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This study develops and validates the Resistance by Perceived Injustice Scale (RPIS), which aims to capture attitudes of race and fairness in a way that explains resistance to organizational diversity policies and strategy. Through initial item generation and three studies, this scale is shown to be a reliable and valid measure which exhibits sufficient psychometric properties. Specifically, the RPIS is reduced to a final set of 22 items, captures distinct but interrelated dimensions, and is shown to be unique from existing related concepts. Finally, this scale is shown to predict support attitudes for many organizational diversity policies and strategies, and in some cases, explains variance in these attitudes beyond modern racism attitudes. This study not only adds to the diversity measurement literature by creating a scale more predictive of resistance than existing modern racism scales, but also helps explain how such modern prejudice manifests to express resistance.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There are numerous considerations to be made by both organizations and researchers regarding the shift in racial and ethnic demographics in the United States (Ortman & Guameri, 2009), as well as the workplace gradually reflecting these shifts (Christian, Porter, and Moffitt, 2006). A first consideration may acknowledge the increased role that diversity strategy will play in organizations (Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008). Such strategies may largely signify a greater attention to diversity and inclusion in organizations, but more specifically can include initiatives such as business resource groups, diversity training, multicultural celebrations, and conducting targeted recruitment, selection, and advancement approaches (e.g. Kaley, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006).

A related concern for organizations might include the presence of diversity resistance from employees. Thomas and Plaut (2008) define diversity resistance as “a range of practices and behaviors within ... organizations that interfere, intentionally or unintentionally, with the use of diversity as an opportunity for learning and effectiveness” (p.5). With increases in workplace demographic diversity, as well as organizational strategies fostering this growth, resistance is also likely to rise over the next several decades. Indicators of this concern already exist, such as workplace discrimination rates on the rise (e.g. Wooten & James, 2004). If organizations wish to avoid the many costs of diversity resistance (Watson & Hoffman, 1996; Thomas, Mack, & Montaglioni, 2004; Levine, 1998), they must address a daunting task of
proactively working to understand and mitigate such resistance patterns in a way that satisfies all employees.

For organizational researchers observing these shifts in the workforce, a final consideration and ongoing dilemma may be related to measurement. Although overt resistance can be captured through metrics such as employee discrimination claims, subtle resistance behaviors are more difficult to quantify. Self-report measures for some resistance behaviors exist (e.g. Hitlan & Noel, 2009; Bennett & Robinson, 2000), but there appear to be little to no self-report measures explaining resistance attitudes. Modern racism measures (e.g. Henry & Sears, 2002) exploring more implicit biases against groups offer one approach, but often fall short in a number of ways to meet McConahay’s (1986) still relevant calls to recognize the evolving nature of prejudice over time, and to shift our measures accordingly. If organizations are to understand and address resistance attitudes, researchers must improve their measurement instruments to better capture such perceptions.

The present study addresses several of these considerations with the development and validation of a new scale measure, the Resistance by Perceived Injustice Scale (RPIS). This scale proposes that individuals resist diversity today in a manner that justifies resistance through alleged unfairness of such strategies. Specifically, using Equity Theory as an explanatory mechanism, this study argues that a collection of attitudes help explain the extent to which employees will find specific diversity initiatives unfair, and thus resist their implementation in organizations. This study’s impact has potential for both diversity researchers searching for improved measurement approaches, as well as organizations hoping to understand the nature of employee diversity resistance.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW, HYPOTHESES & RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The Changing Nature of Race and Perceived Opportunity

United States demographics have shifted considerably over the past decades to produce a more diverse population (Ortman & Guarneri, 2009). Indeed, the 2010 Census finds that roughly 72% of Americans identify as White, 16% as Hispanic or Latino, and 13% as Black or African-American (www.census.gov). Although such shifts have not entirely translated to the workforce, organizations are employing a more diverse staff than ever, and these trends are only projected to increase (Christian, Porter, and Moffitt, 2006). While once considered a choice requiring bottom-line justifications (e.g. Diversity Inc., 2002), diversity in the workforce is now an inevitable factor that requires attention and understanding.

The extent of this attention is the subject of a wider debate in America. Specifically, many have pointed to these figures and their accompanying trends as reason to disregard the importance of race in society. Although long recognized as a socially constructed phenomenon (Cohen, 1998), race has largely been acknowledged to be associated with disparities in a number of areas, including education, police treatment, loan rates, and so on (e.g. Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Knowles, Persico, & Todd, 2001; Krueger, Rothstein, & Turner, 2006; Munnell, Tootell, Browne, & McEneany, 1996). Recently, however, the significance of race in society as a barrier to opportunity has been challenged, particularly in light of the election and reelection of President Barack Obama. Although he was simply one man, the fact that an
African American had ascended to the most powerful position in the nation certainly begged some debate regarding race relations and opportunity in America (e.g. Cho, 2009; Cooper, 2010; Onwauchi-Willig & Barnes, 2012). Although debate wavered in opinion, a popular interpretation of our current state of race in America emerged from such pundits as Morning in America’s Bill Bennett, who asserted that Blacks no longer have excuses for failures and unattained successes. Indisputably, the unprecedented election of the United States’ first Black president challenged many preconceived assumptions about race and access to opportunity. For many, it seemingly confirmed opinions that such issues have become irrelevant.

**Diversity Management and Ideologies**

*The Increasing Prevalence of Diversity Management*

Although a complete review of diversity management practices and strategies is beyond the scope of this study, it’s safe to say that the prevalence of research exploring such strategies has drastically increased in conjunction with the shifting workforce demographics. Stevens, Plaut, and Sanchez-Burks (2008) note that over 450 articles on “diversity in the workplace” have been published since 2000, and specific approaches to “diversity management” have become particularly relevant. Topics range from strategic initiatives such as hiring diversity consultants or executives with primarily diversity roles, to more specific practices such as offering diversity training, building focus groups, establishing business resource groups, facilitating multicultural celebrations, conducting targeted recruiting practices, or practicing affirmative action approaches in recruitment, selection, and advancement systems (Kaley, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006; Cross & Conklin, 2003; Thomas, 2004).

In addition to the more tangible practices that organizations might enact for diversity management, the overarching strategy and theoretical approaches toward diversity is a key
feature for consideration. Many of the mixed findings in research regarding the bottom-line effectiveness of diversity in organizations reflect the varied outcomes that may result from either effective or ineffective diversity management. Such strategy then aims to capitalize on diversity in an organization through effective management (e.g. Wright, Ferris, Hiller, & Kroll, 1995), while realizing that ineffectively managing this facet can actually lead to negative outcomes (e.g. Thomas & Ely, 1996; Richard, 2000). The nuances separating effective and ineffective management are complex and riddled with many false assumptions. One nuance organizations may consider is the focal group of diversity strategies, which has historically centered on minority employees (Shore, Chung-Herrera, Dean, Ehrhart, Jung, Randel, & Singh, 2009). Recently, diversity research has examined some of these nuances by considering dominant group reactions, and the complicating factors of negative outcomes for dominant group members. Some presumably inclusive diversity strategies have resulted in increased stereotyping (Wolko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbring, 2000), prejudice against beneficiaries of affirmative action (James, Brief, Dietz, & Cohen, 2001), and feelings of exclusion (Plaut, Sanchez-Burks, Buffardi, & Stevens, 2007) by majority group members. For both organizations and researchers, understanding the nature of diversity strategies which effectively manage diversity reflecting all employees has become a priority, while also a difficult task.

Multiculturalism / Colorblindness

Much of the debate of “how” to implement diversity strategies centers around the extent to which organizations commit to practices reflecting colorblind or multicultural ideologies. Although related, these two distinct approaches both commit to create workplaces which are inclusive and accommodating of all groups (Berry, 1984; Markus, Steele, & Steele, 2000; Plaut,
Although proclaiming similar goals, the two ideologies commit to very different assumptions to create such an environment.

The colorblind model embraces the “melting pot” metaphor from American rhetoric, thus asserting that we are all more similar than different. Furthermore, this approach presumes that emphasizing such differences will only result in greater schisms and conflict between groups. Assimilation is an implicit feature of colorblind workspaces, if not explicitly encouraged. In contrast, multiculturalism may be metaphorically seen as a mosaic. Although all individuals are distinctly different pieces, they can still assume a coherent picture. These differences are acknowledged and embraced in the workplace, and it is presumed that only by encouraging such differences can individuals feel comfortable in offering their unique contributions while maintaining their unique identities as employees (Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011).

**Ideology Support**

Support for colorblind and multicultural ideologies has been explored through research, and results generally show a split across racial/ethnic groups. For instance, the dominant group has been found to primarily embrace colorblindness (Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, & Chow, 2009), and largely adopt a belief that this is the ideal outlook for reducing inequity. Although some findings have revealed that there can be some support for colorblindness offered by minority group members as a means of reducing stigmatization (Purdie-Vagnns & Ditlmann, 2010), this ideology seems largely against the interests of minorities as a means to combat group inequity. Specifically, studies have revealed attitudes by minority group members that colorblindness serves as an excuse to avoid more deliberate diversity approaches which might address the sources of inequity. Colorblindness is thus seen to assume inequity largely doesn’t exist, and
treated everyone as the same will serve to maintain that status quo. This assumption serves as grounds to dismiss more active practices such as business resources groups and affirmative action policies to ensure all are treated equally, and tends to particularly serve as a popular solution in organizations with low diverse representation (Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby, 2008). Although not universally resisted, minority group members, on average, do not offer strong support for colorblindness. In contrast, dominant group members typically believe this is an ideal strategy to maintain equality.

Multiculturalism tends to draw more opposition from the dominant group. Over time, such opposition has seemingly grown, with academics (Michaels, 2006; Schmidt, 1997), historians (Schlesinger, 1992), and judges (Shaw v. Reno, 1995; Parents Involved v. Seattle, 2006) denouncing multiculturalism as an effective strategy for race relations in society. Opposition to multiculturalism often goes beyond assertions of ineffectiveness, and tends to accuse this approach of adverse effects on equality. This rhetoric has included a “fraud of inclusion” (Auster, 2004b, p. 197), as well as universal accommodation for others at the expense of within-group self-efficacy (West, 2005, p. 5). Empirical research observing attitudes toward multiculturalism reveals similar trends, with dominant group members offering less support than minorities (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995b; Plaut, 2002; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007; Wolsko et al., 2006). Although both are predominant theoretical approaches to diversity management proclaiming the same desired outcome, colorblindness and multiculturalism yield quite different interpretations and support, largely separated by racial/ethnic groups.

Ideology Outcomes

In addition to creating a split of opinions supporting the two ideologies, colorblindness and multiculturalism also tend to result in a wide range of different outcomes for organizations,
with regard to diversity and inclusion. Somewhat consistent with many suspicions of colorblindness, studies have found that this ideology can result in increased racial bias and discrimination for Whites (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Schofield, 2006), reduced empathy among counselors toward their minority clients (Burkard & Knox, 2004), and disparate treatment of students in schools (Apfelbaum, Pauker, Sommers, & Ambady, 2010; Schofield, 2006). Organizational studies in particular have found colorblindness to stunt the growth of employment status for minorities (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995a), decreased organizational effectiveness (Ely & Thomas, 2001), and reduced levels of engagement for minorities (Plaut et al., 2009).

On the other hand, multiculturalism has been found in research to increase employment status for minorities (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995a). At the organizational level, this alternative approach has been found to boost engagement (Plaut et al., 2009), creativity (Leung, Maddux, Galinsky, & Chiu, 2008), learning and effectiveness (Ely & Thomas, 2001), and intellectual and citizenship engagement (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). Perhaps most intriguing are the positive outcomes found for dominant group members when exposed to multicultural practices, including the reduction of racial bias (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004), more inclusive attitudes toward social policies (Wolsko et al., 2006), and a generally greater acceptance of others (Verkuyten, 2005; Vorauer, Gagnon, & Sasaki, 2009). Upon examination of this brief review of ideological outcomes, it would appear that multiculturalism would be a superior choice for diversity management strategies.

However, in the shifting context of increased diversity and greater access to opportunity, it’s important to also consider unintended negative outcomes of multiculturalism. Research certainly portrays multiculturalism as a superior choice to colorblindness, but to best develop a
diversity strategy, both researchers and organizations must acknowledge and attempt to understand the drawbacks of this approach. Although not universal, many of these negative outcomes seem to appear in the form of dominant group attitudes, including perceptions of exclusion (Plaut, Sanchez-Burks, Buffardi, & Stevens, 2007), increased stereotypical attitudes (Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbring, 2000), resentment (James, Brief, Dietz, & Cohen, 2001), and increased judgment of outgroup members (Cox, 1993). As expected, these attitudes can translate to behaviors that seriously impede the progress of diversity strategies, if not also directly impact the lives of other employees (Stevens, Plaut, Sanchez-Burks, 2008). These behaviors can not only stunt the growth of diversity initiatives, but may have negative impact on general organizational functioning as well (Brief, Umphress, Dietz, Burrows, Butz, & Scholten, 2005, Kalev et al., 2006; Mannix & Neale, 2006; Thomas, 2008). Thus, organizations and researchers must be determined to better understand not only the benefits of particular diversity ideologies, but also the unintended negative outcomes of these approaches, as well as strategies to mitigate such drawbacks.

Resistance to Diversity

Defining Resistance and Costs

Organizational diversity literature largely classifies these objecting attitudes as “resistance to diversity.” Thomas and Plaut (2008) provide an excellent overarching account of diversity resistance. They defined the phenomenon as “a range of practices and behaviors within and by organizations that interfere, intentionally or unintentionally, with the use of diversity as an opportunity for learning and effectiveness” (p. 5). As a framework to categorize these resistance behaviors, these authors suggest that resistance may occur at an individual or organizational level, while manifesting in subtle or overt manners. Individual resistance occurs
at the employee level, while organizational resistance can include systematically biased policies
or strategies, as well as organizational inaction toward employee complaints (Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). While overt resistance resembles the more traditional problematic workplace behaviors such as racist outbursts, remarks, and outward objection to diversity initiatives, subtle behaviors are more difficult to identify, including avoidance and distancing toward outgroup members, as well as apathy when observing overt behaviors (Thomas & Plaut, 2008).

Although intuition alone would suggest that diversity resistance is not conducive for organizational effectiveness, such costs are also well-documented. Overt individual or subtle organizational resistance can result in legal action. The costs of settlements and payoffs for these cases can be significant (Thomas & Davis, 2006), with figures amounting to as much as $100,000, with even greater costs should those lawsuits be lost (Thomas, Mack, & Montagliani, 2004; “what is this going to cost me?, 2002). Costs of these lawsuits extend beyond finances, with productivity, continuity, and emotional weight as collateral damage during legal action (Levine, 1998). Resistance can have impact at the individual-level of organizations as well. If resistance can be seen as a source of conflict between employees and other employees, or employees and organizational practices, it is worth recognizing that managers have been found to spend as much as 42% of their time resolving conflict (Watson & Hoffman, 1996). Minority employees may be especially susceptible to resistance, with exclusion, social distancing, barriers to advancement, and absenteeism as potential outcomes (Thomas, 2005). More distal, health-related costs for targets of resistance should also be acknowledged, such as stress, burnout, and lowered self-esteem (Blascovich, Spencer, Quinn, & Steele, 2001). If particular multicultural approaches are ultimately resulting in negative individual and organizational outcomes, as explained through diversity resistance, then understanding such resistance is more important than
ever. Organizations must tackle the difficult task of managing diversity to capture the positive outcomes of diversity and inclusion, while simultaneously mitigating the backlash of resistance.  

*Why Employees Resist*

To accomplish this goal, organizational researchers must develop a more nuanced understanding of the attitudes explaining diversity resistance. Why do some people feel uncomfortable with diversity initiatives while others do not? What can account for within-group differences in these attitudes, in addition to the documented between-demographic group differences supporting such ideologies? Qualitative and observational field studies documented by Thomas and Plaut (2008) offer a number of attitudinal explanations for resistance. Self-interest has always been suggested as a motivation for political affiliation and policy support (e.g. Katz, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956), and its reasoning could easily apply to resistance behaviors. This argument asserts that people tend to support (or oppose) particular policies based on how the policies will affect their own (or their group’s) circumstances. The circumstances are typically in reference to factors that affect individuals’ well-being, while simultaneously accounting for minimizing losses of such factors. Although typically applied to political affiliation in a society, this reasoning can apply to organizational settings, as long as the context includes limited resources and opportunities.

Thomas and Plaut (2008) go on to suggest that anxiety, discomfort, fear, and anger may ultimately guide resistance behaviors, with many of these motivations originally proposed through the organizational change literature. Organizational change researchers noted that attitudes of anxiousness and frustration due to a perceived lack of control helped explain the extent to which employees would resist organizational change (French & Bell, 1999). Change can signify a potential loss of power, resources, and influence, with such perceptions triggering
emotional responses of anger and sadness. Faced with these challenges to one’s self-control, resistance serves as a means to regain this control over a situation.

In some ways, a more simple explanation for diversity resistance may be explained by racial bias. Although our definition and framework of resistance acknowledges overt racial slurs and insults committed at the individual level, the authors realize that such acts are rare in an increasingly progressive society (Thomas & Plaut, 2008). But while racial bias might evaporate in explicit form, it likely still impacts everyday behaviors and attitudes in subtle manners. Indeed, implicit association tests (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998) reveal that even among individuals proclaiming egalitarian beliefs, racial bias still exists today at an unconscious, implicit level. These tests offer evidence for a level of prejudice which many researchers had suggested for some time: a new racism devoid of overt sentiments and objections to other races, while still maintaining negative attitudes justified by some other factor than race alone. Henry and Sears (2002) offer a helpful review of the evolution of this “new racism,” which label progresses from modern racism (McConahay, 1986) to symbolic racism (Sears, 1988) to racial resentment (Kinder & Sanders, 1996) over a few decades. Gaertner and Dovidio’s (1986) aversive racism theory further suggests that individuals look for nonracial terms or reasons to express bias. Although a full review of these attitudes is beyond the scope of this study, their shared sentiment is often assumed to be the source of many group differences we find in modern diversity research, and certainly could offer an explanation for diversity resistance behaviors. Although individuals may resist diversity initiatives and practices allegedly for other reasons, it must always be assumed that implicit bias could be guiding their attitudes as well.
Calls for Improved Measurement

As organizational researchers, we could ideally test these alternative explanations for resistance against each other to see which best predicts resistance behaviors and attitudes. However, the current state of measurement in diversity resistance involves several barriers to this process. To begin, many of the necessary measurement instruments to tackle these questions do not appear to exist. To this author’s knowledge, although there are self-report measures which capture general resistance and counterproductive work behaviors (e.g. Hitlan & Noel, 2009; Ferris, Brown, Berry, & Lian, 2008; Bennett & Robsinson, 2000), there are no existing scales attempting to measure the attitudes guiding diversity resistance. As mentioned above, there would likely not be any single scale that could capture these attitudes, as many explanations have been offered. Furthermore, any given combination of these attitudes would also likely be considered in conjunction with some level of deeper implicit prejudices.

In addition to many potential predictors of resistance behaviors lacking measurements, even those that do have existing scales may involve problems. Although scales attempting to capture various conceptions of modern racism are inherently tapping more subtle racial attitudes, many still discuss race in explicit language, while often referencing specific racial groups. For instance, Katz and Hass’ (1988) Racial Ambivalence and American Value Conflict Scale includes an entire dimension of “Anti-Black” attitudes, including items such as “Many Black teenagers don’t respect themselves or anyone else.” McConahay’s (1986) Modern Racism Scale attempts to capture more subtle attitudes against Blacks, but still includes items such as “Blacks are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights.” Finally, even more recent scale attempts at Modern Racism such as Henry and Sears’ Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale (2002) include language such as “… if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as
whites.” As some of the most recent examples of attempting to capture these modern racism attitudes, such examples are problematic in that they utilize language which many would perceive as offensive and socially undesirable in society today. As paper and pencil scale measures involve conscious response processes by participants, it’s unlikely that researchers would yield responses which truly capture the implicit bias of respondents in today’s society. As opposed to implicit association tests, scale measures are more often embraced for research purposes by organizations. However, with such controversial racial language, and particularly language directed toward a specific racial group (e.g. Blacks), it’s unlikely these scales would even be considered for administration in organizational settings.

Although each of the above scale examples offers much room for criticism, this pattern is not without each paper’s authors’ self-awareness. Nearly three decades ago, McConahay (1986) insightfully noted that researchers must acknowledge the evolving nature of racism when attempting to capture “modern racism.” As race is a social construct, its meaning is also socially constructed, and has shifted over time. McConahay and subsequent authors continuing this work have agreed that such scales must be constantly revised as the language and meaning of race changes. Although bias likely still exists in our society, evoking these attitudes from participants in a truthful and conscious manner will only become increasingly difficult. As Tatum articulated as long ago as 1999, there are few assertions worse in society today than being called a “racist,” and measures which use language that is associated with public perceptions of racism may become quickly outdated, or at least ineffective. If organizational researchers are to explore the attitudes predicting resistance to diversity with real workforce samples, the current measurement gap must be addressed and improved to account for these evolving challenges.
Alternative Approaches to Measurement

A model for a helpful alternative measurement approach is the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Brown, 2000). This scale attempts to capture the cognitive aspects of colorblind racial attitudes, and is thus more focused on participants’ understanding and conceptualization of race as a construct, as opposed to their evaluation of any particular racial group. An example item includes “everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.” For participants, it’s likely that such a focal shift away from specific racial groups could translate to more candid answers, further teasing out social desirability as a confound. Also encouraging is the fact that the dimensions of this scale actually overlap with some of the key mechanisms that allow modern racism to manifest, that being the denial of discrimination as a whole. Although not precisely overlapping with modern racism, this measure likely still captures essential elements, while avoiding threatening content that limits a measure’s predictive ability through range restriction. Finally, the authors of the CoBRAS note that the scale has the potential to effectively capture within-group differences by race. Although views concerning the cultural defects of a specific racial group will likely produce little within-group variance, the construct of race as a whole may carry a wide range of interpretations within-groups (Neville et al., 2000). Such an advantage falls in line with calls within diversity research to improve measurements to better capture mediating factors explaining group differences, as opposed to simply identifying such differences (Cox & Nkomo, 1990; Yee, Fairchild, Weizmann, & Wyatt, 1993). Simply put, researchers must develop tools to better understand diversity-related outcomes beyond racial categorization or dichotomization.
**Resistance by Perceived Injustice**

*A Case for Fairness Lens*

The present study argues that much of resistance to diversity can be explained through perceptions of the fairness of specific diversity initiatives. It’s largely anticipated that individuals will support or resist diversity policies and practices to the extent that they perceive them as fair or unfair, respectively. To test this assumption, this study develops and validates a measure capturing attitudes which would theoretically capture one’s fairness appraisal of diversity practices in organizations. The context surrounding such a measure falls well in line with two dominant appraisals of justice in the workplace, *distributive justice* and *procedural justice*. Distributive justice is an appraisal of the equity of outcomes or opportunities to which employees have access, while procedural justice is the appraisal of fairness in processes that determine such outcomes or opportunities (Colquitt, 2001). Through this contextual lens, the overarching fairness of diversity policies and practices may be seen as an evaluation and reconciliation of achieving a distributive justice of opportunity for all, but at the expense of some procedural injustice through preferential treatments. Fundamentally, organizational processes fostering equality may not seem fair to employees, and what employees see as fair treatment may not always result in an equality of opportunity for all groups. A measure capturing the nuances of fairness specifically applied to diversity ideologies in organizations would not only help organizations strategically reconcile distributive and procedural justice concerns, but may also help better understand the mechanisms behind diversity resistance attitudes.

To begin, the change management literature overlaps with the justice literature in ways that help explain resistance. Thomas and Plaut (2008) allude to change management as an overarching lens through which to compare diversity resistance. Diversity initiatives and
practices are often seen as organizational changes that can threaten employees’ status quo, as well as sense of control. Such threats may in turn evoke a sense of anxiety and fear. The change management literature notes that during organizational change, responses to perceived unfairness of a change become especially acute to employees (Cobb, Wooten, & Folger, 1995). In addition, Baron, Burton, and Hannan (1996) demonstrate that organizational change predicts a greater sensitivity among employees regarding fairness. These authors consistently find that procedural justice concerns appear to have greater importance during change than distributive justice concerns, which may explain why diversity-related changes signal a greater concern for employees. Other research notes that when such procedures are viewed as unfair during a change process, employees are likely to manifest responses driven by resentment (Cropanzano & Folger, 1989). For these reasons found at the intersection of change management and fairness literatures, justice is likely to be a relevant concern in the context of diversity resistance.

*Fairness as a Breached Value*

Much of the modern racist literature that has evolved over the past few decades has consistently discussed the utilization of American values to justify negative attitudes toward Blacks. Specifically, individuals are thought to value the equal treatment of Blacks, but ultimately still harbor negative sentiment due to a perceived breach of American value by this group (e.g. *symbolic racism*, Kinder & Sears, 1981). These values are often cited as The Protestant Work Ethic, the “American Dream,” and other beliefs that largely celebrate hard work, patience, and equal treatment. *Racial resentment* (Kinder & Sanders, 1996) largely was labeled accordingly to emphasize the importance of a breach of values, in addition to harbored prejudice, as a key factor, and *Racial ambivalence* (Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz, Wackenut, & Hass, 1986) specifically references values as the source of its “anti-black” dimension. *Aversive*
*Racism* as a theory contends that biased behaviors toward Blacks only occurs when such bias can be justified in non-racial terms, such as the breach of traditional values (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Dovidio, Mann & Gaertner, 1989). In the ongoing attempt to define and revise what we consider “modern racism,” the breach of traditional values has been a consistent theme.

If modern racism sentiments are assumed to be a relevant factor in understanding diversity resistance attitudes, the perceived fairness of diversity policies and practices fits well as an explanation. Fairness is a core traditional value for many societies, but equal treatment and opportunity are concepts ingrained in many Americans from a young age. Although many diversity practices are instituted to create more fair outcomes for all employees, the process through which they are executed tends to be preferential in nature. Although implicit bias may play a role in diversity resistance, many employees would likely need to perceive other factors that are non-racial to enable their opposition. Resistance to diversity through perceived injustice is a likely factor in these attitudes and behaviors, as a breach of fairness as a core value could trigger resentment toward diversity practices.

**Resistance by Perceived Unfairness Factors**

*Perceptions of Equal Opportunity*

Although diversity policies and practices may appear to be preferential in nature, many exist to correct previous systemic and overt practices against minorities. Proponents of more active diversity strategies argue that such historical practices largely created a modern context where distributive justice of opportunity does not exist. Following this logic, it has been assumed that minorities on average have not been afforded the same career opportunities, both through selection and advancement, that the dominant group has enjoyed. However, it appears these assumptions are shifting. A particularly telling study regarding these attitudes
demonstrated that on average, Whites now believe that racism is a slightly greater issue for the dominant group in today’s society than it is for Black Americans (Norton & Sommers, 2011). These perceptions do not appear to be a sudden outlier of appraisal, but rather the culmination of perceptions of bias against Whites and Blacks converging over time. Specifically, as these attitudes have been tracked over decades, participants consistently perceived discrimination against Blacks decreasing, and discrimination against Whites increasing. Such trends illustrate that although society has historically assumed minorities experienced more hardships than the dominant group, these views are shifting and reaching a point where many assume such experiences are becoming equal.

A related and increasingly prevalent phenomenon which has emerged in the past few decades has been the notion that specific practices in society have resulted in racism towards the dominant group, or “reverse racism.” Although a far earlier example of such sentiment is documented in Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 1978, Supreme Court cases in recent years have reinvigorated this new direction of prejudice (e.g. Gratz v. Bollinger, 2003; Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003; Ricci v. DeStefano, 2009; Fisher v. University of Texas, 2013). Academics have explored this attitude as well, identifying perceived exclusion by Whites (Plaut et al., 2011), as well as perceptions of discrimination against Whites (Norton & Sommers, 2011). In conjunction with increasing diversity in population demographics and the workforce, these attitudinal trends document a perception that both opportunity and hardships are becoming more even across racial/ethnic groups. When considering the fairness appraisals of diversity strategies, this is a critical perception that should be considered in a scale tapping this construct.
Fairness of Colorblindness vs. Multiculturalism

Perhaps related to shifting societal views on the equity of opportunity and hardship, colorblindness has increasingly been adopted as a normative assumption among many dominant group members. This ideology has permeated legal debate (Duncan, 2000; Norton, Sommers, Vandello, & Darley, 2006), educational initiatives (Pollock, 2004; Sue, 2004), and general ideological beliefs (Firebaugh & Davis, 1998; Plaut, 2002). This adoption may be for several reasons. First, colorblindness has been shown as a strategy to avoid public perception of racial bias (Apfelbaum, Sommers, and Norton, 2008). In this sense, minimizing acknowledged differences and encouraging an assimilationist approach signals a deliberate attempt to treat everyone equally. Colorblindness operates on a premise that discrimination is a phenomenon of the past (Neville et al., 2000), thus reinforcing an assimilationist approach as a means to create equal opportunity for all. By this logic, multicultural approaches may seem particularly unnecessary and unfair. Although many of these efforts are actually intended to foster a more inclusive workplace for minority group members (e.g. Cox, 1993; Morrison, 1992), this ideology’s foundation rests on observing employee differences, which many may find counterproductive toward treating people equally. The perceived fairness of each diversity ideology would likely be important factors to consider when predicting resistance, as many diversity practices represent a specific commitment to multiculturalism at the expense of a colorblind approach.

Equity Theory

The perceived equity of opportunity in society, in conjunction with the perceived fairness of colorblindness and multiculturalism, likely captures an overarching appraisal of justice for many diversity strategies and practices. However, this does not fully explain why such attitudes
would translate to behavioral resistance, as well as general opposition to these strategies.

Adams’ (1963, 1965) Equity Theory includes aspects from dissonance, social comparison, and exchange theories to help predict relationship patterns between individuals concerning perceived allocations of resources. The theory holds four propositions: (a) individuals continuously evaluate their relationships with others by appraising the ratio of their outcomes from and inputs to the relationship against the outcome/input ratio of comparison others, (b) inequity exists when such outcome/input ratios between the individual and comparison others are perceived as unequal, (c) greater inequity leads an individual to greater distress, and (d) greater distress felt by an individual will lead to a variety of actions intended to restore equity, such as altering or cognitively distorting outcomes and inputs, acting on the comparison other, or terminating this relationship completely (Adams, 1963, 1965).

Although Equity Theory has traditionally been conceptualized through an individual lens, Ng (1981) recognized the possibility of equity theory applying to group settings. Although ingroup favoritism by a particular individual would seemingly be against the propositions of this theory, this author demonstrates the potential for favoritism to exist in an effort to correct expected patterns of inequity due to behaviors of another party. Specifically, those who are aware they do not have total control of the allocation of resources demonstrated ingroup favoritism toward their own group, presumably as an effort to maintain intergroup equity in expectation that another party would favor the other group. In this sense, equity theory still serves to explain individual behaviors in the context of groups when control is at least partially held by an external party, and when expectations exist for discriminatory conduct by this party.

Considering the propositions of Equity Theory and its potential for group-based application, this study contends that fairness appraisals of diversity practices will predict
resistance behaviors and attitudes. As group-level input/output ratios are appraised between dominant groups and minority groups in organizations, perceived discrepancies between those ratios likely produce distress. To the extent that individuals perceive equity of opportunity across groups in society, diversity and inclusion practices which appear to inflate the outputs of particular groups over others may threaten the equity of such ratios. In spite of objective metrics suggesting that minority groups remain lacking in many areas of compensation and opportunity in organizations, general perceptions of a growing equity between such groups (e.g. Norton & Sommers, 2011) would then create distress when organizations implement multicultural policies that seem to create preferential treatment for such groups. As this distress grows, resistance to diversity may serve as actions to restore equity, or terminate relationships with the sources of this inequity.

**Study Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to add to the growing literature on diversity resistance in organizations by (a) constructing the Resistance by Perceived Injustice Scale (RPIS) to assess key attitudes behind resistance, (b) providing initial validation and psychometric assessment of the RPIS, and (c) testing the RPIS’ predictive ability to both behavioral and attitudinal diversity resistance. It’s important to acknowledge that the RPIS is not a continuance of modern racism scales, but rather a suggested alternative to capture superior variance when predicting resistance to diversity. As even modern racism becomes increasingly difficult to capture through non-experimental measures, it’s important that scales such as these are developed in order to understand resistance attitudes as they are perceived by employees.

A construct validation of the RPIS scale should address several psychometric “threats” to a newly proposed scale. After initial item generation, a preliminary analysis was conducted to
remove items which threatened content validity. In the first study of this construct validation, initial tests of the factor structure were conducted, as well as initial reliability estimates. In the second study, additional tests of factor structure confirmed the first tests’ dimensions with a separate sample of participants, as well as reliability estimates with the existing RPIS items. With this same sample, the existing items of the RPIS were also tested for convergent and discriminant validity. Kerlinger and Lee (2000) describe convergent validity as the extent to which a measure is highly correlated with other measures of the construct. Should no other existing scales of this construct exist, another test of convergent validity is to examine a measure’s correlation with multiple other measures of related constructs. If correlations with each of these other measures are relatively consistent, the scale’s convergent validity is assumed.

“Belief in a just world” has been a popular construct in Psychology for decades. It aims to measure the extent to which individuals adopt a just worldview. Simply put, “do people get what they deserve?” Given the RPIS’ emphasis on perceived equity of opportunity, as well as desire to treat individuals without regard to differences as a means to achieve justice, Belief in a Just World would likely be a related construct. Those who assume the world affords equal opportunities and treating people as if they are similar should see the world as an inherently just place. Assuming construct validity for the RPIS, this study proposes that it will correlate significantly, moderately, and positively at similar levels with three Belief in a Just World scales (Lipkus, 1991; Furnham & Procter, 1988; Rubin & Peplau, 1975).

_Hypothesis 1: The RPIS will correlate at a significant, similarly moderate level with three unique scales measuring Belief in a Just World._
Kerlinger and Lee (2000) describe discriminant validity as the extent to which a scale does not overlap with theoretically similar measures. In order to explore discriminant validity, this study will explore the relationships between the RPIS and several constructs and attitudes which could threaten overlap. Katz and Hass’ (1988) Humanitarian-Egalitarian Scale measures the extent to which individuals believe in humanitarian efforts, or providing for those who are in need, with higher scores indicating greater humanitarian beliefs. Given the RPIS’ emphasis on operating in fair world, as well as reinforcing this fairness through equal acknowledgement and treatment, it’s important to ensure that such a scale is simply not the opposite of humanitarian attitudes. To confirm such discriminant validity, this study proposes that the RPIS will correlate in a significant and moderate, negative direction with the Humanitarian-Egalitarian Scale.

*Hypothesis 2a: The RPIS will correlate in a moderate and significant, negative direction with the Humanitarian-Egalitarian Scale.*

Political views aligned with American political ideologies often guide individuals’ beliefs concerning assistance programs for those in need. Much of these views are dictated by assumptions of what is fair for all those involved, as well as the state of need for those lacking opportunity. Consistent with recent modern racism scales (e.g. Henry & Sears, 2002), the relationships between the RPIS and both political ideology and political party identification will be explored to ensure they are distinct. To further confirm discriminant validity, this study proposes that the RPIS will correlate at significant and moderate positive levels with political ideology and political party affiliation.
Hypothesis 2b: The RPIS will correlate in a moderate and significant, positive direction with the Political Ideology Measure.

Hypothesis 2c: The RPIS will correlate in a moderate and significant, positive direction with the Political Party Measure.

A major premise of this study is that the RPIS is less susceptible to social desirability than existing attitudinal measures which could explain diversity resistance. As we continue to move toward a more progressive society that does not tolerate racism, conscious paper and pencil measures capturing attitudes regarding race are particularly vulnerable to socially desirable response patterns. Thus, it’s imperative to demonstrate discriminant validity with a measure of social desirability (Reynolds, 1982). This study proposes that the RPIS will not correlate with this measure of social desirability.

Hypothesis 2d: The RPIS will reveal a weak and negative correlation with social desirability.

Finally, it’s important to explore whether the RPIS is simply reflecting a general desire to maintain existing hierarchical structures of power in society. The RPIS is intended to capture logical thought patterns appraising fairness tactics in organizations, and should not be overlapping with a general preference for the existence of social dominance in society. Social dominance measures (e.g. Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, Malle, 1994) specifically aim to capture the extent to which individuals embrace the notion of inequity among social groups in society.
To complete testing of discriminant validity, this study proposes that the RPIS will significantly correlate in a moderate, positive direction with social dominance orientation.

*Hypothesis 2d: The RPIS will correlate in a moderate and significant, positive direction with social dominance orientation.*

The third study will explore criterion-related validity by testing how the RPIS is related to subtle behavioral examples of diversity resistance, as well as general support or resistance for diversity practices. A central argument for this study’s purpose is the RPIS’ predictive ability above and beyond modern racism measures in today’s society. Specifically, this study proposes that the RPIS will contribute significant additional variance explaining diversity resistance beyond the Henry & Sears’ (2002) Modern Racism 2000 scale. Regarding this criterion-related validity, this study proposes the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 3a: The RPIS will predict ostracism behaviors toward outgroup coworkers in a positive and significant direction, after controlling for modern racism attitudes.*

*Hypothesis 3b: The RPIS will predict coworker-directed deviance toward outgroup coworkers in a positive and significant direction, after controlling for modern racism attitudes.*
Hypothesis 4a: The RPIS will predict support for multicultural celebrations by organizations in a negative and significant direction, after controlling for modern racism attitudes.

Hypothesis 4b: The RPIS will predict support for business resource groups for minorities in organizations in a negative and significant direction, after controlling for modern racism attitudes.

Hypothesis 4c: The RPIS will predict support for diversity training in organizations in a negative and significant direction, after controlling for modern racism attitudes.

Hypothesis 4d: The RPIS will predict support for targeted recruiting efforts toward minorities by organizations in a negative and significant direction, after controlling for modern racism attitudes.

Hypothesis 4e: The RPIS will predict support for mentoring programs for minorities toward minorities by organizations in a negative and significant direction, after controlling for modern racism attitudes.

Hypothesis 4f: The RPIS will predict support for targeted hiring efforts benefitting minorities by organizations in a negative and significant direction, after controlling for modern racism attitudes.
Hypothesis 4g: The RPIS will predict support for targeted advancement efforts benefiting minorities by organizations in a negative and significant direction, after controlling for modern racism attitudes.

Consistent with Aversive Racism theories (e.g. Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986), this study also intends to test whether modern racism attitudes are truly predicting resistance behaviors and general support, as explained through RPIS attitudes. Specifically, it was proposed that RPIS attitudes afford individuals non-racial terms through which to manifest their resistance, with RPIS attitudes mediating the relationship between modern racist attitudes and resistance behaviors and general support.

Hypothesis 5a: The RPIS will mediate the relationship between modern racism and ostracism behaviors toward outgroup coworkers.

Hypothesis 5b: The RPIS will mediate the relationship between modern racism and coworker-directed deviance toward outgroup coworkers.

Hypothesis 6a: The RPIS will mediate the relationship between modern racism and support for multicultural celebrations by organizations.

Hypothesis 6b: The RPIS will mediate the relationship between modern racism and support for business resource groups for minorities in organizations.
Hypothesis 6c: The RPIS will mediate the relationship between modern racism and support for diversity training in organizations.

Hypothesis 6d: The RPIS will mediate the relationship between modern racism and support for targeted recruiting efforts toward minorities by organizations.

Hypothesis 6e: The RPIS will mediate the relationship between modern racism and support for mentoring programs for minorities toward minorities by organizations.

Hypothesis 6f: The RPIS will mediate the relationship between modern racism and support for targeted hiring efforts benefitting minorities by organizations.

Hypothesis 6g: The RPIS will mediate the relationship between modern racism and support for targeted advancement efforts benefitting minorities by organizations.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

General Method & Dimensions

Initial Item Generation

Initial items for the RPIS were generated by the author, with helpful input and feedback provided by a leading diversity scholar, as well as graduate student members of a diversity research lab at a large Southeastern University. These items were written according to existing definitions and colorblindness and multiculturalism in the literature, as well as language articulating one of the consistent facets of modern racism, the denial of racial discrimination as a significant factor in society for any particular group. Further assisting this process were many existing modern racism and colorblindness scales offering specific language examples (e.g. Henry & Sears, 2002; Neville et al., 2000; Katz & Hass, 1988; Swim, Akin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995).

Given the aforementioned themes considered in the literature review, items were written to capture three proposed dimensions: Equity of Opportunity (EOO), Fairness of Colorblindness (FOC), and Injustice of Multiculturalism (IJM). These three theoretically-related dimensions should combine to summarize an individual’s fairness appraisal of an organization’s diversity strategies. The first dimension, “Equity of Opportunity,” includes items that capture a sentiment in line with some modern racism scales and current empirical findings, specifically that racial/ethnic exposures to opportunity and hardship have become equal (i.e. Bobo, Kluegel, &
Smith, 1997; Henry & Sears, 2002; Norton & Sommers, 2011). The second dimension, “Fairness of Colorblindness,” includes items measuring one’s appraisal of colorblindness as a fair approach to diversity, an increasingly common finding across many contexts (Pollack, 2004; Sue, 2004; Duncan, 2000; Norton, Sommers, Vandello, & Darley, 2006; Plaut, 2002). Finally, the third dimension, “Injustice of Multiculturalism,” contains items which capture participants’ appraisal of facets of multiculturalism as particularly unfair. Specifically, these items measure the extent to which certain practices that acknowledge group membership and differences are seen as problematic. These three dimensions capture not only the context of perceived opportunity in society, but also specific fairness appraisals of the two dominant diversity ideology approaches. In conjunction, they likely will denote individuals’ overall fairness appraisals of diversity practices in organizations. After initial item generation, the RPIS had 28 items total, with 9 EOO items, 10 FOC items, and 9 IJM items.

Content Validity

Kerlinger and Lee (2000) define content validity as “… the representativeness or sampling adequacy of the content -- the substance, the matter, the topic -- of a measuring instrument” (p. 667). Largely, content validity addresses the extent to which the RPIS measures the concepts it claims to measure. To answer this question, an initial content analysis exercise was performed using 38 student participants, including both undergraduate and graduate students of research labs at a large Southeastern university. As noted in Schriesheim et al. (1993), the requirements to complete a content validity task are sufficient intellectual ability to rate the correspondence of items and definitions of various constructs, as well as the lack of biases. Thus, college students were a sufficient sample for this initial procedure. Based on methods recommended by Hinkin and Tracy (1999), each participant rated the extent to which each RPIS
item was a strong match to each dimension. This analysis of variance procedure is found to provide a higher degree of confidence in determining item integrity and scale content validity than other content validity measures (e.g. Anderson & Gerbing, 1991; Schriesheim, Powers, Scandura, Gardiner, & Lankau, 1993), as well as effective when used with even small sample sizes (Hinkin & Tracy, 1999).

Using results from one-way ANOVAs with Duncan’s multiple comparison tests, each item’s mean rating on one intended dimension is compared to the item’s rating on the other two dimensions. In this manner, it can be determined whether this mean rating is significantly higher on the intended content than other content for each item. Items which do not yield ratings higher on the intended dimension than the other dimensions are recommended for deletion (Hinkin & Tracy, 1999). Results for this procedure can be found in Table 1. In total, 6 items did not meet the above criteria, and were thus deleted. The remaining RPIS scale items totaled 22, with 8 EOO items, 8 FOC items, and 6 IJM items. The remaining RPIS scale items can be found in Table 2.

**Study 1: Factor Structure and Initial Reliability Estimates**

*Participants & Procedure*

Participants were 233 undergraduate students from a large Southeastern university. These students were recruited from classes requiring research participation for credit, and were notified of the study through an online portal which organizes student participation in IRB-approved studies. After agreeing to a consent form, participants completed the 22-item version of the RPIS, with each item measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*). RPIS items were slightly reworded to be in referent to “universities,” as
opposed to organizations, and “students,” as opposed to employees. In exchange for agreeing to participate, students received credit toward their required research participation grade.

Measures

The only measures administered in the first study were the remaining 22 items of the RPIS from the content validity exercise. The alpha coefficients for the three dimensions and the total score were found to be acceptable; .88, .89, .83, and .91, respectively.

Study 2: Factor Analysis, Validity, and Additional Reliability Estimates

Participants & Procedure

Participants were 253 undergraduate students from a large Southeastern university who were not participants in the first study. These students were recruited from classes requiring research participation for credit, and were notified of the study through an online portal which organizes student participation in IRB-approved studies. After agreeing to a consent form, participants completed the 22-item Academia-focused version of the RPIS, as well as several other measures to explore convergent and discriminant validity. Each RPIS item was measured on a 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree). In exchange for agreeing to participate, students received credit toward their required research participation grade.

Validity Measures

Convergent validity for the RPIS was explored using three Belief in a Just World Scales. The Global Belief in a Just World Scale (GBJWS) (Lipkus, 1991) measures the extent to which individuals believe the world is a just place. These 7 items ($\alpha = .83$) were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ($1 = strongly disagree$ to $5 = strongly agree$; e.g., “I feel that people get what they are entitled to have”). The Multidimensional Belief in a Just World Scale (MBJW) (Furnham & Proctor, 1988) measure several dimensions of beliefs in a just world, such as interpersonal
justice, socio-political justice, and cynicism/fatalism. This study only utilized the 10 socio-political justice items (α = .41), as these items best fit the present content of race and opportunity. These items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree; e.g., “It is rare for an innocent man to be wrongly sent to jail”). Finally, Rubin and Peplau’s (1975) Belief in a Just World Scale (BJW) also measures the extent to which individuals believe the world is a just place. These 20 items (α = .67) were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, e.g., “By and large, people deserve what they get”). Discriminant validity was examined using five measures. The Humanitarian-Egalitarian Scale (HES) (Katz & Hass, 1988) was developed as a facet of these same authors’ Racial Ambivalence Scale, and largely captures participants’ humanitarian or egalitarian outlook, with higher scores indicating greater humanitarian beliefs. These 10 items (α = .87) were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, e.g., “A person should be concerned about the well-being of others”). To assess political ideology and political party affiliation, two 1-item scales were used. Participants were asked to select their political ideology, featuring a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strong liberal to 5 = strong conservative), and were asked to select their political party identification, featuring a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strong democrat to 5 = strong republican). Social desirability (SD) (Reynolds, 1982) is a scale commonly used to assess the impact of social desirability on response patterns in other self-report measures. These 13 items (α = .72) were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, e.g., “There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone”). Finally, Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, Malle, 1994) intends to measure one’s degree of preference for inequality among social groups. These 16 items (α = .91) were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly
disagree to 5 = strongly agree, e.g., “To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups”).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>Equity of Opportunity</th>
<th>Fairness of Colorblindness</th>
<th>Injustice of Multiculturalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOO1</td>
<td>3.82*</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO2</td>
<td>4.39*</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO3</td>
<td>4.13*</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO4</td>
<td>4.37*</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO5</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO6</td>
<td>4.08*</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO7</td>
<td>3.71*</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO8</td>
<td>4.32*</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO9</td>
<td>3.82*</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.55*</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC2</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC3</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.97*</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC4</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.89*</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC5</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.79*</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC6</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC7</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.32*</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC8</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.18*</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC9</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.08*</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC10</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.92*</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM1</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM2</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM3</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM5</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM6</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM7</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM8</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM9</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold* items were rated significantly higher on intended dimension than other offered dimensions. Item labels correspond to their intended dimension. EOO = Equity of Opportunity; FOC = Fairness of Colorblindness; IJM = Injustice of Multiculturalism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Label</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EOO1</strong></td>
<td>We now live in a post-racial society where race/ethnicity simply does not matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EOO2</strong></td>
<td>All races/ethnicities have an equal chance to succeed in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EOO3</strong></td>
<td>Every race/ethnicity now experiences prejudice to the same degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EOO4</strong></td>
<td>No matter your race/ethnicity, you have an equal chance to make it in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EOO5</strong></td>
<td>There is not any particular race/ethnicity of people that has it harder than others today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EOO6</strong></td>
<td>People don’t really treat others differently because of their race or ethnicity today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EOO7</strong></td>
<td>Today, we all have a similar chance of being offered a job, regardless of race/ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EOO8</strong></td>
<td>In our society, you are not judged by your race/ethnicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equity of Opportunity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Label</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOC1</strong></td>
<td>If we ignore race/ethnicity in the workplace, we will create the most fair experience for all employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOC2</strong></td>
<td>Our society will begin treating people equally when we stop talking about race/ethnicity in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOC3</strong></td>
<td>It’s most fair in the workplace to see all employees as more similar than different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOC4</strong></td>
<td>Employees will best experience justice in the workplace when they are not seen as members of racial/ethnic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOC5</strong></td>
<td>Workplaces will achieve justice when we solely focus on individual accomplishments and qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOC6</strong></td>
<td>Things are most fair when our organization views our employees as one unified group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOC7</strong></td>
<td>If we are all only seen as employees of this organization, no employee will experience discriminatory treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOC8</strong></td>
<td>If people at my work don’t acknowledge my race/ethnicity, I’m more likely to be treated fairly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fairness of Colorblindness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Label</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IJM1</strong></td>
<td>It's unfair for organizations to implement special practices for employees based on race/ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IJM2</strong></td>
<td>Employees receive too much attention in the workplace simply due to their race/ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IJM3</strong></td>
<td>Specific programs that focus on race/ethnicity in the workplace are inherently unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IJM4</strong></td>
<td>It’s unfair for structures in the workplace to consider employees' race/ethnicity when implementing strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IJM5</strong></td>
<td>When certain races/ethnicities are given special treatment in the workplace, other groups will automatically be disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IJM6</strong></td>
<td>Things have gone too far when we provide specific practices for employees based on their race/ethnicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study 3: Criterion Validity and Mediation

Participants & Procedure

Participants were 113 working professionals who were at least 18 years in age, working full-time, and interacting with coworkers as part of their job role. Descriptive statistics for this sample, including age, race/ethnicity, sex, and others, can be found in Table 3. These employees were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), an online system which allows data requesters to compensate data providers for their survey responses. Participants were notified of the study through the online MTurk portal, which organizes participation for IRB-approved studies. After agreeing to a consent form, participants completed the 22-item version of the RPIS, as well as several other measures to explore criterion validity interests, such as behavioral resistance toward outgroup members, as well as support for diversity practices. Participants were also asked to complete a modern racism measure. Each RPIS item was measured on a 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree). Employees who fulfilled their commitment to completing the survey were compensated with $1.00.

Measures

In addition to the 22 RPIS items, participants were asked to respond to several measures of resistance outcomes, as well as a modern racism scale. The Workplace Ostracism Scale (WPO) (Ferris et al., 2008) measures the extent to which employees perceive ostracism from their coworkers. For this study, referent points of each item were reworded to explore the extent to which employees commit these behaviors against their coworkers. Specifically, employees were asked the extent to which they commit such behaviors against outgroup coworkers, which were described to be “coworkers perceived to be of different races/ethnicities than yourself.” These 10 items (α = .96) were measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Never to 7 = Always, e.g.,
“I leave areas at work when outgroup members enter”). The Workplace Deviance Scale (WPD) (Bennett & Robinson, 2000) measures the extent to which employees commit overtly deviant verbal remarks toward coworkers. Similar to this study’s application of the WPO scale, the referent points in each item were worded so that coworkers were specifically defined as outgroup coworkers, and these coworkers were specified with the same definition provided above. These 7 items ($\alpha = .88$) were measured on a 7-point Likert scale ($1 = \text{Never}$ to $7 = \text{Daily}$, e.g., “I’ve played a mean prank on an outgroup member at work”). The Modern Racism 2000 Scale (MRS) (Henry & Sears, 2002) serves as a recent example of a modern racism scale which might be used to predict diversity resistance behaviors. Similar to other modern racism approaches, this scale captures dimensions of prejudice denial, as well as assumptions that Blacks are violating core American values. This scale utilized 8 items in total ($\alpha = .91$), with 5 items measured on a 5-point Likert scale ($1 = \text{Strongly disagree}$ to $5 = \text{Strongly agree}$, e.g., “Over the past few years, blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve”). One item inquiring about Blacks’ responsibility in creating racial tension utilized a unique 5-point Likert scale ($1 = \text{Not much at all}$ to $5 = \text{All of it}$). Another item inquiring about how fast Blacks leaders are pushing utilized a unique 5-point Likert scale ($1 = \text{Going too slowly}$ to $5 = \text{Trying to push too fast}$). The final item exploring the amount of discrimination existing against Blacks today also utilized a unique 5-point Likert scale ($1 = \text{A lot}$ to $5 = \text{None at all}$). Participants were also asked to respond to a series of 1-item statements offering support for a variety of common diversity practices by organizations, with each item measured on a 5-point Likert scale ($1 = \text{Strongly disagree}$ to $5 = \text{Strongly agree}$, e.g. “I would be willing to lend my support toward diversity training classes offered by my organization”). These statements addressed practices including multicultural celebrations, business resource groups for minorities, diversity training, targeted recruiting
efforts for minority job applicants, mentoring programs for minority employees, targeted hiring efforts of minority job applicants, and targeted advancement efforts for minority employees. The alpha coefficients for the three RPIS dimension measures, and the total RPIS measure were found to be acceptable; .93, .89, .94, and .94, respectively.
Table 3

*Study Three: Descriptive Statistics (N = 113)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Average Age: 37.95 years. Minimum Age: 22 years. Maximum Age: 68 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Race / Ethnicity** | 2.7% Latino/Hispanic  
|                   | 0.9% Native American  
|                   | 2.7% Multiracial  
|                   | 78.4% White/Caucasian  
|                   | 8.1% Asian/Pacific Islander  
|                   | 5.4% Black/African American  
|                   | 1.8% Other               |
| **Sex**           | 57.8% Male  
|                  | 42.2% Female             |
| **Marital Status** | 33.6% Single  
|                  | 18.2% In a relationship, but not married  
|                  | 40.9% Married  
|                  | 5.5% Divorced  
|                  | 1.8% Widowed             |
| **Sexual Orientation** | 4.5% Bisexual  
|                    | 92.7% Heterosexual       
|                    | 2.7% Homosexual          |
| **Highest Degree** | 6.3% High School Diploma  
|                    | 22.5% Some College (1 year to less than 2 years)  
|                    | 12.6% Two-Year College Degree (A.A.)  
|                    | 49.5% Four-Year College Degree (B.A. or B.S.)  
|                    | 9% MA/PhD, MD, MBA, Law degree |
| **Parent’s Degree** | 1.8% Some high school or less  
|                    | 23.4% High School Diploma  
|                    | 9.9% Some College (1 year to less than 2 years)  
|                    | 13.5% Two-Year College Degree (A.A.)  
|                    | 36.9% Four-Year College Degree (B.A. or B.S.)  
|                    | 14.4% MA/PhD, MD, MBA, Law Degree |
| **Industry**      | 2.8% Consumer Products  
|                    | 7.3% Entertainment and Leisure  
|                    | 10.1% Financial Services  
|                    | 16.5% Health Care  
|                    | 5.5% Manufacturing  
|                    | 16.5% Retail and Wholesale  
|                    | 13.8% Technology  
|                    | 2.8% Transportation  
|                    | 24.8% Other             |
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Study 1: Factor Structure and Initial Reliability Estimates

Exploratory Factor Analysis

A principal-components analysis was performed on the 22 items of the preliminary RPIS. Three factors met the Kaiser retention criterion (1958) of eigenvalues greater than 1.00, accounting for 56% of the variance. An examination of the scree plot suggested as many as 3 components were interpretable. To further confirm a three factor solution, a parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) was conducted. This approach uses information from random samples based on the same sample size and number of variables of the data to generate eigenvalues for comparison. Eigenvalues from the data’s extraction which are greater than the randomly generated eigenvalues should be retained as a guide for factor structure (Horn, 1965). Once again, three components were supported as these factors’ eigenvalues were greater than those randomly generated. Given the aforementioned theoretical reasoning from the literature, the three expected dimensions should be correlated. As a result, a direct oblimin rotation was utilized, revealing strong factor loadings for the three-factor solution. All 22 RPIS items were retained as each item loaded above .40 on only one of the three factors (See Table 4). The first factor accounted for 35% of the variance and consisted of six items (eigenvalue = 7.675). These items were the Injustice of Multiculturalism items, as intended. The second factor accounted for an additional 14% of the variance and consisted of eight items (eigenvalue = 3.062). These items were the
Equity of Opportunity items, as intended. Finally, the third factor accounted for an additional 7% of the variance and consisted of eight items (eigenvalues = 1.566). These items were the Fairness of Colorblindness items, as intended. Descriptive statistics for each dimension of the RPIS, as well as total RPIS scores across studies, can be found in Table 5.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO1</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO2</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO3</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>-.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO4</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO5</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO6</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>-.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO7</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO8</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC1</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC2</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC3</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC4</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC5</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC6</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC7</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC8</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM1</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM2</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM3</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM4</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM5</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM6</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No items have been reverse scored. Unique factor loadings > .40 are in bold. Analysis is based on 233 observations. Item labels correspond to their intended dimension. EOO = Equity of Opportunity; FOC = Fairness of Colorblindness; IJM = Injustice of Multiculturalism.
Study 2: Factor Analysis, Validity, and Additional Reliability Estimates

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Given the components and remaining items suggested from the first study’s principal components analysis, a major purpose of Study 2 was to confirm this factor structure with an additional sample. Using the statistical software MPlus, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with robust maximum likelihood estimation was conducted on the 22-item RPIS scale. The EOO dimension specified as 8 items, the 8 FOC dimension specified as 8 items, and the IJM dimension specified as 6 items, given factor loadings from the previous study. The three dimensions of the scale were correlated in the model, given theoretical reasoning behind the scale construction, as well as observed correlations between the dimensions as retained by the first study. In order to examine the model structure, a number of fit statistics were observed, including a chi-square statistic, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), comparative fit index (CFI), and a Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI). Across these indices, the three-dimension structure of the RPIS scale with the aforementioned item categorizations appears to produce a good model fit. Particularly strong evidence for this fit was found in the RMSEA (.074), which is recommended to be below .08, the SRMR (.062), which is recommended to be below .08, the CFI (.901), which is recommended to be greater than .90. Although the TLI is recommended to be greater than .90, its value still suggested a good fit (.889) (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The phi matrix exploring relationships between the three specified factors of the scale appeared to confirm expectations of these dimensions’ relationships with each other. Significant relationships between these three factors were found, ranging from .142 to .460. Given these findings, the proposed 22-item version of
the RPIS, with EOO, FOC, and IJM dimensions, appears to demonstrate a good factor structure.

Confirmatory factor analysis results can be found in Table 6.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Study 1 (N = 233)</th>
<th>Study 2 (N = 253)</th>
<th>Study 3 (N = 113)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO1</td>
<td>2.11 1.04</td>
<td>2.04 .92</td>
<td>2.25 1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO2</td>
<td>2.58 1.19</td>
<td>2.53 1.17</td>
<td>3.03 1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO3</td>
<td>2.45 1.13</td>
<td>2.57 1.19</td>
<td>2.72 1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO4</td>
<td>2.75 1.15</td>
<td>2.76 1.20</td>
<td>2.99 1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO5</td>
<td>2.25 .99</td>
<td>2.26 1.05</td>
<td>2.67 1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO6</td>
<td>2.06 .92</td>
<td>2.08 .98</td>
<td>2.37 1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO7</td>
<td>2.50 1.23</td>
<td>2.58 1.23</td>
<td>2.90 1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO8</td>
<td>2.09 .97</td>
<td>1.93 .90</td>
<td>2.27 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO Composite</td>
<td>2.35 .80</td>
<td>2.34 .81</td>
<td>2.65 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC1</td>
<td>3.38 1.16</td>
<td>3.26 1.24</td>
<td>3.69 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC2</td>
<td>3.01 1.22</td>
<td>2.99 1.22</td>
<td>3.46 1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC3</td>
<td>3.57 1.03</td>
<td>3.42 1.07</td>
<td>4.07 0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC4</td>
<td>3.66 .96</td>
<td>3.62 1.07</td>
<td>3.97 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC5</td>
<td>3.87 .97</td>
<td>3.81 .99</td>
<td>4.22 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC6</td>
<td>3.76 .95</td>
<td>3.84 .94</td>
<td>4.22 0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC7</td>
<td>3.04 1.14</td>
<td>3.15 1.12</td>
<td>3.77 0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC8</td>
<td>3.30 .87</td>
<td>3.27 1.04</td>
<td>3.54 0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC Composite</td>
<td>3.45 .70</td>
<td>3.42 .80</td>
<td>3.87 0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM1</td>
<td>3.57 1.11</td>
<td>3.36 1.09</td>
<td>3.46 1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM2</td>
<td>3.19 1.09</td>
<td>3.20 1.05</td>
<td>2.75 1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM3</td>
<td>2.89 1.09</td>
<td>2.82 1.10</td>
<td>3.27 1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM4</td>
<td>3.33 1.05</td>
<td>3.20 1.10</td>
<td>3.39 1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM5</td>
<td>3.46 1.12</td>
<td>3.40 1.06</td>
<td>3.42 1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM6</td>
<td>3.32 1.09</td>
<td>3.23 1.06</td>
<td>3.29 1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM Composite</td>
<td>3.29 .87</td>
<td>3.20 .87</td>
<td>3.27 1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPIS Composite</td>
<td>3.01 .63</td>
<td>2.99 .62</td>
<td>3.26 0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No items have been reverse scored. Item labels correspond to their intended dimension. EOO = Equity of Opportunity; FOC = Fairness of Colorblindness; IJM = Injustice of Multiculturalism.
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goodness-of-Fit Indices for 3-Factor Model of RPIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RPIS Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Factor</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index.

Convergent & Discriminant Validity

The correlations among the RPIS and the three Belief in a Just World scales were examined to investigate the convergent validity of the RPIS. Results indicate significant correlations among each of these scales (See Table 7). Correlations ranged from .257 (between RPIS and MBJW) and .333 (between RPIS and GBJW). Considering these similar significant correlations across three measures of a theoretically related construct, support is shown for Hypothesis 1, as well as convergent validity for the RPIS. The correlations among the RPIS and the HES, political ideology, political party affiliation, SD, and SDO were examined to provide estimates of discriminant validity (See Table 7). Although many significant relationships were found between the RPIS and these variables, each correlation indicated the variables were distinct constructs. The range of variance accounted for between the RPIS and other measures was about 4% to 13%. The most encouraging finding, consistent with our hopes for the practicality of the RPIS, was the lack of significant correlation with social desirability (r = -.081, ns). Given these moderate to weak correlations with theoretically similar constructs, support is shown for Hypothesis 2a, Hypothesis 2b, Hypothesis 3b, and Hypothesis 4b, as well as the general discriminant validity of the RPIS. Upon examining reliability estimates for this study’s sample, the alpha coefficients for the three factors and the total score were found to be acceptable: .88, .87, .89, and .90, respectively.
**Table 7**

**RPIS Convergent Validity Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RPIS</th>
<th>GBJW</th>
<th>MBJW</th>
<th>BJW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPIS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBJW</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBJW</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJW</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Bold values denote p < .05; Bold and italicized values denote p < .01; RPIS = Resistance by Perceived Injustice; GBJW = Global Belief in a Just World; MBJW = Multidimensional Belief in a Just World; BJW = Belief in a Just World*

**RPIS Discriminant Validity Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RPIS</th>
<th>HES</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PID</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SDO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPIS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Bold values denote p < .05; Bold and italicized values denote p < .01; RPIS = Resistance by Perceived Injustice; HES = Humanitarian/Egalitarian Scale; PI = Political Ideology; PID = Political Identification; SD = Social Desirability; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation*

**Study 3: Criterion Validity and Mediation**

**Criterion Validity & Mediation**

In order to test the RPIS for meaningful criterion validity, diversity resistance outcomes of interest were regressed on the RPIS composite scores, while controlling for modern racism attitudes. Consistent with this study’s goal of validating a measure which offers more practical and effective explanatory power than modern racism measures, it’s important to examine the extent to which the RPIS accounts for variance above and beyond simple modern racism attitudes in predicting resistance. The first two hypotheses concerned resistance behaviors in the workplace against outgroup coworkers, while the second set of hypotheses aimed to predict general attitudes of resistance (or support) for the aforementioned variety of common diversity practices in organizations. Hierarchical regression was utilized to test each hypothesis, with participants’ modern racism scores entered first, followed by the RPIS composite scores. Results for these analyses can be found in Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10.
Hypothesis 3a and Hypothesis 3b were unsupported, as the RPIS did not add significant variance explained to predicting both workplace ostracism (\(\beta = -0.092, p = 0.266, \text{ns}\)) and coworker-directed deviance (\(\beta = -0.119, p = 0.319, \text{ns}\)) above and beyond modern racist attitudes. Additionally, Hypothesis 4a, Hypothesis 4b, Hypothesis 4c, and Hypothesis 4e were unsupported. The RPIS did not add significant variance-explained to modern racism attitudes when predicting support for multicultural celebrations (\(\beta = -0.121, p = 0.498, \text{ns}\)), business resource groups (\(\beta = -0.073, p = 0.686, \text{ns}\)), diversity training (\(\beta = -0.253, p = 0.168, \text{ns}\)), and mentoring programs for minority employees (\(\beta = -0.335, p = 0.068, \text{ns}\)), respectively. However, Hypothesis 4d, Hypothesis 4f, and Hypothesis 4g were supported. The RPIS significantly predicted support above and beyond modern racism attitudes for targeted recruiting efforts for minority applicants (\(\beta = -0.438, p<0.05\)), with an overall \(R^2\) improvement of 0.034 (\(R^2 = 0.288\)). The RPIS also predicted support above and beyond modern racism attitudes for targeted hiring efforts for minority applicants (\(\beta = -0.498, p<0.01\)), with an overall \(R^2\) improvement of 0.046 (\(R^2 = 0.279\)). Finally, the RPIS predicted support above and beyond modern racism attitudes for targeted advancement efforts for minority employees (\(\beta = -0.396, p<0.05\)), with an overall \(R^2\) improvement of 0.033 (\(R^2 = 0.275\)).

This study’s final series of hypotheses addressing criterion validity hoped to further support the notion that the RPIS could serve as an aversive racism strategy. As Gaertner and Dovidio (1986) theorized, this form of modern racism expression operates by allowing individuals to manifest negative attitudes toward minorities only when non-racial terms allow them to do so. A major assumption of the RPIS is that fairness appraisals would allow for a superior predictor of diversity resistance, as this explanation may serve as an aversive strategy for manifesting bias against diversity practices in less-racial terms. Specifically, this study
utilized mediation to test whether the relationship between modern racism attitudes and diversity resistance was best explained through RPIS attitudes.

### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WPO (H5a)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Racism</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td><strong>.296</strong></td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.411</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPIS</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| WPD (H5b)      |       |       |       |       |       |       | SMCC (H6a) |       |       |       |       |
| B             | .098   | .039  | .144  |       |       |       |         |       |       |       |       |

| F for R² change | 1.251  | 1.002 | .462  |       |       |       |         |       |       |       |       |

**Note:** RPIS = Resistance by Perceived Injustice; WPO = Workplace Ostracism; WPD = Workplace Coworker-Directed Deviance; SMCC = Support for Multicultural Celebrations.

**Note:** p < .05 in **bold**, p < .01 in **bold italics**

Preacher, Zyphur, and Zhang’s (2010) simple mediation approach with bootstrapping was utilized, as tested with the statistical software package Mplus. With regard to predicting behavioral patterns of diversity resistance, Hypothesis 5a and Hypothesis 5b were unsupported. RPIS attitudes did not mediate the relationship between modern racist attitudes and workplace ostracism, nor coworker-directed deviance. Regarding support for diversity practices, Hypothesis 6a, Hypothesis 6b, Hypothesis 6c, Hypothesis 6e, and Hypothesis 6g were also unsupported. Specifically, the RPIS did not mediate the relationship between modern racism and support for multiculturalism celebrations (sum of indirect, β = -.073, p = .520, ns), business resource groups (sum of indirect, β = -.044, p = .706, ns), diversity training (sum of indirect, β =
-.154, p =.187, ns), mentoring for minority employees (sum of indirect, β = -.203, p =.087, ns), and targeted advancement for minority employees (sum of indirect, β = -.240, p =.071, ns).

### Table 9

*Multiple Hierarchical Regression Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SBRG (H6b)</th>
<th>SDT (H6c)</th>
<th>STR (H6d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Racism</td>
<td>-.510</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Racism</td>
<td>-.465</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPIS</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td></td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F for R² change</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* RPIS = Resistance by Perceived Injustice; SBRG = Support for Business Resource Groups; SDT = Support for Diversity Training; STR = Support for Targeted Recruiting of Minority Applicants.

*Note:* p < .05 in **bold**, p < .01 in ***bold italics***

However, Hypothesis 6d was supported, with the RPIS mediating the relationship between modern racism attitudes and support of targeted recruiting efforts (sum of indirect, β = -.265, p < .05). The effect was tested using bootstrapping procedures. Unstandardized indirect effects were computed for each of 5,000 bootstrapped samples, and the 95% confidence interval was computed by determining the indirect effects at the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles. The bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect 95% confidence interval ranged from -.529, -.028. Thus, the indirect effect was statistically significant, and the RPIS was found to partially mediate the relationship between modern racism and support for targeted recruiting efforts for minorities.
In addition, Hypothesis 6f was supported, with the RPIS mediating the relationship between modern racism attitudes and support of targeted hiring efforts (sum of indirect, $\beta = -.302$, $p < .05$). The effect was tested using bootstrapping procedures. Unstandardized indirect effects were computed for each of 5,000 bootstrapped samples, and the 95% confidence interval was computed by determining the indirect effects at the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles. The bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect 95% confidence interval ranged from -.581, -.051. Thus, the indirect effect was statistically significant, and the RPIS was found to partially mediate the relationship between modern racism and support for targeted hiring efforts for minorities. These findings are illustrated in Figure 1.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SMP (H6e)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>STH (H6f)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>STA (H6g)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Racism</td>
<td>-.513</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.439</td>
<td>-.609</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.483</td>
<td>-.592</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Racism</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-.265</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPIS</td>
<td>-.335</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>-.498</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.321</td>
<td>-.396</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td></td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ for $R^2$ change</td>
<td>3.041</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.022</td>
<td>4.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: RPIS = Resistance by Perceived Injustice; SMP = Support for Mentoring Programs for Minorities; STH = Support for Targeted Hiring of Minority Applicants; STA = Support for Targeted Advancement for Minorities.*

Note: $p < .05$ in **bold**, $p < .01$ in *bold italics*
Figure 1a: Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between modern racism and support for targeted recruitment efforts for minority applicants, as mediated by RPIS. The standardized regression coefficient between modern racism and support for targeted recruitment efforts, controlling for RPIS, is in parentheses. *p < .05.

Figure 1b: Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between modern racism and support for targeted hiring efforts for minority applicants, as mediated by RPIS. The standardized regression coefficient between modern racism and support for targeted hiring efforts, controlling for RPIS, is in parentheses. *p < .05.

Figure 1c: Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between modern racism and support for targeted advancement efforts for minority applicants, as mediated by RPIS. The standardized regression coefficient between modern racism and support for targeted advancement efforts, controlling for RPIS, is in parentheses. *p < .05.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The present study developed and provided validation evidence for the Resistance by Perceived Injustice Scale (RPIS), a measure which aims to help explain why employees resist diversity in the workplace. Specifically, this study created a measure which tested the notion that employees resist diversity practices largely due to a collection of fairness appraisals regarding such practices. In conjunction, these attitudes combined to measure an individual’s perception of societal equity of opportunity, preference for colorblindness as a fair process, and rejection of multiculturalism as an unjust concept. In addition to the content this measure could add to the diversity resistance literature, it also addresses several measurement-related concerns. Many prior explanations for diversity resistance were either theorized, but unmeasured, or infused with suggestions of prejudicial bias toward minorities benefiting from more proactive diversity strategies. The RPIS is found to have several advantages over these approaches, and thus offers optimism for researchers hoping to better understand diversity resistance.

Much of this study concerned the development and validation of the RPIS as a sound measure meeting appropriate psychometric properties, while simultaneously capturing the intended content it claims to measure. To accomplish this goal, items were developed based on an extensive literature review of factors likely pertaining to both the appraisal of diversity strategies by employees, as well as how that appraisal would manifest through a justice lens (e.g. Colquitt, 2001; Plaut et al., 2011). In addition to the direction provided by reviewing the
literature, valuable insight and rewording was provided by diversity experts in academia, as well as graduate students enrolled in a diversity research graduate lab. After this item development process, three dimensions were proposed to categorize item development. The Equity of Opportunity (E0O) dimension aimed to capture emerging sentiment that we now live in a “post-racial” society, or that opportunity and discrimination are now more equally experienced across racial/ethnic groups (e.g. Norton & Sommers, 2011). The Fairness of Colorblindness (FOC) dimension measured the extent to which individuals preferred colorblindness as a fair procedure, which also has been noted as an emerging assumption in society (e.g. Pollack, 2004; Sue, 2004). Finally, the Injustice of Multiculturalism (IJM) dimension captured the growing resentment toward multiculturalism as an approach, and specifically it’s adverse effect on society (e.g. Michaels, 2006; Schmidt, 1997).

To properly demonstrate evidence for construct validity, Kerlinger and Lee (2000) recommend a series of tests which support content validity, factor structure, convergent validity, discriminant validity, criterion validity, and reliability. Through three unique samples, including two student and one professional sample, these tests were performed, with each demonstrating encouraging results as to the RPIS’ construct validity. Content validity was assessed with a Hinkin & Tracy (1999) procedure allowing participants to rate the content of each proposed item to its intended dimension against other possible dimensions. Results from this analysis helped reduce the total item pool of 28 to 22 RPIS items. The factor structure of these 22 items was then tested using an exploratory factor analysis in the first student sample. Results from this procedure suggested a 3-factor structure best fit the data, with items loading onto the three intended dimensions as they were written. The second student sample helped test the model of this factor structure with a confirmatory factor analysis. Fit indices suggested the 3-factor model
was an appropriate fit of the data, and a phi matrix revealed correlations between the factors, reinforcing the assumption that these dimensions were related, but distinct.

Convergent and discriminant validity are important to demonstrate a measure consistently relates to similar measures, while also avoiding overlap from theoretically similar constructs. The second study sample provided evidence for convergent validity, as the RPIS related at similar levels and in the same direction with three unique measures of Belief in a Just World (Lipkus, 1991; Furnham & Procter, 1988a; Rubin & Peplau, 1975). Discriminant validity was supported in a number of ways, with the RPIS avoiding any strong correlations with potentially similar constructs, such as the Humanitarian-Egalitarian Scale (Katz & Hass, 1988), Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto et al., 1994), political ideological beliefs, and political party affiliation. Even more encouraging, the RPIS had no significant relationship with social desirability (Reynolds, 1982). With the first two student samples, as well as the final sample of working adults, reliability estimates were adequate, within-dimensions and reflecting the total RPIS measure.

The third study offered a sample of full-time working adults with coworker interactions. Using these participants’ responses, criterion validity was assessed regarding both behavioral patterns of diversity resistance, as well as general support for common diversity practices in the workplace. Specifically, the RPIS was tested as a predictor of each of these resistance outcomes, after controlling for modern racism attitudes. Results indicated that RPIS attitudes do not add significant variance-explained above and beyond modern racism when predicting workplace ostracism (Ferris et al., 2008), nor workplace deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). The RPIS also added no additional variance-explained beyond modern racism attitudes in predicting support for multicultural celebrations, business resource groups, diversity training, and
mentoring programs for minorities. However, with regard to diversity practices that would traditionally fall under “affirmative action” categorization, the RPIS proved to be a better predictor than simple modern racism attitudes. Specifically, the RPIS significantly predicted support for targeted recruitment practices, targeted hiring practices, and targeted advancement practice, while controlling for modern racism attitudes. It seems that these specific practices are particularly sensitive to fairness appraisals as a predictor to support or opposition. It should also be noted that the RPIS came close to explaining support for mentoring programs for minorities above and beyond modern racism, as an effect was found at the p < .10 level. A large sample may have revealed such an effect more conclusively.

A final criterion-related series of tests in the third study explored the extent to which RPIS attitudes could mediate modern racism’s relationship with the proposed diversity resistance outcomes. Consistent with theorizing by Gaertner and Dovidio (1986), aversive racism suggests that individuals have hidden biases that are manifested into negative actions toward minorities, but only when non-racial terms provide an opportunity to do so. Following this logic, fairness appraisals of diversity programs may allow bias against such programs to manifest in terms of justice, as opposed to focusing on the racial aspect of these programs, or the specific races of those who could benefit from them. If the RPIS mediates the relationship between modern racism attitudes and resistance outcomes, it may be argued that fairness appraisals could be an aversive non-racial strategy through which people manifest their biases in a socially appropriate manner. Consistent with the aforementioned analyses, results suggested that modern racism attitudes and behavioral resistance outcomes were not found to be mediated by RPIS attitudes. Similarly, RPIS attitudes did not mediate the relationship between modern racism and support for multicultural celebrations, business resource groups, diversity training, mentoring programs
for minorities, and targeted advancement for minorities. Once again, it should be noted that the indirect effect for both mentoring programs support, and targeted advancement support, would have been declared significant at the p < .10 level, but given the sample size of the third study, could not be confidently declared significant. However, RPIS attitudes were found to partially mediate the relationship between modern racism attitudes and support for targeted recruitment, as well as targeted hiring. These findings lend additional support to the role of RPIS attitudes serving as aversive reasoning to manifest bias against diversity practices in the workplace, as well as providing evidence for the RPIS as a helpful factor in better understanding diversity resistance altogether.

Consistent with research’s suggestion that resistance can take many forms and operate through many motivations (Thomas & Plaut, 2008), the RPIS appears to explain resistance for certain collections of diversity practices more so than others. A striking finding across this study’s hypotheses was that perceived fairness of diversity strategies appears especially important in predicting resistance when considering diversity practices that promote access to opportunities. Targeted recruitment, hiring, and advancement strategies each demonstrated support for RPIS attitudes as an explanatory mechanism through which modern racism attitudes could manifest as resistance. On average, employees appear to resist these strategies to the extent to which they perceive such strategies as unfair. On the other hand, behavioral resistance patterns (i.e. ostracism and deviance), and treatment-related practices such as multicultural celebrations, business resource groups, and diversity training did not appear to be explained by these attitudes. These findings help explain the bigger picture of resistance and how it manifests through multiple vessels, depending on the nature of what is being resisted.
In addition to the aforementioned findings this study adds to the diversity resistance literature, the RPIS should be seen as a successful methodological approach to understanding diversity resistance, as well as keeping pace with the evolution of race in society. McConahay (1986) noted that as the socially-constructed race evolves as a variable in terms of how it is viewed by society, researchers and their measurements must also evolve to accurately capture attitudes pertaining to race. Although modern racism attitudes have evolved over time to chase an increasingly elusive negative sentiment toward minorities (e.g. Sears, 1988; Kinder & Sanders, 1996; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995), as well as utilize the most-relevant item language for their time (e.g. Henry & Sears, 2002), such self-report measures will likely fade out of practical application. Participants will only grow more aware of appropriate answers regarding race and ethnicity, regardless of how they actually feel about these constructs. Continuing a helpful model from other authors (Neville et al., 2000), the RPIS shifts focus from items addressing a specific race to cognitive appraisals of the construct of race as a whole, and its application in society today. The discriminant validity finding that the RPIS was unrelated to social desirability provides encouraging evidence of this strength. In addition to this practical advantage, the RPIS was found to actually better predict certain resistance outcomes above and beyond modern racism. Finally, in accordance with methodological recommendations by diversity authors (e.g. Cox & Nkomo, 1990; Yee et al., 1993), diversity research needs to develop better measures to empirically discover not simply that racial differences exist across outcomes, but rather why these differences are manifesting. By offering fairness appraisals as an explanation, this study’s measure answers these calls.
Future Directions and Limitations

This study addresses many gaps in the literature, both in regards to developing our understanding of diversity resistance, as well as offering improvements to measurement tactics in the diversity literature. Future research could consider capitalizing on this momentum with both the proposed RPIS measure, as well as the validations of other similar measures explaining diversity resistance. First, the RPIS was only tested in one sample of working adults, which should probably be duplicated across multiple samples. Although the scale’s effectiveness seems hopeful for student participants in academic contexts, it’s intended as a measure for predicting diversity resistance in the workplace, and thus should be generalized across future studies. In addition, this employee sample only included 113 participants, and many criterion-related findings seemed to nearly demonstrate significant effects for the RPIS above and beyond modern racism attitudes. Large samples may conclusively reveal these findings.

Another consideration for future research should be to better understand how the RPIS fits into a nomological network. Although many relationships with similar variables were tested in this study’s convergent and discriminant tests, reaching a better understanding of what attitudes or experiences predict RPIS attitudes could help to reduce such resistance threats. Similarly, practical variables which may moderate the relationship between RPIS attitudes and resistance outcomes should be considered. Leadership practices or diversity training focuses which reframe fairness perceptions could help reduce the relationship between RPIS attitudes and resistance for many diversity practices. This study contributes in that it helps validate the RPIS as an important construct, but it’s important to continue exploring how these attitudes manifest, as well as how they can be buffered to avoid resistance to important diversity strategy.
A final recommendation for future research concerns the lack of alternative measurement approaches to diversity resistance rationales. A value of the RPIS is offering researchers a measurement tool to assess perceptions of injustice as a specific motivating factor for resistance, but Thomas and Plaut (2008) cover a number of possible explanations that appear to lack measurement tools. If we are to better understand how each of these possible factors impacts resistance to specific behavioral and general opinion outcomes, we need to create additional scales which capture such motivational processes. Future research should consider scale development and validation for alternative explanations, such as fear of change or redistribution of resources.
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