). Due to the removal of participants, a smaller sample was collected than was originally intended. The combination of a lower sample size and range restriction can lead to lower power to detect a moderation (Aguinis & Stone-Romero, 1997). The current study had both of these limitations, so it is likely that the power to detect a moderating effect was decreased, resulting in a failure to detect a relationship that truly exists.

Finally, information on participants’ ethnic backgrounds and racial identity development were collected and analyzed to understand if either factor was overrepresented in the sample, thereby biasing the results in predictable ways. There were no significant differences in these variables across the racial groups; therefore, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the failure to observe the hypothesized moderation was due to the overrepresentation of certain racial groups in the sample. The results of this study suggest two possibilities, first there may be no relationship between the variables in the study or second, I was not able to detect a relationship between the variables due to a Type II error. Despite these limitations, the current research study has multiple strengths which supplement the existing literature.

**Conclusion**

Results of the current study contribute to the diversity and inclusion literature by lending support to the importance of holding behaviors for fostering inclusion in the workplace for
people of color. In this study, I assessed the relationship between experiencing racial discrimination in an individual’s workgroup and perceptions of inclusion in the workgroup as well as an individual’s turnover intentions. Furthermore, I explored the moderating role of holding behaviors on these negative associations. Overall, the results present evidence for the main effects of microaggressions and ambient discrimination, suggesting that increases in these two forms of discrimination yield diminished levels of inclusion and greater turnover intentions. Furthermore, holding behaviors did not moderate any relationships in the study. Finally, the results demonstrated that holding behaviors uniquely predicted both inclusion and turnover intentions beyond microaggressions and ambient discrimination. Findings from this research suggest that holding behaviors are important to encourage within the workplace and can impact outcome variables that matter to both employees and the organizations.
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APPENDIX A: Figures

Figure 1. Overview of variables in the current study.

Figure 2. Proposed model for predicting inclusion.
Figure 3. Graph of proposed simple slopes for holding behaviors moderating the relationship between racial microaggressions and inclusion.

Figure 4. Graph of proposed simple slopes for holding behaviors moderating the relationship between ambient discrimination and inclusion.
Figure 5. Proposed model for predicting turnover intentions.

Figure 6. Graph of proposed simple slopes for holding behaviors moderating the relationship between racial microaggressions and turnover intentions.
**Figure 7.** Graph of proposed simple slopes for holding behaviors moderating the relationship between ambient discrimination and turnover intentions.

**Figure 8.** Graph of simple slopes for holding behaviors moderating the relationship between microaggressions and inclusion when within-group support was included as a covariate.
Figure 9. Graph of simple slopes for holding behaviors moderating the relationship between ambient discrimination and inclusion when within-group support was included as a covariate.

Figure 10. Graph of simple slopes for holding behaviors moderating the relationship between microaggressions and turnover intentions.
Figure 11. Graph of simple slopes for holding behaviors moderating the relationship between ambient discrimination and turnover intentions.
### APPENDIX B: Tables

#### Table 1

*Frequencies of Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American &amp; Black or African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, &amp; Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native American, &amp; Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American, Black or African American, &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American &amp; White</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American, White, American Indian/Native American &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American, Mixed, &amp; Other (Caribbean)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American, White, &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American &amp; Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, White, American Indian/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American, &amp; Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, White, &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American &amp; White</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, White, &amp; American Indian/Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American, Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, White, American Indian/Native American &amp;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino &amp; White</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino, White, American Indian/Native American, &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino, White, &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino &amp; American Indian/Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; American Indian/Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, American Indian/Native American &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Other (Native Hawaiian)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 288.
# Table 2

**Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistencies, and Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>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>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Discrimination</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Behaviors</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>(0.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-0.56**</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-group Support</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*  
*N = 288.* Sex is coded 0 = Male and 1 = Female. Within-group Support was coded 0 = No and 1 = Yes.  
*p < .05 level (2-tailed). **p < .01 level (2-tailed).
Table 3
Preliminary Analysis: Regression Analysis Summary for Ethnic Identity as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Microaggressions and Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>70.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-4.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions*Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.90**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 288. SE = standard error. * p < .05 level (2-tailed). ** p < .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4
Preliminary Analysis: Regression Analysis Summary for Ethnic Identity as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Ambient Discrimination and Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>71.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Discrimination</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-4.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Discrimination*Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.29**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 288. SE = standard error. * p < .05 level (2-tailed). ** p < .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5
Preliminary Analysis: Regression Analysis Summary for Ethnic Identity as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Microaggressions and Turnover Intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions*Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.05**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 288. SE = standard error. * p < .05 level (2-tailed). ** p < .01 level (2-tailed).
Table 6
*Preliminary Analysis: Regression Analysis Summary for Ethnic Identity as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Ambient Discrimination and Turnover Intentions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>39.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Discrimination</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Discrimination*Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.49**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 288. SE = standard error. *p < .05 level (2-tailed). **p < .01 level (2-tailed).*

Table 7
*Primary Analysis: Regression Analysis Summary for Holding Behaviors as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Microaggressions and Inclusion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>35.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-3.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Behaviors</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-group Support (covariate)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions*Holding Behaviors</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.32**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 288. SE = standard error. Within-group Support is coded 0 = No and 1 = Yes. *p < .05 level (2-tailed). **p < .01 level (2-tailed).*

Table 8
*Primary Analysis: Regression Analysis Summary for Holding Behaviors as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Ambient Discrimination and Inclusion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>35.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Discrimination</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-4.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Behaviors</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-group Support (covariate)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Discrimination*Holding Behaviors</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.74**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 288. SE = standard error. Within-group Support is coded 0 = No and 1 = Yes. *p < .05 level (2-tailed). **p < .01 level (2-tailed).*
Table 9
*Primary Analysis: Regression Analysis Summary for Holding Behaviors as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Microaggressions and Turnover Intentions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>(\Delta R^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>40.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Behaviors</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-4.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions*Holding Behaviors</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>14.91**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 288. SE = standard error. *p < .05 level (2-tailed). **p < .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 10
*Primary Analysis: Regression Analysis Summary for Holding Behaviors as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Ambient Discrimination and Turnover Intentions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>(\Delta R^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>40.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Discrimination</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Behaviors</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-4.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Discrimination*Holding Behaviors</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>17.92**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 288. SE = standard error. *p < .05 level (2-tailed). **p < .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 11
*Exploratory Analysis: One-way Analysis of Variance Results for Differences Among Racial Groups on Ethnic Identity, Microaggressions, and Ambient Discrimination*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Levene’s</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Discrimination</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 288. *p < .05 level (2-tailed). **p < .01 level (2-tailed).
Table 12
*Exploratory Analysis: Hierarchical Regression Results for Variables Predicting Inclusion and Turnover Intentions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step and Variable</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE_B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE_B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Discrimination</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Holding Behaviors</strong></td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td>33.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 288. SE = standard error. *p < .05 level (2-tailed). **p < .01 level (2-tailed).*
APPENDIX C: Multiple Imputation Processes

First, I conducted multiple imputation at the item-level. Placeholder composite scale scores were calculated and used as a way to maintain the structure of the dataset and auxiliary variables such as age, gender, and ethnic identity were used to inform the model in estimating the missing values. Placeholder scale scores and auxiliary variables were only used as predictors. A fully conditional specification Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) procedure was used for the imputation. I imputed 20 datasets based on the simulation results from Graham, Olchowski, and Gilreath (2007), which suggested that pooled results can produce findings that are more sufficiently powered and minimally biased with an imputation of 20 datasets. The estimation method would not allow convergence when imputing at the item-level, so then I proceeded to conduct a another multiple imputation at the scale-level.

Thus, I repeated a fully conditional specification (MCMC) procedure, this time using the scale composite scores as the values to be imputed and the same auxiliary variables to inform the model. For the imputation, the maximum case draws was specified at 50 and the maximum parameter at 2. Again, I specified that 20 imputed data sets were created. This time, there was convergence at the scale-level; so I ran all analyses for the current study using data sets that were generated via scale-level—as opposed to item-level—imputation. Additionally, I used the listwise deletion approach and removed the 30 cases that had too much missingness on a primary variable from the sample and ran the analyses.