UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

REALISTIC ORGANIZATIONAL PREVIEWS (ROPS) DURING THE OFFER

CONSIDERATION PERIOD: A COMPARISON OF CANDIDATE RESPONSES TO

ABSENT, EXPLICIT, AND IMPLICIT RACE-RELATED RECRUITMENT MESSAGING

FROM ORGANIZATIONAL RECRUITERS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

JASMINE TERRELL AUSTIN
Norman, Oklahoma
2019

REALISTIC ORGANIZATIONAL PREVIEWS (ROPS) DURING THE OFFER

CONSIDERATION PERIOD: A COMPARISON OF CANDIDATE RESPONSES TO

ABSENT, EXPLICIT, AND IMPLICIT RACE-RELATED RECRUITMENT MESSAGING

FROM ORGANIZATIONAL RECRUITERS

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

BY THE COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF

Dr. Ryan S. Bisel, Chair

Dr. Ioana A. Cionea

Dr. Michael W. Kramer

Dr. James O. Olufowote

Dr. Marilyn Y. Byrd

Acknowledgements

I want to thank God for strengthening me through this process and for blessing me with additional pillars of strength in the form of my angels (ancestors), family, friends, coaches, teammates, mentors, mentees, colleagues, and one and all who directly or indirectly, lent their hand in this venture.

To my parents, congratulations on your third doctor. When success comes to one of us, it comes to all of us. You both have literally given of your blood, sweat, and tears, to ensure my brothers and I could inherit the path of least resistance. Thank you for supporting me physically, mentally and emotionally through every step of my life. To my line editor- mom- thanks for always encouraging me to "Let it Shine".

I would like to acknowledge my big brothers, Drs. Jude and Julius Austin. Thank you for bearing with me through my emotions and then helping me regain balance through your practical perspectives. Jude, thanks for letting me cry… Julius, thanks for *not* letting me cry… Megan, my sister, thanks for crying with me. Sharing this experience with y'all has been the key to my survival, sanity, and success. Brothers, you two have provided balance and clarity when I felt unstable and lost at times. Thank you for always speaking life into me and reminding me of who I am – who *we* are.

I also owe a huge amount of gratitude to my professors, mentors, students, and fellow graduate students, thank you all for allowing me to share who I am, and for being brave enough to let me experience who you all are – I am proud to call you all colleagues. Special shout out to Amanda, Chris, Paola, Pavitra, Eryn, Marisa, Natalie, Tianna, Jules, Beth, Val, Doris, Haijing, Arden, Dalaki, Lil Britt, and Dr. Irungu: All have gone above and beyond for my success. To my cohort and the cohorts before and following mine, I leave you with a verse, "You're broken down and tired, of living life on a merry go round. And you can't find the fighter, But I see it in you so

we gonna walk it out… And move mountains. We gonna walk it out." – Andra Day. I look forward to *walking it out* alongside of you all for graduation and through the tenure of our careers and lives. To my tribe, Marlin, Ajia, Britney, Peay, Leroy, and JD, I leave you with a phrase from a great philosopher and scholar, "it's crazy, it seems it'll never let up, but please, you got to keep your head up" – Tupac.

I would like to thank my dissertation committee members Dr. Marilyn Byrd, Dr. Ioana Cionea, Dr. Michael Kramer, and Dr. James Olufowote. Dr. Byrd, you put me in the position to find my passion for teaching — not only have you played a key role in getting me to the starting line, but you ran next to me as I passed the finish line. I will forever be grateful for you. Dr. Cionea, from sharing back pains to sharing much needed hugs and chocolate, you have set a great example as a scholar-mentor. I can only strive to attend to detail as you so effortlessly do. Dr. Kramer, thank you for ushering me into the field by providing a pragmatic perspective that will help me maintain my sanity. To my first-year mentor, Dr. Olufowote, thank you for being a part of my family. Thank you for supporting my goals and future as a scholar by going above and beyond to ensure I saw myself in the literature and encouraging me to be myself in the literature.

Lastly, I would like to thank my dissertation chair Dr. Ryan Bisel. This experience has been a crucible of self-determination. Thank you for being-with me throughout this journey, giving me the space to grow, believing in me, and trusting me. You have taught me exactly what I needed to know to be a productive and competent member of our Organizational Communication field.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

This study addresses the critical question as to whether recruiters should provide race-related realistic organizational previews (ROP) to minority job candidates after the candidate receives a job offer to join the organization. Specifically, the researcher argues that social identity theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1985), social exchange theory (SET; Homans, 1958), and politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987) represent competing theoretical explanations for what to expect from job candidates' responses to race-related ROPs. The present study explores which of the three theories best explains the type of message that is most likely to reap the most positive outcomes for recruits and organizations. For example, a positive outcome is a minority candidate who decides to join an organization after being made aware of the potential for racially-motivated experiences and becomes less likely to exit voluntarily immediately following such experiences.

Specifically, the purpose of this study is to explore what type of race-related ROP recruitment message will enhance organizational attraction, motivation to join the organization, and intention to accept a job offer from Black job candidates, who are offered a position into a predominately White institution (PWI), and who are in the *offer consideration phase* of organizational socialization. The research also explores whether the job candidate may perceive the recruiter as more or less credible and polite, depending on the explicitness of the recruitment message about race and the racial identity of the recruiter.

This study discusses the passing of the conversational burden of race-related ROPs onto other organizational member who shares the same or similar racial identity as the candidate and interrogations barriers to providing race-related ROPs to a job candidate during the offer consideration phrase. This study followed a 2 (Black male recruiter vs. White male recruiter) × 3

(absent, explicit, and implicit race-related ROP message) message-processing experimental design. For this study, results demonstrated the race of the speaker did not yield any significant differences. In addition, results demonstrated that the explicit recruitment message was significantly different on several of the dependent variables as compared to the implicit and absent messages. Among these latter two, there is no difference. Though there is no statistical difference between the absent and the implicit ROP messages, the literature provides support for why the implicit race-related ROP should be adopted over the absent ROP message. Research demonstrates RJPs (and, by extension ROPs) tend to increase employee retention, therefore, the implicit ROP message strategy is superior to absent and explicit. Further, arguments were made in light of a holistic interpretation of these results for why the implicit-race related ROP message was likely most desirable to achieve recruiter image management goals (i.e., credibility and politeness) and short-term organizational goals (i.e., organizational attraction, motivation to join, and intention to accept offer). The results of this study provide support for race-related ROP messages being a strategy recruiters and organizational leaders could potentially use to recruit Black candidates into their organization effectively. These results can alleviate fears that speaking about race to recruits will undermine important and ethical efforts to achieve a more diverse workforce. This study contributes to the organizational socialization literature the idea that SIT, SET, and politeness theory are intellectual puzzle pieces needed to understand the pattern of reactions Black recruits have when processing a race-related ROP message.

Chapter 1: Introduction

"No one in my family could share advice or expectations because they did not have the experience… I wasn't sure how to handle conversations concerning my ethnicity or gender. I wasn't aware how isolating graduate school can be nor ways to circumvent it. I ended up learning a lot through experience and some lessons kinda hurt." – Blk + in Grad School

Blk + in Grad School is a blog written by Black graduate students with the goal of relating to other Black graduate students and inspiring them towards graduation. This quote was written by a blogger about entering a graduate program without proper socialization of what to expect as a Black person entering a predominately White institution (PWI). The average Black-student enrollment at PWIs range from a high of 25% and low of less than 1% within the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). The U.S. Census Bureau (2012) estimated 42 million Black people are accounted for in the total American population of 316.1 million. This 13.6% includes those who identify as "Black only" and as "Black in combination with another race." Of the 42 million Black U.S. citizens, 2.9 million—or 1.4%—are enrolled in colleges and universities, with a growing fraction attending PWIs.

Though unfortunate, the quote mentioned above may be a common experience of Black graduate students, who do not know what to expect as a brown body entering a predominately White space. The blog notes, "There wasn't anyone around me having these conversations and I entered my Master's program without the tools I needed for a smooth transition" (Blk + in Grad School, 2018, para. 1). The Black graduate student is the specific case of interest for the present study due to the prevalence of negative racially motivated experiences at PWIs and voluntary exiting of their graduate programs (Austin, in press). Research indicates that the purpose of many organizational socialization efforts is to foster smooth transitions into the process of becoming a full member. Organizational socialization refers to "the process by which an individual acquires

the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role" (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 211).

This socialization process can be used to describe graduate education because one important purpose of graduate education is preparing students for a professional role in a workplace setting after degree completion (Baird, 1990). Graduate training represents an *induction stage* of organizational socialization for future faculty members, research scholars, and professionals (Corcoran & Clark, 1984). Graduate students are often both students and employees in the context of US graduate training because graduate students are often granted an education and monetary compensation in return for their research or teaching labor—an employment arrangement that means many graduate students are both students and employees, simultaneously. Aside from the graduate students' own information-seeking behaviors (Miller & Jablin, 1991), faculty members are primary agents of organizational and professional socialization, who have an opportunity to introduce the student to personal and professional resources that may aid in success post-graduation. With a longer tenure in the field and a greater understanding of disciplinary literature than graduate students, faculty members, and in particular faculty advisors, tend to adopt a mentoring and socializing role (Golde, 2000). Golde (2000) argued that the relationship with faculty advisors seems more important in graduate student completion than relationships with peers. Therefore, this study directs attention to early interactions between incoming racial minority graduate students and a faculty member— specifically, the Director of Graduate Studies—during the *pre-entry* phase of the socialization process and after an offer of employment has been given. The Director of Graduate Studies was chosen for this study because they serve as a liaison among the graduate students, faculty, and

the college and administrations, while also serving as a point of contact for recruited and

incoming graduate students (Miller, 2001).

Rationale

   The case for a diverse workforce. The subject of workplace interactions between members of minority groups and majority group members are important because the U.S. is experiencing an increase in numbers of persons of color, people that are differently abled, homosexual people, and elderly citizens (Allen, 2011). By the year 2020, people of color will account for one-third of the U.S. population and will directly affect the demographic make-up of organizations and educational institutions (Allen, 2011; Lorenzo, Voigt, Tsusaka, Krentz, & Abouzahr, 2018). Importantly, cultivating a diverse workforce is known to have several positive outcomes for organizations. Lorenzo et al. (2018) found racially-diverse teams outperformed non-diverse ones by 35% and companies with more diverse management teams reported 19% higher revenue, due to innovativeness. Due to the changing demographics of organizations, Lewis and Cooper (1995) called for research that identifies and explores trends to help practitioners anticipate, understand, and address the challenges of managing a diverse workforce and educational departments appropriately. Thus far, previous research has heeded this call by focusing on how organizations leverage diversity and benefit from a diverse workforce.

   Viewing diversity as an opportunity creates possibilities for increased organizational understanding (e.g., Jackson & Dutton, 1988) and positive, organization-wide change (Cooperrider & Sekerka, 2003). Empirical evidence reveals that diversity has material benefits for teams and organizations (Galinsky et al., 2015). Examples of these benefits include, but are not limited to, effective decision making, innovation, economic growth, and enhanced information processing. For instance, experimental evidence shows that ethnically-diverse juries consider more perspectives and make fewer inaccurate statements than homogeneous juries (Sommers, 2006). In 1992, Nemeth found organizations benefit from the dissent of minority

members because dissent stimulates improved performance and decision making. Likewise, foundational research by Maier and Hoffman (1961) found that groups of varied personality type and gender identification produced higher quality solutions to problems. Similarly, Triandis, Hall, and Ewan (1965) reported that solutions offered by heterogeneous groups were also more original and practical as compared to homogeneous groups. In addition, a field study conducted by Murray (1989) found that firms with diverse top management teams were more adaptive, due to innovation, than homogenous top management teams. Also of note, Eagle, Macy, and Claxton's (2010) network analysis of telephone call patterns revealed that social network diversity (i.e., interacting with people from different geographic regions) is associated with greater economic prosperity of a community. Thus, both laboratory and field studies have shown that diversity among organizational members is related to effective decision making, creativity, adaptability, innovation, and economic growth.

Although diversity has tangible benefits, without effective management and communication, diverse groups run the risk of descending into disadvantageous conflict (Alesina & Ferrara, 2005). According to a survey study of 450 working adults, diversity can also lead to miscommunication, dysfunctional adaptation behaviors, and the creation of barriers that reduce the benefits diversity can bring to the organization (Al-Jenaibi, 2011). The key is to find ways to maximize the benefits and minimize the troubles of diversity—to harness the tangible benefits of diversity without producing counterproductive forms of conflict. The benefits can be harnessed with adaptive communication, early and often, to manage expectations and intentions of the diverse workforce (Galinsky et al., 2015; Al-Jenaibi, 2011). In addition, a study by Plaut, Sanchez-Burks, Buffardi, and Stevens (2007) approached diversity in a way that decreased conflict and resistance by allowing nonminorities to feel included and respected while

simultaneously fostering minorities' feelings of inclusion and respect. By encouraging all employees to feel included in diversity and inclusion initiatives, this approach fosters organizational commitment and trust, internal motivation, and satisfaction for both minorities and nonminorities alike (Morrison & Milliken, 2000).

Though previous research identifies numerous benefits of a diverse workforce, changing demographics can bring a fear of lawsuits with the increasing demands for equal access and equitable work environments (Allen, 2011). The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) reported 91,503 workplace discrimination filings in the private sector during the 2016 fiscal year (EEOC Reports, 2016). This trend suggests that with changing organizational demographics, discrimination based on age (20,857 filings), race (32,309 filings), disability (28,073 filings), gender (26,934 filings), and other factors remain a major organizational problem, despite past and present social movements (EEOC Reports, 2016). Experiences like these can lead to a dissatisfactory working environment for minority employees and increase their voluntary exiting of organizations. Experienced educators and practitioners suggest implementing a variety of trainings to challenge discriminatory worldviews and deal with subjective issues related to diversity, racism, cross-cultural competence, and the marginalization of identities (Hanover & Cellar, 1998; Law, 1998). Additionally, members of minority groups are often ill-prepared to enter organizational environments due to unmanaged expectations of their potential experience. By managing expectations, organizational members may be able to aid minority job candidates in adjusting to problems and potential problems, providing support for the job candidate, increasing coping ability, and appreciation of the organization for being honest (Costigan, 1995; Earnest, Allen & Landis, 2011).

Realistic job previews (RJPs) and realistic organization previews (ROPs). Given the positive organizational outcomes of attending to and encouraging a diverse workforce, organizations should consider the role of early socialization exchanges in initiating a healthy relationship between the organization and minority candidates. In the context of the offer consideration period, candidates attempt to manage their own expectations prior to entering an unfamiliar organization by seeking information about task expectations, organizational culture, organizational beliefs, and organizational identity, which may, in turn, help them align with the organization. Examples of information-seeking strategies include observation of verbal and nonverbal norms, overt questions and conversations about expectations, and disguising conversations that tend to be a more covert strategy (Miller & Jablin, 1991). When recruiters share information as a result of the information-seeking strategies, they are communicating realistic job previews (RJP; Costigan, 1995; Miller & Jablin, 1991). RJPs are defined as programs, materials, conversations, and presentations that provide applicants with realistic and balanced (positive and negative) information about a job or organization that provides a picture of the organizational reality prior to making their employment decisions (Barber, 1998; Breaugh & Starke, 2000; Jablin, 2001; Popovich & Wanous, 1982).

A realistic preview of the potential experience can have positive and negative outcomes for the organization: The information provided during RJPs allow candidates to make an informed decision about their intention to join the organization (Bretz & Judge, 1998). Across previous RJP literature, scholars have found several benefits of providing an RJP. First, those candidates who receive an RJP tend to perceive the organization as having a positive climate, and see the organization as supportive, trustworthy, and honest (Crow, Hartman, & McLendon, 2009; Dean & Wanous, 1984; Laker & Shimko, 1990). Additionally, receiving an RJP increases

the candidate's ability to cope with the new position and the likelihood that more of their expectations will be met expectations once joining the organization (Colarelli, 1984; Crow, Hartman, & McLendon, 2009; Kramer, 2010; Phillips, 1998). Due to an increase in met expectations, newcomers who receive RJPs tend to have higher job satisfaction rates and better job performance (Horner, 1980).

The detail in the RJP can also influence the perceptions of the job candidate: In a study by Roberson, Collins, and Oreg (2005), using an experimental design and data from 171 college-level job seekers, the researchers found that detailed recruitment messages led to enhanced perceptions of positive organizational attributes and person-to-organization fit. In addition, those results were found to influence intentions to apply under circumstances of explicit recruitment information while attractiveness and fit perceptions were shown to influence application intentions under conditions of implicit recruitment information (Roberson, Collins, & Oreg, 2005).

Studies of RJPs, however, reveal their potential for mixed results. Specifically, an RJP can be associated with a reduction in initial acceptance of job offers due to lowered attraction to the organization. Although an RJP may prompt job candidates to withdraw from the selection process and decline a job offer, those who do accept the job offer are more likely to remain with the organization for a longer tenure (Jablin, 2001; Phillips, 1998).

A realistic organizational preview (ROP) is a specific form of RJP, but the ROP focuses on the cultural context in which work will be done and previewing for the candidate potential experiences not specific to work tasks. In this way, a ROP is a subset of RJP, in which all ROPs are RJPs, but due to the focus on the cultural context and experiences specific to the candidate, not all RJPs are ROPs (Earnest, Allen, & Landis, 2011; Phillips, 1998). For example, an RJP

may include on-the-job-training for the work task the candidate will be expected to complete once hired, while a ROP would not include such training. Instead, a ROP may focus on the history of racism in the organization and the steps organizational members took to reduce the likelihood of future occurrences of racism. Therefore, the race-related ROP can help minority candidates make an informed decision to join the organization based on their potential racial experience. However, a race-related ROP could share similar benefits and downsides as the RJP and have positive and negative outcomes for the organization. For example, a positive outcome is a minority candidate who decides to join an organization after being made aware of the potential for racially-motivated experiences becomes less likely to exit voluntarily immediately following such experiences. Though a reduced likelihood of voluntarily exiting the organization is a positive outcome, organizations risk reducing their organizational attractiveness by making minority candidates less likely to join if they use race-related ROP messages. In other words, RJPs may dissuade some from accepting an employment offer, but will also, ultimately, improve retention by managing expectations.

Results of a meta-analysis found that the most effective RJP design may be an oral or written RJP delivered post job offer and designed to signal honesty about aspects of the organization and potential experiences of new members (Earnest, Allen, & Landis, 2011). RJPs are important as they can reduce the likelihood of unrealistic expectations, which are related to higher performance and important for reducing voluntary turnover (Louis, 1980; Phillips, 1998). With the potential for negative racially-motivated experiences, a race-related ROP can be interpreted as an initial attempt to provide support to the minority candidate before such experiences arise. Though the RJP and ROP can both occur during the offer consideration phase of pre-entry during the anticipatory socialization phase, the ROP and RJP are also distinct from

other socialization phases as they are provided after a candidate has been offered an opportunity to join, but before the candidate makes a decision to accept or reject that offer. Realistic information allows candidates to make more informed job acceptance decisions by providing the ability to compare job alternatives (Breaugh & Starke, 2000). Thus, the hiring entity can expect the use of RJPs to be associated with lower acceptance. However, those who do accept the offer are less likely to voluntarily exit, and more likely to have positive attributes towards the organization and appreciate the willingness of the organization to provide an open and honest assessment of the job and work environment (Phillips, 1998; Premack & Wanous, 1985).

As ROPs are a subset of RJPs, any known benefits and drawbacks of RJPs should relate to ROPs. Furthermore, sharing role and organizational-culture related information through a ROP can better recruit candidates and aid them in coping with change, difference, and surprise, which, in turn, reduces voluntary turnover and increases the probability for organizational attraction, motivation to join, and willingness to speak up and contribute to organizational learning, which benefits the future newcomer and organization. Within the graduate education setting, ROPs may be helpful for easing candidates through this transition thereby improving recruitment and retention of Black graduate students.

Study preview. Broadly, this study focuses on the interaction between a racial minority candidate being recruited into a PWI–defined as having 50% to 93% enrollment of White members. Specifically, this study explores whether and how early recruitment messages about race might enhance potential Black graduate student candidates' attraction to the organization and willingness to accept an offer. In doing so, this study addresses the critical question as to whether leaders should provide realistic organizational previews in regard to race, when attempting to recruit Black members to their organization and profession.

Organizational communication scholars have found it useful to study graduate students for organizational socialization research because they are examples of organizational members that are entering an organization at regular intervals (Bullis & Bach, 1989), with the assumption that they will learn the ropes of the organization and future careers in their field. As Allen (1998) argues, it is important to focus on race as it is a salient identity that informs individuals' standpoint and worldview. Specifically, this study examines whether transparent messaging that includes an acknowledgement of the recruit's racial identity are needed and should be used to socialize Black graduate candidates into their potential experience more completely.

Based on the benefits and potential drawbacks of providing recruits with ROPs, an intellectual puzzle to be solved is whether recruiters should provide race-related ROPs to job candidates? Also, if a race-related ROP is provided, what type of message is most adept at information-sharing during early attempts at recruiting candidates, especially when communicating sensitive or potentially-unattractive information? In particular, this study focuses on solving that intellectual puzzle. If a race-related ROP is provided, this study is interested in which type of recruitment message is best to use when socializing a candidate in regard to inclusion of their racial identity. Such knowledge is important in that it holds the promise of achieving short-term organizational goals of attracting and motivating racial-minority (i.e., Black) candidates to join thereby increasing workforce diversity, which benefits the newcomer and organization.

Importantly, social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and social exchange theory (Homans, 1958) offer potentially divergent recommendations for how Black candidates will respond to race-related ROP messages. A better understanding of how potential candidates perceive ROPs can hold the promise of reducing newcomers' and recruits' unmet expectations

and increasing their coping ability. In the context of recruiting and attracting Black graduate students, this understanding could provide key guidance to departmental administrators (i.e., Graduate Director, Chair of Department, and faculty members) hoping to attract and retain Black graduate student candidates, and by extension, help organizational recruiters attract and retain Black job candidates.

Social identity theory (SIT) explores how individuals come to know who they are as a product of the personal and social memberships they claim (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Examples of these personal and social memberships can include tenured identities such as age, race, gender, and the intersections of each, and professional identities, which can include organizational memberships and vocational roles (Stets & Burke, 2000). SIT predicts individuals are most likely to claim membership in new groups that have space for and do not conflict with existing personal and tenured memberships (Stets & Burke, 2000). On one hand, race-related ROP messages during the offer consideration stage are fraught with danger because such messages signal to candidates their membership will be difficult or challenging. On the other hand, if members remain silent about the candidate's personal identity, the candidate may come to speculate a lack of fit.

Alternatively, social exchange theory (SET) explains human behavior is the product of weighing the costs and benefits of decision options (Homans, 1958). From this theoretical perspective, not acknowledging difference of candidates' personal identities might be the safer option when wanting to increase focus on the benefits and reduce attention to costs, thereby making the organization more attractive, at least initially. However, the consequences of not having a race-related ROP, that includes the potential costs of joining the organization, can increase voluntary turnover (Breaugh & Starke, 2000), which can be detrimental to the potential

newcomer and organization (Louis, 1980). A point that is especially relevant in the context of attracting and retaining Black graduate students.

However, this study adds another piece to this intellectual puzzle by highlighting a third possibility. Another option is to implement a combination of SIT and SET with the addition of politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987) to develop a message crafted with linguistic politeness that includes the personal identity of the candidate and the costs and benefits of joining the organization. Brown and Levinson's (1987) foundational work on politeness is based on the notion that language use plays a crucial role when developing, enhancing, maintaining, and challenging relationships in interpersonal communication. Brown and Levinson (1987) view politeness as a system for softening face-threatening acts. Furthermore, if the content of a message is socially-appropriate and employs facework strategies, there is a high potential for initiating a trusting interpersonal relationship and achieving additional recruiter image management goals (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Locher, 2008).

Though this alternative boasts potential benefits of the individual SIT and SET options, and a combination of the two, it also claims their potential negative outcomes. However, if this strategy of message is most adept at information-sharing, such an explanation would contribute to the organizational socialization literature the notion that a combination of SIT, SET, and politeness theory are especially helpful in explaining how individuals with marginalized identities respond to race-related ROP messages when the potential for negative organizational experiences pertinent to their personal identities (i.e., race) apply.

Regardless of the specific ROP message content, Goffman (1967) argued communicators perform their identities in interactions. During interactions, communicators position themselves relative to their own and others' identities in dialogue. Through this constant iterative process of

making meaning from interactions and then re-creating meaning based on subsequent interactions, illustrates that identities, relationships and positions are shaped through talk, which in turn shape future interactions (Giddens, 1984).

This study aims to aid well-intended organizational members who are wanting to recruit members of minority populations in an effective manner. This study will develop three types of race-related ROP messages. One that acknowledges the race of the candidate and the potential for racist experiences in an explicit manner, another that alludes to race and racism in an implicit manner, and a message that is absent of race, racism, and personal identities of the candidate. All messages are developed with the goal to compare the relative effects of these race-related ROP messages in attracting potential minority candidates to accept an offer of membership and employment.

The previous section served as an introduction to and rationale of key concepts necessary to understand the purpose of this study. After explaining some relevant statistics regarding Black student enrollment in the U.S., the researcher defined organizational socialization and identified the incoming graduate students and faculty members as serving in primary roles in the socialization process as information seekers and information givers, respectively. Then realistic organizational previews (ROPs) were explained as a subset of realistic job previews (RJPs). Next, the researcher made three arguments outlining the intellectual puzzle of which theoretical foundation may support a race-related ROP message to best socialize recruits. SIT, SET, and a combination of SIT, SET, and politeness theory are pieces of that puzzle that have the potential for positive and negative outcomes for the recruits *and* organizations. This intellectual puzzle is the fodder for the primary goal of this study, which is to address the critical question as to whether leaders should provide race-related ROPs when attempting to recruit Black candidates to

their organization and profession. If so, it also seeks to answer which theoretical foundation best explains the type of message that is adept at reaping the most positive outcomes for recruits and organizations.

In the following section, the researcher expands on these points by beginning with an explanation of the organizational socialization process. After taking a historical approach to organizational socialization and its phase model, the researcher explains rhetorical absence of messaging about race during socialization. Then, the researcher elaborates on the recruiter image management goals. Finally, the researcher expands on the SET, SIT, and SET, SIT, and politeness theory puzzle piece arguments to explain likely responses by minorities to varying forms of race-related ROP messaging.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Organizational Socialization

Historically, organizational socialization refers to the process through which a newcomer acquires the attitudes, behaviors, and knowledge needed to participate successfully as an organizational member (Schein, 1968; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Organizational socialization has been referred to colloquially as *learning the ropes,* wherein newcomers must acquire the cultural, social, and task skills for effective role performance (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) to meet organizational and peer expectations. Finally, socialization involves a process of indoctrination and training of what an organization, or some subunit thereof, deems important (Schein, 1968). In the late 1980's, Fisher (1986) redefined organizational socialization as a joint process among socialization efforts by organizational members (i.e., existing employees, referred to as *insiders*) and newcomers. That is, organizations seek to shape and influence newcomers, while newcomers shape and redefine roles for themselves within the organization (Fisher, 1986). Jablin (2001) considers these newcomer socialization efforts as the process of *individualization*.

The beginning phases of organizational socialization represents the early experiences an individual has with a new role, organization, and workgroup (Kramer, 2010). The socialization process may include communication prior to starting a new role, training and onboarding sessions when beginning a new role, and continued education during role transformations. A possible outcome of adequate socialization by the organization is when newcomers have the cultural, social, task, attitudinal, and behavioral knowledge necessary to perform their organizational role effectively. Further, other possible outcomes of effective socialization include achieving role clarity, enhancing social acceptance, promoting job satisfaction, reducing turnover, strengthening organizational commitment, and promoting better job performance

(Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007; Saks, Uggerslev & Fassina, 2007). The socialization process is influenced by the interplay of at least three sources: organizational practices, insiders, and the newcomer (Reichers, 1987). As later discussed in more detail, socialization is now conceptualized in the scholarly literature as an ongoing process, which is initiated well in advance of membership through well past discontinued membership.

Phase Model of Organizational Socialization

In the following paragraphs, the researcher describes Jablin's (1987) socialization model, which proposes that the process unfolds in four phases: anticipatory socialization, encounter, metamorphosis, and exit. Briefly, the anticipatory socialization or pre-arrival phase includes the time period prior to joining the organization (Jablin, 1987). The encounter or entry phase includes initial participation in the organization (Jablin, 1987). Metamorphosis phase is when a member attempts to become an accepted, participating member of the organization and can be characterized as an organizational member attaining a new identity, at times due to promotion or transfers (Jablin, 1987). The exit phase refers to the disengagement and (voluntary or involuntary) exit of an organizational member (Jablin, 1987). The present research is chiefly concerned with the *offer consideration* period of candidates—a period which somewhat overlaps between the anticipatory and entry phases, known as *pre-entry* (Kramer, 2010). During this period, the job candidate has already been offered a position in the organization and is in the consideration phase of accepting or denying the offer. An important differentiation between a *job candidate* and *recruit* for this study is that the recruit may or may not have been offered a position of membership, while job candidates have been offered a position of membership by the organization but have not yet decided whether to accept that membership offer. As the present research is focusing on the pre-entry phase of a job candidate, more attention is paid to the

specific time period between anticipatory socialization and entry, known as pre-entry. However, to promote a holistic understanding of the socialization process, the next sections explains each phase in detail.

       Anticipatory socialization. First, the anticipatory socialization or pre-arrival phase includes the time period prior to joining the organization. Jablin (2001) divides anticipatory socialization into vocational anticipatory socialization and anticipatory organizational socialization (AOS). Vocational anticipatory socialization (VAS) refers to the values, norms, and beliefs about the type of work done in a particular job and its title (Allen, 1996; Jablin, 1987). Vocational anticipatory socialization is a process from childhood to young adulthood of gathering information about types of occupations, roles, and vocations intentionally and unintentionally (Jablin, 1987). For example, this VAS phase includes being asked and answering questions such as, "What do you want to be when you grow up?" Sources of information to answer this question includes family members, peers, friends, the media, educational institutions, and previous experience including part-time jobs and internship experiences (Kramer, 2010). Anticipatory organizational socialization (AOS) refers to selecting the organization or type of organization one wants to join (Jablin, 1987). For example, this AOS phase includes being asked and answering questions such as, "Who do you want to work for?"

       The *pre-entry* period of AOS refers to the time period in which potential newcomers decide on the type of job and organization they want to join. Jablin (2001) and Kramer (2010) defined pre-entry as the decision-making period between the time an offer is made and an offer is accepted or declined. In this *offer consideration* period, organizational candidates attempt to seek out information about the job and the values and norms of the organization and its members as a means of informing decision making about whether to take the offer (Jablin, 1987). Some

preliminary unofficial information-seeking strategies include talking to peers, current and past

members of the organization, researching the organization via social media, news media, and

organizational websites, among other strategies (Kramer, 2010). Some candidates rely on

institutional mission statements as one way of identifying a potential organizational attraction,

motivation and intention to join, and organizational fit (Wille & Derous, 2017). However, for

those candidates interested in learning about the culture and race-related identity fit between

themselves and the organization, a mission statement about diversity and inclusion could be mere

"window dressing" of espoused—but not enacted—values. In this way, the values of diversity

and social justice have become static frames adopted to identify the intention (or myth) of an

organization (Allen, Orbe, & Olivas, 1999; Byrd, 2017). In organizations, diversity has taken on

a branding effect in mission statements that allows an organization to market a diverse workforce

as a quality, not a process. For example, "We value diversity and social justice" is less morally

obligating than, "We are committed to responding to social injustice to allow for an environment

that values diversity." The former refuses to acknowledge enduring acts of social injustice and

uses diversity and social justice as qualities of the organization (Byrd, 2017). The latter refers to

social justice as a process of constant vigilance that allows for an environment of social justice

for diverse organizational members.

Another way of discerning potential organizational fit during the offer consideration

period includes official initial interactions with organizational members, such as interviews,

realistic job previews (RJP), and realistic organizational previews (ROP). As previously

mentioned, RJPs and ROPs can help newcomers understand organizational expectations. These

realistic previews are forms of recruitment strategies that can increase organizational

identification and provide a realistic picture of the organization or job to applicants during the

socialization process (Costigan, 1995). To reiterate, a realistic organizational preview (ROP) is a subset of RJP, in which all ROPs are RJPs, but not all RJPs are ROPs. Research demonstrates that RJPs (and by extension, ROPs) that include true, but unappealing, information about the organization and membership, can result in the reduced effectiveness of initial recruitment efforts, but can benefit the organization in the long-term because members are less likely to voluntarily exit the organization due to similar experiences. Thus, any known benefits and drawbacks of RJPs should relate to ROPs because a ROP can also reduce new hires' initial level of dissatisfaction, reduce the organization's voluntary turnover rate, lessen the ill effects of unmet expectations, and increase opportunities for communicative exchanges between leaders and members (Costigan, 1995). To date, the distinction of ROPs are not well attended to in the organizational communication literature.

Previous literature used psychometric scales when considering a number of criteria when evaluating RJPs. As ROPs are an extension of RJPs, the assumptions for applicability of these scales to ROPs are implicated in their usage. These criteria were measured in several ways, ranging from ad hoc items to some of the better-known instruments (Wanous, 1977). The researcher will highlight some of the better-known and commonly used scales in the organizational communication and recruitment literatures to measure 11 of these criteria: realistic expectations, role ambiguity and conflict, work-related needs, stress, anxiety, self-efficacy, credibility of member giving preview, organizational attraction, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and perceived acceptance by organizational members. Realistic expectations were commonly measured by a three-item scale developed by Feldman (1976). Feldman's (1976) scale measures the extent to which individuals believe they had realistic expectations of the job. The scale developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman's (1970) measures

role ambiguity and role conflict when assessing the definition of the newcomer's role. Alderfer's (1967, 1969) desire questionnaire has been used to measure the work-related needs of newcomers (Saks, Wiesner, & Summers, 1994). Caplan et al, 1975 developed a scale used to measure affective states indicative of psychological strain and stress. This Caplan et. al. (1975) scale is commonly used to measure stress levels of the newcomer after receiving an RJP. Anxiety, another affective state is measured using the Taylor manifest anxiety scale (Rizzo, house, & Lirtzman, 1970).

Self-efficacy of the newcomer was used as a measure of initiation to the task and is commonly adapted from a measure used by Bandura (1977). Bandura's (1977) scale usually measured the confidence of an individual to engage successfully in a number of organizational tasks (Ellis & Taylor, 1983). Credibility of the member giving the RJP can be measured using McCroskey's (1966) perceived leader credibility scale. Highhouse, Lievens, and Sinar's (2003) Organizational Attractiveness Scale is commonly used to measure how attracted a newcomer is to an organization before, during, and/or after a RJP. Organizational commitment was typically measured by the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian (1974). Specifically, affective commitment and continuance commitment is usually measured using the McGee and Ford (1987) scale. Job satisfaction was measured by one of the better-known instruments, such as the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire or the Job Descriptive Index (Gillet & Schwab, 1975). Perceived acceptance by members of the new organization is commonly measured by Fey's (1955) Acceptability to Others Scale.

Encounter. After the anticipatory socialization phase, the following phase is the encounter phase, which includes initial participation in the organization as the candidate accepts the job offer and becomes a newcomer (Kramer, 2010). During the encounter phase, newcomers

21

learn the requirements and reality of their role and what the organization and its members

consider to be "normal" patterns of behavior and thought (Van Maanen, 1975). If newcomers

have not accurately anticipated the reality of the new job and organization, this period can

become a traumatic and destructive phase, "which serves to detach the individual from his or her

former expectations" (Van Maanen, 1975, p. 84). A general example of this trauma is when a

newcomer is inadequately socialized into the potential experiences of a member holding their

differing orientations, ethnic markers, beliefs, or values. This inadequate socialization can result

in members' detachment or dis-identification with the organization and make the organization

seem less attractive and in turn reducing their motivation to join (Costigan, 1995). According to

Mumby (1996), organizational communication during the encounter phase will continue to be

inadequate until we treat race and gender as defining features of the process.

We must acknowledge that though individuals may hold membership *inside* the

organization, personal factors may still make organizational members feel like *outsiders within*

the organization. Allen (1996) and Hill Collins (1990) argue knowledge generated from the

position of the "outsider within" produces a more complete view of the world and organization.

Therefore, implementing an "outsider within" perspective can inform the recruitment message

during the pre-entry period and will help to align the candidate's individual identity with that of

the organization's. In support of these claims, previous research states racial minority female

employees report less social support, job satisfaction, job commitment, fewer mentoring

opportunities, isolation, loneliness, disconnectedness, and personal struggles with issues such as

voice, silence, and marginalization (Allen, Orbe, & Olivas, 1999; Atewologun, Sealy, &

Vinnicombe, 2016; Buzzanell, Long, Anderson, Kokini, & Batra, 2015; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994;

Olsen & Maple, 1993; Walter, et al., 2017; Wright, 2016). To ensure future employees and

organizational members are made aware of these experiences, it is integral that organizations utilize diverse perspectives in their recruitment messaging, particularly during the pre-entry phase. Allen (1996) argues that recruitment and later organizational socialization cannot be effective without considering gender, race, and additional ethnic markers. However, giving a ROP informed by the personal identity of the candidate is an opportunity to enact the valuing of those members who may feel like outsiders within the organization.

   Metamorphosis. During the metamorphosis phase, the newcomer "attempts to become an accepted, participating member of the organization by learning new attitudes and behaviors or modifying existing ones to be consistent with the organization's expectations" (Jablin, 1984, p. 596). In addition, metamorphosis can be characterized by an organizational member attaining a new position due to promotion or transfers and changes in organizational ownership through mergers and acquisitions. Thus, as a result of various reinforcements that a newcomer experiences in prior stages, he or she begins the gradual process of using, accepting, and eventually internalizing a set of appropriate "constitutive rules through which organizational meanings are established and regulative rules through which members coordinate their everyday interactions" (Harris & Cronen, 1979, p. 14). This process includes the communication of organizational culture, which is a set of shared and taken-for-granted assumptions that underlie organizational communication ideology (Jablin, 1987; Keyton, 2011). In other words, culture informs employees of organizational values, beliefs, and issues that are important and provides expectations for communication behavior and attitudes within the organization and its subunits. As is explored later in detail, social exchange theory helps to explain patterns of behavior during this phase as newcomers weigh costs and benefits of adjusting their personal behavior to display acceptable organizational membership behavior.

Brown (1985) proposes organizational narratives or stories as a strategy to foster shared meanings. During the metamorphosis phase, narratives or stories can aid in understanding how to behave as a member of the organization and can also foster an understanding of one's own experience. For example, Allen (1998) reports that once she realized she was partly hired due to her race, she was able to make sense of the discrimination and negative behaviors of her coworkers. As previously mentioned, the socialization process is effective once newcomers are made aware of the aforementioned culture, rules, values, beliefs, and expected behavior. However, a newcomer who is effectively socialized is not necessarily one who is "well adjusted" (Grusec & Hastings, 2014). Here, the concept of a member feeling like an outsider within their organization applies in the sense that understanding the culture and expected behavior does not necessarily mean acceptance of or compliance with those expectations.

In addition to understanding the culture, the metamorphosis phase is highly influenced by gender, age, religion, race-ethnicity, nationality, and sexual orientation (Allen, 1995). These factors are usually the reasons why some newcomers have organizational adjustment issues. For example, stereotypes cannot only influence the socialization process, but can influence the interactions of organizational members. If organizational members have negative stereotypes of their coworker, this can contribute to a divisive and defensive climate because negative categorizations tend to give rise to contemptuous communication among subgroups (Allen, Orbe, & Olivas, 1999; Bisel, Zanin, Rozzell, Risley-Baird, & Rygaard, 2016; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Mumby, 1996; Parker, 2003). Referring back to Allen's (1996) experience, an assumption that all ethnic minority organizational members are under qualified and received their position solely due to Affirmative Action initiatives can lead to hostile and defensive inter-racial interactions. As a result, though an organizational member is well socialized, he or she

may not feel well-adjusted nor accepted in the organization, which impedes every day interactions.

Exit. Exit is the phase that sets Jablin's (1987) model apart from previous socialization models, albeit the least researched phase. The exit phase refers to the disengagement and (voluntary or involuntary) exit of an organizational member. Kramer (2010) describes organizational exit as an inevitable transition for all organizational members. Arguably, voluntary exiting is a reflection of withdrawal from the organization more than from the job (Hom & Hulin, 1981; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Although one can identify many reasons for voluntarily exiting an organization, Jablin (1987) describes four prevalent communication variables that indirectly cause exit: (1) role ambiguity and conflict, (2) violations of communication expectations, (3) frequency and quality of supervisory and coworker communication, and (4) lack of network integration. Other researchers argue voluntary exit is the result of a general lack of fit between organizational members and the person (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010), as well as alternative and more advantageous employment offers. No matter the reason, members weigh the costs and benefits of remaining with the organization before or instead of voluntarily exiting.

The exit phase also encompasses exiting an organization *in*voluntarily. During involuntary exiting, supervisors discuss costs and benefits of retaining employees rather than dismissing them (Cox & Kramer, 1995; Fairhurst, Green, & Snavely, 1984). Kramer (2010) attributes involuntary exiting to multiple organizational and individual factors: For example, an organization may be forced to terminate employment due to reductions-in-force, mergers and acquisitions, and funding cuts. Examples of individual factors include failure to perform one's job duties and illegal activities (e.g., stealing, sexual harassment). In the vein of inter-racial

communication, an inability to manage and function in ethnically-diverse environments can result in reduced organizational performance, and potentially, termination of employment (Kilduff, Angelmar, & Mehra, 2000).

In the previous pages, the researcher elaborated on the four phases of Jablin's (1986) socialization model, why organizational newcomers that share differing and competing personal identities from that of the organization and organizational culture are at risk of reduced organizational identification and increased negative organizational experiences. The next section raises the question as to why organizational socializers might refrain from discussing race with a minority job candidate upfront during the pre-entry phase.

Rhetorical Absence of Messaging About Race during Socialization

Rhetorical absence is an answer to why organizational socializers refrain from discussing race with a minority candidate during the pre-entry phase. Silence, in this regard, is likely strategic. An overt discussion about the race of the candidate may be silenced out of fear of offending the candidate, which undermines an otherwise pro-social goal to attract a more diverse workforce. However, that strategic silence could have unintended or unexamined negative consequences for the organization and job candidate. The importance of organizational leaders having conversations about past events pertaining to race and racism is to discontinue the perpetuation of rhetorical *absence* (Bisel, Kelley, Ploeger, & Messersmith, 2011). Rhetorical *presence* is a persuasive strategy that calls listeners' attention to certain premises, and in contrast, Bisel et al. (2011) coined the term rhetorical *absence* as the intentional exclusion of a premise during the course of talk.

Both rhetorical *absence* and *presence* provide the opportunity for the speaker and listener to assign meaning to a premise and each has implications for future conversations. For example,

26

if organizational members do not provide a ROP to a Black job candidate about past racially-motivated events, it can be interpreted by the candidate to mean that discussions of racism in the here-and-now is off-limits in the organization (Bisel, 2018). Therefore, the rhetorical absence of past organizational wrongdoing in organizational socialization during the pre-entry phase of a job candidate can (a) blindside the newcomer, if history repeats itself, (b) foster an environment where conversations about racism must involve an external agency (i.e., EEOC), or (c) perceive the absence of the conversation means voluntarily exiting the organization is the only way to overcome future occasions of organizational wrongdoing. However, it could be the case that disclosing past organizational wrongdoing pertinent to the recruit's tenured individual identity will build trust and attraction between the candidate and the recruiting organization.

Many current initiatives present in the U.S. workforce are associated with increasing diverse membership and, in some cases, mandate diversity training of all organizational members (Bezrukova, Jehn, & Spell, 2012). Additionally, it is crucial to the experience of underrepresented members that spaces are created, which are accepting of cultural differences and promote ways different cultures can coincide without a power struggle. To achieve this in organizational settings, more education is needed at PWIs about cultural differences and strategies for offering support. As Reeder and Schmitt (2013) propose, members' ability to thrive in their organization increases when resources and support are readily available. Kimbrough (1995) posits that Black members' valuing of leadership skills and participation in activities increased due to being supported in their membership.

In reference to the higher education context at a PWI, Tinto (1990) maintained that "the practical route to successful retention lies in those programs that ensure, from the very outset of student contact with the institution, that entering students are integrated into the social and

academic communities of the college" (p. 44). Many Black students find membership in Black Greek-life organizations (fraternities and sororities), multicultural resource centers, Black undergraduate and graduate student associations, athletic teams, and special interest groups. In these groups, Black students find a sense of belonging due to the similarities in cultural norms, appearances and experiences (Kimbrough & Hutcheson, 1998). Educating the faculty about these resources at PWIs may increase the prevalence of resources and support that is available to and utilized by Black students. In doing so, a recommendation is changing the norms of the socialization process of Black graduate students into PWIs by framing messages that are inclusive of their personal identities as Black students and the resources that are available to them.

The norms and resources of academic PWIs are typically not rooted in the culture that a Black student may come from, and this will add to the significance of the adjustment that some students experience when transitioning into graduate school and later into employment (Hitchcock, 1998). According to Sinanan (2016), Black students do face conflicts—both intrapersonal and interpersonal—associated with adapting to the environments of a PWI. For example, researchers argue that African Americans who do not identify with the aforementioned student organizations may feel isolated, lack of confidence and have trouble adjusting at a PWI (Chen & Starosta, 1996; Cooper, 2012; Freeman, 1998; Rowley, Sellers, Chavous & Smith, 1998). If faculty members can utilize their interpersonal communication as an opportunity to give a ROP of that student's potential experience pertaining to their racial identity, then that may increase identification with the institution and that recruiter, regardless of the racial identification of the recruiter.

Unfortunately, there are barriers to having these ROPs that develop from a motivation to manage impressions stemming from a fear of saying the wrong message and a perceived inability to frame the message of transparency appropriately. Impression management (IM) is the process by which individuals—knowingly or unknowingly—attempt to influence how others' view them through verbal and nonverbal displays (Leary & Kowalski, 1990) and through the intentional inclusion and exclusion of certain topics of discussion. Adame and Bisel (2019) emphasized that organizational members' attempts to influence one another's impressions are not necessarily dishonest or malicious but can come from a place of genuine concern for themselves and others. In order to avoid potential incompetent communication with minority recruits and job candidates, and circumvent creating poor impressions, recruiters may decide to avoid the topic of race or transfer the conversation to someone they perceive as better equipped to have the conversation (i.e., minority faculty member).

Buck-passing. An unfortunate alternative to providing a race-related ROP during the pre-entry and offer consideration periods is to avoid the conversation by passing the burden to another organizational member who shares the same or similar racial identity as the student or job candidate (Settles, Buchanan, & Dotson, 2018). At face value, it makes sense to pair a Black organizational member with an incoming Black graduate student or job candidate for their socialization experience. This pairing will allow for firsthand discussions of one's potential experience with the organizational members, institution, and greater community. However, this also creates hyper visibility of minority organizational members while simultaneously and paradoxically perpetuating their burden of *in*visible labor (Settles, Buchanan, & Dotson, 2018).

Visible labor has traditionally been defined as work that is readily identifiable, overt, and typically used to reward faculty work: reappointment, tenure, and promotion (Crain, Poster, &

Cherry, 2016; Matthew, 2016). *Visible labor* is typically paid, directly profit-generating, occurs in the public sphere, and has historically been long-term and state regulated. Meanwhile, *invisible labor* refers to work that is not valued by institutions because it does not generate the currency they typically use to reward institutionally-sanctioned work (Crain, et. al., 2016; Matthew, 2016). Assigned mentorship between a minority organizational member and a graduate student or job candidate is *in*visible labor, which can take valuable time away from visible tasks, such as leading research teams, lecturing to students or additional work tasks. By majority members passing-the-buck of this conversation to minority members, this leaves their privilege unquestioned and unchallenged. Also, passing along the responsibility of having this conversation allows those majority members to maintain their regularly-scheduled visible labor tasks, while this same time is taken away from the minority members. Regrettably, these may be reasons racial majority members do not engage in these transparent conversations about organizational wrongdoing and the racial identity of the recruit.

Assumed EEOC barrier. In addition to impression management being a deterrent from recruiters having the transparent conversation that includes the racial identity of the job candidate, another hurdle is present: One assumed legal barrier to recruitment during ROP are the laws enforced by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) that makes it illegal to discriminate in making hiring decisions based on individual identities such as race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, age, and other personal identities (Kramer, 2010). Many organizational members in the United States—especially human resource professionals— know not to ask these questions during the hiring process because improper communication can risk an EEOC report against the organization. However, EEOC rules do not prevent organizational members from discussing race and racism *after* hiring decisions and employment

offers have been made. Providing a ROP in this context is an instance of offering support and

aligning expectations on the basis of race (The Civil Rights Act, 1964). Again, EEOC

requirements do not apply to a ROP during pre-entry because a job candidate has already been

offered a position in the organization. Furthermore, according to Huq (2017), providing a ROP to

a candidate is legal because the *intent* of the conversation is to offer support to the potential

newcomer, not to discriminate in the hiring of new members. Therefore, the fear of violating

EEOC regulations is not based in legal precedence. Presumably, this EEOC barrier is an example

of people's fear of violating the law—a belief which may inadvertently prevent organizational

members from doing a moral good (Bisel, 2018). A lack of discussion about individual identities

caused by EEOC's assumed barrier and the need to manage impressions, can create a disconnect

between a job candidate's individual identity and potential organizational identity.

Short-Term Goals and Recruiter Image Management Goals of Organizational Socialization

The following section describes some short-term goals taken from the RJP, ROP and

organizational socialization literature (Kramer, 2010; Laker & Shimko, 1991) and recruiter

image management goals of organizations adapted from interpersonal and politeness literature

(Brown & Levinson, 1987; Locher & Watts, 2005), which are important for warranting the need

to provide minority job candidates with race-related ROPs. Specifically, as found in previous

literature mentioned in the organizational socialization section of this paper, organizations and

recruiters are likely motivated to achieve the short-term goals of organizational attraction,

motivation to join the organization, and intention to accept a job offer, and the recruiter image

management goals of perception of politeness and source credibility of the recruiter with the

socialization messages they provide to job candidates, and minority job candidates in particular.

Each of these goals correspond to dependent variables of interest to the present study and each are discussed in the following section.

Short-Term Organizational Goals: Promoting Organizational Attraction, Motivation to Join, and Intention to Accept a Job Offer

Despite the complexity of race-related discussions during the pre-entry period, recruiting and retaining Black graduate students and job candidates for assistantships is a widely-shared goal of many academic programs (Ford, Grantham, & Whiting, 2008; Karsten, 2013). To those ends, organizations and academic units likely have short-term goals of enhancing the attractiveness of their organization, motivating candidates to want to join, and encouraging minority candidates to accept a job offer, after an offer has been extended.

Minimal levels of identification are necessary for individuals to consider joining organizations. Scott, Corman, and Cheney (1998) described organizational identification as the degree or sense of oneness when an individual claims belongingness to a group. This identification also informs one's decision at each phase of the socialization model, including what type of career they choose, what organization they want to be a part of, their decision to accept a job offer and participate in the culture and expected behaviors of that organization, and their decision to stay with or leave an organization (Jablin, 1987; Kramer, 2010; Scott, Corman, & Cheney, 1998).

Identification is motivated by attraction to the organization and fear of isolation, wanting a sense of alignment with the rules and norms, and wanting to partake vicariously in the rewards and successes of the organization (Mael & Ashforth, 1992). Organizational identification is important because it can lead to organizational attraction, motivation to join, intention to accept a job offer, job satisfaction, job involvement, satisfaction with work, supervision, pay, and goal

32

achievement (Kramer, 2010; Riketta, 2008; Scott, Corman, & Cheney, 1998). These outcomes can also reduce intentions to turnover, because identification with organizations blurs the bounds of self-concept and makes individuals more persuaded to remain with the organization after organizational wrongdoing (Costigan, 1995; Scott, Corman, & Cheney, 1998) or even to defend its image to outsiders after wrongdoing (Ploeger & Bisel, 2013).

In the context of organizational identification, attraction, and intention to accept a job offer, social identity theory (SIT), places emphasis on personal identity and various social categories with which we may hold membership. In some cases, identification with one organization leads to disidentification with another (Kramer, 2010). Therefore, it is likely that personal and social identities interact, conflict, overlap, and influence each other (Alvesson, Ashcraft, & Thomas, 2008). To that end, the short-term organizational goals may be achieved with an acknowledgement of job candidates' personal identity that allows them to mesh tenured personal and potential organizational identities, which should lead to attraction to the organization, enhanced motivation to join, and intention to accept a job offer.

Image Management Goals of Recruiters: Achieving Perceptions of Politeness and Source Credibility

In addition to these short-term organizational goals, recruiters themselves likely have image management goals for their pre-entry interactions with minority job candidates. Specifically, recruiters likely intend to be perceived as following social norms about what tends to be said and how it is said to encourage politeness and afford familiarity with social norms (Fraser, 1990). In achieving the interpersonal goal of image management, conversational partners attempt to position themselves and each other in a way that avoids offending, insulting, or violating social norms (Fraser, 1990). An outcome of achieving image management goals is

identification with and perceived credibility of the recruiter and met expectations of interpersonal interactions.

The danger of voicing race-related ROPs after a job is offered can stem from the potential for face threat's relational implications. According to politeness theory, individuals have a universal need for positive self-regard (e.g., public image) and attempt to aid others in maintaining their public regard through facework and politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987). SIT explains that motivation to hold a positive regard is not only oriented to the self, but also to the groups in which we claim salient membership (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Further, SIT and politeness theory predicts that in order to reduce face threat and increase source credibility, individuals must aid others in maintaining a positive regard for the personal and social memberships they claim and wish to claim.

The previous section described the short-term and recruiter image management goals of organizational socialization during race-related ROPs. The question remains as to whether race-related ROPs given after a job offer will enhance or diminish the achievement of those goals. In the following section, the researcher explains how different theories invite us to expect divergent patterns of responses to ROP messaging. Social exchange theory, social identity theory, and politeness theory invite us to anticipate different kinds of reactions to recruitment messages involving race and which messages may lead to the best quality outcome for achieving recruiter image management goals. Once results are known, we can better understand which of those theories best explain how minority job candidates will likely respond to varying forms of race-related ROPs during offer consideration.

Social Exchange Theory, Social Identity Theory, Politeness Theory, and

Job Candidate's Reactions to Recruitment messages Involving Race

Saks and Ashforth (1997) argued that "there is no theory" of socialization (p. 235). Nevertheless, many socialization researchers study related factors in an attempt to demonstrate statistical relationships and predictive models of effective socialization practices. While there is no formalized theory of socialization, there are theoretical frameworks that guide many studies and the development of socialization models, most notably, Jablin's (1987) model. According to Jablin (1987) the process of socializing into an organization has four phases: anticipatory socialization, encounter, metamorphosis, and exit, which was explained earlier in this chapter. Waldeck and Myers (2007) and Kramer (2010) identify four primary theories that have been used to examine the organizational socialization process: social identity theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1985), uncertainty management theory (UMT), sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995), and social exchange theory (SET; Homans, 1958).

The following section contributes a theoretical foundation of the underpinnings of Jablin's (1987) model with additional elaboration on the anticipatory socialization phase. More attention is paid to social exchange theory and social identity theory as they are most pertinent to this study because they are most apt for potentially explaining what kinds of responses to expect from minority job candidates who receive race-related ROPs from recruiters. A final section describes a potential synthesis between SET and SIT—along with politeness theory—as a means of explaining potential reactions to socialization messaging regarding race.

Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory (SET) pertains to scholarship that focuses on how individuals weigh the costs and benefits of their decision to select, enter, maintain, and end social

relationships and organizational prospects (Kramer & Miller, 2014). During anticipatory

socialization, individuals compare the costs and benefits of selecting alternative careers and

organizations. A consideration of factors such as salary, time off, intellectual freedom, taint of

the type of job, and upward mobility (Kramer & Miller, 2014; Parker, 2003) may influence their

decision. Allen (1996) suggests a person's ethnicity, socioeconomic status, family dynamics, and

race are also important factors in this decision. If that person was raised by a mechanic and

cannot afford a television, it is likely that the individual will not have the opportunity to see other

job or careers as options, other than a mechanic (Lucas, 2011).

In regards to anticipatory organizational socialization, individuals may weigh the culture,

location of the organization, comparison level of alternatives, and potential experiences based on

their personal identities as a pro or con in their decision to join (Kramer, 2010). The present

study does not focus on location or a comparison level of alternatives. Instead, the study will

focus on the influence race-related ROPs from recruiters have on job candidates' intention to

accept an offer and join the organization. Job candidates' potential experience based on their

personal identities will be included in some of the recruitment messaging for this study. In this

example, social exchange theory applies as minority job candidates may consider the costs and

benefits of attaining and maintaining organizational memberships, depending on their

experiences. As previously mentioned, experiences of discrimination, isolation, and ethnic

incompatibility may warrant weighing those costs over the benefits of salary, status, and

intellectual freedom (Allen, Orbe, & Olivas, 1999; Parker, 2003).

Taking a SET perspective leads us to expect that pre-entry recruitment messages that

involve explicit mention of racial identity and the potential for negative experiences or

challenges due to one's racial identity will make the organization less attractive or *un*attractive to

36

Black recruits. From an AOS perspective, imagine a hypothetical scenario of a job candidate who was recently offered employment in an organization. While considering joining the organization, the candidate is invited for a day of meeting other candidates, touring the facility, chatting with potential supervisors, and learning what to expect. From a SET perspective, mentioning racial identity implicitly or explicitly could result in the recruiter confirming that racism is possible, creating an immediate interpersonal violation, and creating a deep imbalance towards cost and away from benefits of joining. In other words, a SET perspective might encourage organizational recruiters to refrain from mentioning racial identity to avoid these negative outcomes. A weakness of the SET perspective is that it does not communicate what to expect from the recruiter's racial identity as it pertains to the aforementioned outcomes.

Social Identity Theory

In contrast, another major theoretical foundation of the socialization model is Tajfel and Turner's (1985) social identity theory, which may suggest that minority job candidates would respond favorably to a recruitment message that includes their racial identity. According to social identity theory, individuals have personal identities that are less voluntary (e.g., physical, psychological, personality) and social identities, which can be claimed voluntarily (e.g., group or organizational membership; Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Together, these identities explain how individuals come to know who they are as a product of personal and social memberships they claim. These sets of identities overlap, interact, and influence each other (Alvesson, Ashcraft, & Thomas, 2008). Job candidates are most likely to claim membership in new groups when they are able to add their social identities that complement, as oppose to challenge or conflict with, existing and salient group memberships and which offer the opportunity to partake in group accomplishments vicariously.

37

Additionally, each identity is characterized by its tenure (i.e., length of time that a specific identity has been part of the self). For example, the identities we are born *with* and *into* (e.g., sex, race, gender, ethnicity) may have the longest tenure. These engrained and tenured individual identities may have an influence on our ability to adjoin additional identities (e.g., organizational identity). The salience of ethnic identity is a potential confounding variable that influences the experience of organizational members. Accordingly, ethnic identity salience is used as a control variable in the present study.

Along the lines of identity salience, there is a potential for Black candidates to identify stronger with the organization when being recruited by another organizational member who shares the same or similar racial identity as them (Settles, Buchanan, & Dotson, 2018). This pairing will allow for firsthand discussions of one's potential experience with the organizational members, institution, and greater community. Due to the initial commonality of shared racial identity, the researcher notes a potential for candidates to prefer a race-related ROP recruitment message from a Black recruiter.

During the initial interactions with organizational members, researchers argue that understanding ulterior motives for being hired due to one's personal identity can greatly affect that person's understanding of their "position" in the organization and can set realistic expectations for their experience (Allen, 1998; Allen, Orbe, & Olivas, 1999; Parker, 2003). In Allen's case, once she joined the organization she learned that she was hired partly due to the university's image of being racist. The assumption is that by hiring a Black professor, their image will look better. Due to this reasoning, Allen had a traumatic experience as her peers viewed her as unqualified, not credible, and a "twofer" hire (race and gender), resulting in unexpected experiences of discrimination (Allen, 1996). Though a ROP may not have changed Allen's

experience, the met expectations due to the ROP are "hypothesized to lead to increased coping ability and increased appreciation of the organization for being honest" (Costigan, 1995, p. 10).

Referring back to the hypothetical scenario of a job candidate who was recently offered employment in an organization. From a SIT perspective, a recruitment message during this scenario would mention race and racism explicitly. The explicitness of the message would allow for the recruiter to invite the job candidate's personal identity to begin meshing with existing and salient group memberships of the organization. The recruiter would mention the candidate's *racial identity* and express *concern* that the candidate will have a *negative* experience. However, this explicit message would, in certain terms, acknowledge that members of the organization *absolutely do not tolerate racism* and will offer support to the candidate in such events. To be clear, the intention of a race-related ROP should not dwell solely on the social identity of the recruit, nor should it dwell on past organizational wrongdoing. However, an absence of these topics can disconfirm, deny, and strip away tenured identities (e.g., race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability; Dallimore, 2003), and can create a disconnect between the person and the organization, diminishing organizational fit, if the "person" is absent in the equation.

Yet, inclusion of one's personal identity in race-related ROPs can have implications. Linguistically, mentioning one's identity is fraught with danger because, on one hand, it can fail to achieve recruiter image management goals (i.e., credibility and politeness) and short-term organizational goals (i.e., organizational attraction, motivation to join, and intention to accept offer) by signaling to the candidate that the membership will be difficult; however, on the other hand, if the recruiter does not mention candidates' identity, conjecture and speculation can occur and can be accompanied by negative outcomes. In addition, outcomes may be influenced by the personal identity of the recruiter.

Taking a SIT perspective, leads us to expect that pre-entry recruitment messages that involve explicit and unambiguous mention of racial identity and the potential for negative experiences or challenges due to one's racial identity will make the organization more attractive to minority job candidates and may act as a springboard for future conversations pertaining to race and social injustice. In addition, mentioning racial identity explicitly can result in the candidate interpreting that the recruiter intends to provide support for the potential organizational experience garnered by that identity. Though this message may draw attention to the costs of racism, concurrently it draws attention to the benefit of the organization's eagerness to support the candidate as an organizational member. In other words, a SIT perspective might encourage organizational recruiters to mention, unambiguously, the recruit's racial identity in order to foster positive outcomes of organizational attraction, motivation to join, intention to accept the job offer, message politeness, and source credibility.

Social Identity Theory, Social Exchange Theory, and Politeness Theory

The intellectual puzzle of race-related ROPs during offer consideration, however, may be resolved with reference to a combination of three theories: SIT, SET, *and* politeness theory. To recap thus far, while SIT may allow us to anticipate minority job candidates would respond favorably to a recruitment message that includes their racial identity; yet, a SET perspective leads us to expect explicit mention of racial identity and the potential for negative experiences due to one's racial identity may make the organization less attractive or *un*attractive to Black recruits. A resolution to these divergent explanations, may be addressed by a third puzzle piece, politeness theory, in combination with SIT and SET, to help recruiters manage this complex conversation.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory argues that everyone has a public self-image (i.e., *face*) and depending on the actions of the other interactant, one's *face* can be bolstered, maintained, or threatened. Generally, a *positive face* is a desire to be treated in a kind and friendly manner. A *positive face* interaction can bolster or maintain one's face by expressing appreciation or approval by the other member(s) in the interaction (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Locher & Watts, 2005). Generally, *negative face* is a desire to be treated as though one has rights over their person and property (i.e., to remain unimpeded). A *negative face* interaction can threaten one's face by imposing on the interactant by negatively violating expectations and infringing on one's freedom of action and freedom from imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Locher & Watts, 2005). A race-related ROP is fraught with danger as an interaction without proper messaging can threaten the face of the recruiter and job candidate.

An erasure of one's personal identities can be face threatening and detrimental to the individual candidate as they are not usually able to mesh their personal identity with that of the organization and they may experience a violation of expectations when it comes to their potential experience. On the other hand, too harsh of a recruitment message about one's personal and social memberships can result in face threat that impedes one's ability or willingness to mesh identities with that of the organization. However, a positive interaction that saves the face of both members of the interaction can lead to positive outcomes. A combination of politeness theory, SIT and SET could help recruiters manage this complex conversation.

Referring back to the hypothetical scenario of a job candidate who was recently offered employment in an organization. From a perspective that combines SET, SIT, and politeness, a recruitment message during this scenario would mention race and racism implicitly, not explicitly. Instead of *racial* identity, the recruiter would mention the candidate's *personal*

identity and express *awareness* that the candidate may have a *different* experience. However, this implicit message would, in less certain terms, acknowledge that members of the organization *are invested in their experience* and will offer support to the candidate in such events.

In this example, by mentioning the potential experience based on one's personal identity, it is less of a cost (as compared to an explicit message involving race and the potential for racism) because the candidate is aware of the possibility of racism already, and adding politeness to the message may somewhat mitigate the face threat of the immediate interaction. In other words, by relaying the message politely, the recruiter is not costing as much in terms of face violation and is simultaneously making room for the personal identity of the student (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

If we know, from SET messages, that not including one's racial identity (i.e., absent message) can achieve recruiter image management goals, and according to SIT messages that unambiguously include one's racial identity (i.e., explicit message) can achieve short-term organizational goals, by implementing politeness theory to find the balance between SET and SIT (i.e., implicit message) that utilizes euphemisms and indirectness but still pertains to the personal identity of the recruit, a combination of all three theories can predict the attainment of recruiter image management goals, and achieve short-term goals of organizational attraction, motivation to join, and perception of message politeness, and goals of retention and potentially a willingness to speak up in the long run. An example of this implicit message is referring to one's *personal identity* instead of racial identity, and potentially *experiencing concerns* instead of experiencing racism.

The section on recruiter image management goals served to provide and justify the importance of the five outcomes of a ROP message: organizational attraction, motivation to join

the organization, intention to accept the job offer, perception of message politeness, and source credibility. Social exchange theory, social identity theory, and a combination of the two with the addition of politeness theory serve to predict which outcomes will result depending on the explicitness of the race-related ROP message. The following hypotheses utilizes both aforementioned sections and makes predictions of main effects and interaction effects of the independent variables (i.e., race of speaker and message explicitness) and the five dependent variables (i.e., five outcomes). These hypotheses will lead into the third chapter, which is a discussion of the power analysis, participants, experimental design and procedures, and measures.

Hypotheses

Main Effects: ROP Message Explicitness about Race and Racism

H1a: Black candidates given an implicit recruitment message have more **organizational attraction** towards a recruiting organization (i.e., graduate program) as compared to those given a message-absent of race, who will in turn, be more attracted to the program than those given an explicit recruitment message.

H1b: Black candidates given an implicit recruitment message are more **motivated to join** a recruiting organization (i.e., graduate program) as compared to those given a message-absent of race, who will in turn, be more motivated to join the program than those given an explicit recruitment message.

H1c: Black candidates given an explicit recruitment message are less **likely to accept the job offer** from the recruiting organization as compared to those given an implicit message, who in turn, are more likely to accept than those given no message related to race.

H1d: Black candidates given an implicit recruitment message perceive the message as more

   polite as compared to those given a message-absent of race, who in turn, perceive the

   message as more polite than those given an explicit recruitment message.

H1e: Black candidates given an implicit recruitment message perceive the **source as more**

   credible as compared to those given a message-absent of race, who in turn, perceive the

   source as more credible than those given an explicit recruitment message.

Main Effects: Recruiter Identity

H2a: Black candidates have more **organizational attraction** towards a recruiting organization

   (i.e., graduate program) with a Black male recruiter as compared to a White male recruiter.

H2b: Black candidates are more **motivated to join** a recruiting organization (i.e., graduate

   program) with a Black male recruiter as compared to a White male recruiter.

H2c: Black candidates are more **likely to accept the job offer** from the recruiting organization

   (i.e., graduate program) with a Black male recruiter as compared to one with a White male

   recruiter.

H2d: Black candidates perceive a recruitment message from a Black male recruiter as more

   polite than a one voiced by a White male recruiter.

H2e: Black candidates perceive a Black male recruiter as more **credible** than a White male

   recruiter.

Interaction Effects

H3a: Speaker identity and message explicitness interact, such that Black candidates report

greatest **organizational attraction** to the Black Recruiter *and* implicit recruitment message as

compared to all other combinations of race and explicitness.

H3b: Speaker identity and message explicitness interact, such that Black candidates report greatest **motivation to join** the recruiting organization (i.e., graduate program) in the Black recruiter *and* implicit recruitment message as compared to all other combinations of race and explicitness.

H3c: Speaker identity and message explicitness interact, such that Black candidates report the greatest **likelihood to accept the job offer** to the Black Recruiter *and* implicit recruitment message as compared to all other combinations of race and explicitness.

H3d: Speaker identity and message explicitness interact, such that Black candidates perceive the greatest **message politeness** in the Black Recruiter *and* implicit recruitment message as compared to all other combinations of race and explicitness.

H3e: Speaker identity and message explicitness interact, such that Black candidates perceive the greatest **source credibility** of the Black Recruiter *and* implicit recruitment message as compared to all other combinations of race and explicitness.

Chapter 3: Method

Power Analysis

  To determine the number of participants needed for this study, an a priori power analysis using G*Power was conducted. Four power calculations were computed with the power level set at .80 and the alpha level set at .05. Each computation was conducted for an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), yielding a sample size requirement. The power calculation with the effect size set at .10 indicated a needed sample size of 969. A second power calculation with a .15 effect size yielded a needed sample size of 432. The third power calculation with a .20 effect size yielded a needed sample size of 246. To balance the projected effect size, limitations of the race-based inclusion criteria for sample, and financial constraints associated with compensating participants, the sample size goal for this study was set to 246.

Participants

  An online survey platform was used to collect data. Participants were recruited via Amazon's Mechanical Turk® (MTurk) crowdsourcing service. In order to participate, MTurk participants needed a 95% approval rating from previous participation on MTurk. Buhrmester, Kwang, and Gosling's (2011) argued that MTurk data "met or exceeded the psychometric standards associated with published research" (p. 5). Researchers have also observed that data sets drawn from this crowdsourcing service tend to represent diverse samples in terms of age and income, but not necessarily race (Berinsky, Huber, & Lenz, 2012).

  Eligible participants followed a link to access the study survey which was hosted on Qualtrics. All participants provided informed consent before participating, as required by the Institutional Review Board to ensure ethical research practices were planned and implemented. If participants met the eligibility requirements and completed the study with genuine answers,

without rushing through the survey, they were compensated $3 for their time and participation in this study.

As a requirement for involvement, participants had to self-identify as Black or African American, had to have attended some college, be 18 years old or older, and must reside in the United States (U.S.). A sample of 505 Black identifying adults participated in this study. After removing participants who failed to answer the four attention verification questions accurately, who were significantly above or below the average time of survey completion, and those with excessive missing data, the final sample after data cleaning consisted of 338 participants. The sample included 210 males, 125 females, one transgender male, and one participant identified as both male and female. The sample included the following sexual identities: 225 heterosexual/straight, six homosexual/gay/lesbian, 67 bisexual, four asexual, and three sexual orientations not listed. Participants' age ranged from 18 to 74 years of age ($M = 34.51$, $SD = 8.73$) and lived in 35 states, with the largest amount of participants residing in California, ($n = 58$) and New York ($n = 33$).

Participants were also asked to describe their disability/ability status. Results include 247 did not identify with a disability or impairment, 22 with a sensory impairment (vision or hearing), 11 with a learning disability (e.g., ADHD, dyslexia), 12 with a long-term medical illness (e.g., epilepsy, cystic fibrosis), 24 with a mobility impairment, 13 with a mental health diagnosis, four with a temporary impairment due to illness or injury (e.g., broken ankle, surgery), and three with a disability or impairment not listed.

The sample included education levels ranging from some college to a doctorate degree, with bachelor's degree as the most common educational level (50.6%). Of this sample, 34.7% has been in the position of considering graduate admission to a predominately White institution.

Participants' total work experience ranged from 0 to 53 years, ($M = 10.11$, $SD = 8.88$) with 58.6% having supervisory experience. See footnote for pilot study information regarding demographic information and manipulation checks conducted on speaking identity, message explicitness, situational realism, and message realism. [1]

Design

The messaging-processing experiment utilized a hypothetical scenario that involved a socialization experience of a Black graduate student who is already accepted into a graduate department at a predominately White institution as a student *and* offered compensation as an employee (i.e., graduate assistantship). The study followed a 2 (Black male recruiter vs. White male recruiter) × 3 (absent, explicit, and implicit racial recruitment message) design. The recruitment messages were crafted in consultation with one attorney and one university's Equal Employment Opportunity Officer and Title IX coordinator. Their consensus is that such messages are legal *as well as* desirable for remediating past rhetorical absences associated with racial diversity in the workplace, and likely rare.

Though the recruitment messages were crafted in consultation with professionals, it is important to highlight the advantages and disadvantages to using hypothetical scenarios for conducting research. Martin (2006) found that scenarios allow the researcher to manipulate the independent variables studied, while minimizing the influence of extraneous variables. As a result, scenarios can keep participants focused on the specific variables that are being manipulated (i.e., recruiter race and message explicitness regarding race). Ethical considerations were made when choosing this method because a face-to-face interaction would be difficult to employ and an observation of a recruitment experience, especially in relation to the racially-explicit message condition, could be problematic. However, when using scenarios, a concern is

that the recruitment messages may not be realistic to the participants, if it is difficult for participants to imagine themselves in those situations. Therefore, questions regarding the perceived realism were asked of participants in the study (See Appendix C). The results of the realism test were successful, and are reported below in the measures section.

First, all participants read, "You will be asked to reflect on a specific message before indicating your level of agreement with multiple statements. Please read the message carefully before you advance through the survey." Then, participants were randomly assigned to one of the following six conditions: Black male recruiter/absent recruitment message (message word count: $n = 9$), Black male recruiter/implicit recruitment message (message word count: $n = 68$), Black male recruiter/explicit recruitment message (message word count: $n = 67$), White male recruiter/absent recruitment message (message word count: $n = 9$), White male recruiter/implicit recruitment message (message word count: $n = 68$), or White male recruiter/explicit recruitment message (message word count: $n = 67$). Messages were crafted to reflect increasingly greater levels of explicitness in reference to the racial identity of the recruit. After reviewing one of the randomly assigned recruitment message (see Appendix B for list of messages), participants then responded to a series of questions about the recruiter and how the recruitment message influenced their perception of organizational attractiveness, student motivation to join the department, perceived message politeness, source credibility, and intention to accept the job offer (see details for each measure below). All means and standard deviations of dependent variables are located in the correlation matrix in Table 8.

Measures

Manipulation checks. Manipulation checks were conducted to ensure that participants perceived the racial identity of the department recruiter and the recruiter's message consistent with the condition to which they were randomly assigned.

Perception of speaker identity. To ensure participants perceived the message originated from a department recruiter with a specific racial identity (i.e., Black or White), participants responded to a two-item, 7-point Likert-type measure (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Scale statements include "The recruiter is WHITE," and "The recruiter is BLACK." The first scale (i.e., recruiter is WHITE) item was reverse coded. An independent samples t-test was computed utilizing the two items of the scale. As anticipated, results revealed that participants assigned to the Black recruiter conditions (M = 5.92; SD = 1.39) agreed significantly more with manipulation check items than participants assigned to the White recruiter condition (M = 2.34; SD = 1.51), $t(336)$ = 22.68, $p < .01$. Thus, the racial identity of the speaker was successfully manipulated by the experimental materials. Cronbach's alpha indicated excellent reliability, a = .84.

Message explicitness about race and racism. Second, to ensure participants perceived the nature of the recruitment message as implicit and explicit about racism, participants completed a four-item, 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include: "The recruiter's message is explicit about racism" and reverse coded items such as "The recruiter's message is indirect about racism" (See Appendix C for all scale items). There was no manipulation check for those in the race-absent message conditions because they did not receive a ROP recruitment message. As anticipated, results revealed that participants assigned to the explicit message condition (M = 4.73; SD = 1.85) agreed

significantly more with manipulation check items than participants assigned to the implicit message condition (M = 3.62; SD = 1.25), $t(222)$ = -5.26, $p < .01$. Thus, the explicitness of the race-related ROP message was successfully manipulated by the experimental materials. Cronbach's alpha indicated excellent reliability, a = .84.

Covariate. Phinney's (1992) one-factor, 12-item multigroup ethnic identity measure (MEIM) was used to assess ethnic identity across ethnic groups. The survey measures a sense of attachment or belonging, achieved identity, and involvement in ethnic practices (Phinney, 1992). The first 12 Likert scale items were measured on a 7-point Likert-type measure (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include, "I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group" and "I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group" (See Appendix K for all scale items). The measure has been found to be both valid and reliable in previous studies (Adams, Kurtz-Costes, & Hoffman, 2016; Roberts, et al., 1999). Cronbach's alpha indicated excellent reliability, α = .94.

Dependent variables. The five dependent variables measured in this study were organizational attractiveness, student motivation to join the organization, perception of message politeness, intention to accept the offer, and source credibility.

Organizational attractiveness. Participants completed an adapted version of Highhouse, Lievens, and Sinar's (2003) three-factor, twenty-one item Organizational Attractiveness Scale (OAS). The scale examined the three components of organizational attraction (i.e., attractiveness, intentions, and prestige) that have received the most attention in research on organization choice. The scale was used to capture participants' perception of departmental attractiveness when considering entry into a graduate studies program as a student and employee. Each item is measured on a 7-point Likert-type measure (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample

items include, "For me, this department would be a good place to study and work." and "I would make this department one of my first choices as a graduate student" (See Appendix D for all scale items). High scores on the measure indicate high perceptions of organizational attractiveness. The measure has been found to be both valid and reliable in previous studies (Anderson, Ahmed, & Costa, 2012; Lievens, Van Hoye, & Anseel, 2007). However, to date, the author is unaware of any published organizational communication study that employs the measure. Cronbach's Alpha indicated excellent reliability, $\alpha = .97$.

Student motivation to join. An adapted version of Christophel's (1990) Student Motivation Scale (SMS) was used. Participants complete a condensed version, including items 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, and 16 of the original scale. The scale was reduced to the 8-items that were most applicable to the study elements and experimental scenario about joining the department. Sample items included: "Motivated/Unmotivated" and "Dreading it/Looking forward to it" (See Appendix E for all scale items). The measure has been found to be both valid and reliable in previous studies (Christophel, 1990; Goldman, Goodboy, & Weber, 2017: Richmond, 1990). Cronbach's Alpha indicated excellent reliability, $\alpha = .92$.

Perception of message politeness. An original six-item Likert scale was developed to measure participants' perception of politeness about a message delivered by the department recruiter of an organization (i.e., a graduate program). Each item is measured on a 7-point Likert-type measure (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include, "The recruiter was polite" and "The recruiter's message felt like an attack on me" (reverse coded; See Appendix F for all scale items). Higher scores indicate perceptions of high levels of message politeness and low levels of face threat. Cronbach's Alpha indicated excellent reliability, $\alpha = .91$. Results of an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) are reported in the Results section.

Intention to accept the offer. An original seven-item Likert scale was developed to measure participants' intention to accept the offer presented to them by the departmental recruiter of an organization (i.e., graduate program). Example statements are, "I intend to accept this offer" and, "I am likely to say yes to this offer" (See Appendix L). The response format was a 7-point Likert scale with 1 = *not at all likely* to 7 = *extremely likely*. Cronbach's Alpha indicated excellent reliability, $\alpha = .87$. Results of an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) are reported in the Results section.

Source credibility. Eleven items from McCroskey's (1966) 12-item perceived leader credibility scale were used to measure participants' perception of the departmental recruiter's credibility (See Appendix G for all scale items). Items were measured on a 7-point semantic differential scale. Sample adjective pairs include "pleasant/unpleasant" and "honest/dishonest." The measure has been found to be both valid and reliable in previous studies (Holmes & Parker, 2017; Teven, 2007). Cronbach's Alpha indicated excellent reliability, $\alpha = .93$.

Chapter 4: Results

Data Preparation

Incomplete questionnaires, those completed in significantly less time than the average completion time, or questionnaires that were completed with poor quality answers (i.e., space fillers such as "blah" or "I don't know" for open-ended questions, marking only one answer type for scale answers, such as 4,4,4,4,4,4, or incorrectly answering validation questions) were not compensated and removed from the dataset prior to analysis. Additionally, duration of time spent completing the survey was determined by a stem and leaf plot which identified one extreme case that was removed. Of the initial sample of 505 participants, 167 participants were removed, which left a total of 338 participants for the final sample.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory factor analyses (EFA) were used to assess the scale items for the covariate and the five dependent variables of interest. The adequacy of all six variable scales for EFA was assessed using The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity (see Table 1 for report). Next, an EFA was conducted for each scale in SPSS with the maximum likelihood estimation method, without rotation, with all items in a scale forced into one factor extracted, and by suppressing the display of any loadings whose value was less than .40 (Beavers et. al., 2013; Nunnally, 1978).

Overall, five scales had Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure's values above .90, indicating a marvelous value for factor analysis, and one scale (intention to accept offer) was middling, but acceptable because it was above the commonly recommended value of .60 (Beavers, et. al., 2013; Kaiser, 1974). Also, the percentage of variance for all scales range from 50.13% to 64.04%. The majority of scholars suggest that 75 – 90% of the variance should be accounted for

(Garson, 2010; Pett et al., 2003). However, some indicate that as little as 50% of the variance explained is acceptable. Due to four scales having variance levels below 60%, this latter recommendation was followed. The following paragraphs provide the results of the EFA for all scales of interest.

Ethnic Identity (Covariate). For the ethnic identity covariate, Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure's value was .94, and Bartlett's test of sphericity, which was significant, $\chi^2(66) = 2816.46$, $p < .001$, indicating factor analysis was adequate for these data. Twelve items loaded exclusively on one factor. The non-rotated factor matrix produced a one-factor solution, which explained 59.43% of variance and after computing the scale's reliability based on Cronbach alpha and the value of that was .94

Organizational attractiveness. For organizational attractiveness measure, the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure's value was .97, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(210) = 6239.64$, $p < .001$, indicating factor analysis was adequate for these data. However, twenty of the twenty-one items loaded above a .40 on one factor and the scale explained 61.38% of variance. Due to a factor loading less than .40 the 2nd item ("I would not be interested in this department except as a last resort") was removed from the scale and the revised twenty item measure was used. The final Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure's value was .97, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(190) = 6189.08$, $p < .001$. The final twenty item scale was deemed appropriate and explained 64.04% of variance.

Student motivation to join. For student motivation to join measure, the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure's value was .92, and Bartlett's test of sphericity, which was significant, $\chi^2(28) = 1744.79$, $p < .001$, indicating factor analysis was adequate for these data. All eight items loaded

exclusively on one factor. Therefore, all eight items were deemed appropriate and explained 58.50% of the variance.

Perception of message politeness. For perception of message politeness measure, the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure's value was .91, and Bartlett's test of sphericity, which was significant, $\chi^2(15) = 1270.87$, $p < .001$, indicating factor analysis was adequate for these data. All six items loaded exclusively on one factor. Therefore, all six items were deemed appropriate and explained 63.45% of variance.

Intention to accept the offer. For intention to accept the offer measure, the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure's value was .83, and Bartlett's test of sphericity, which was significant, $\chi^2(21) = 1831.97$, $p < .001$, indicating factor analysis was adequate for these data. However, six of the seven items loaded above a .40 on one factor and the scale explained 46.10% of variance. Due to less than 50% of variance explained and a factor loading less than .40, the 7th item ("I would join this department") was removed from the scale and the revised 6 item measure was used. The final Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure's value was .78, and Bartlett's test of sphericity, which was significant, $\chi^2(15) = 1484.85$, $p < .001$. The final six item scale was deemed appropriate and explained 50.13% of variance.

Source credibility. For source credibility measure, the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure's value was .93, and Bartlett's test of sphericity, which was significant, $\chi^2(55) = 2352.60$, $p < .001$, indicating factor analysis was adequate for these data. All eleven items loaded exclusively on one factor. Therefore, all eleven items were deemed appropriate and explained 53.65% of variance.

Table 1
Reliability Tests of Surveys

| Scale | Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure | Exploratory Factor Analysis Table | | | | Cronbach's Alpha |
		Bartlett's Chi-Square	Bartlett's *df*	Bartlett's *p*-value	% of Variance	α
Ethnic Identity	.94	2816.46	66	.000	55.82	.94
Student Motivation	.92	1744.79	28	.000	58.50	.92
Source Credibility	.93	2352.60	55	.000	53.65	.93
Perception of Politeness	.91	1270.87	15	.000	63.45	.91
Intention to Accept Offer Initial[a]	.83	1831.97	21	.000	46.10	-
Intention to Accept Offer **Revised**	.78	1484.85	15	.000	50.13	.87
Organizational Attraction Initial[a]	.97	6239.64	210	.000	61.38	-
Organizational Attraction **Revised**	.97	6189.08	190	.000	64.04	.97

Note. [a] = includes items with loading less than .4

MANCOVA

A one-way multiple analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was computed to test all hypotheses including speaker identity and message explicitness as independent variables, organizational attraction, motivation to join, intention to accept job offer, message politeness, and source credibility were set as dependent variables, with ethnic identity as the covariate (see complete Table at the end of this section). First, H1a-e involved participants' preference for message explicitness about race and racism (i.e., control, implicit, and explicit). The MANCOVA also provided evidence that explicitness of the of race-related ROP message was significant, $F(10, 652) = 2.13$, $p < .05$, Wilk's $\lambda = .94$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$, showing there was a significant difference between preferences for the control, implicit, and explicit messages across the dependent variables and confirms responses are consistent with assigned conditions. Then, H1a-e was analyzed whether the individual F test was significant for each dependent variable. Results revealed that all were significant: Student motivation to join, $F(2, 330) = 7.77$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$, organizational attraction, $F(2, 330) = 7.72$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$, speaker credibility, $F(2, 330) = 3.19$, $p = .04$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, message politeness, $F(2, 330) = 4.16$, $p = .02$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$, and intention to accept the offer, $F(2, 330) = 6.98$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$. Subsequent pairwise comparisons were used to test each of the predictions of H1a-e.

Organizational Attraction (3 x 2 Design)

H1a stated that Black participants who were given an implicit race-related ROP recruitment message would have more **organizational attraction** towards a recruiting organization (i.e., graduate program) as compared to those given a message-absent of race, who would in turn, be more attracted to the program than those given an explicit recruitment message. Results were partially supported revealing no significant difference in organizational attraction

between the implicit recruitment message ($M = 5.50$, $SD = .10$) and the message absent of race

($M = 5.56$, $SD = .10$), $p = 1.00$. However, results indicated that the message absent of race related

to participants having more attraction to the program than those participants assigned to the

recruitment message which was explicit in its race-related ROP ($M = 5.07$, $SD = .10$), $p = .001$.

Table 2 (3 x 2 Design) Organizational Attraction

	Control			Implicit			Explicit			All		
	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*
Black Speaker	5.54	1.07	61	5.40	1.07	53	5.06	1.31	54	5.33	1.15	168
White Speaker	5.58	1.05	53	5.62	0.88	59	5.03	1.26	57	5.41	1.06	169
All	5.56	1.06	114	5.52	0.97	112	5.04	1.28	111	5.37	1.10	337

(Message Explicitness Condition spans the Control, Implicit, and Explicit column groups)

Motivation to Join (3 x 2 Design)

H1b states, Black participants who were given an implicit race-related ROP recruitment

message are more **motivated to join** a recruiting organization (i.e., graduate program) as

compared to those given a message-absent of race, who would in turn, be more motivated to join

the program than those given an explicit recruitment message. Results were partially supported

revealing no significant difference in motivation to join between the implicit recruitment

message ($M = 5.04$, $SD = 0.08$) and the message absent of race ($M = 5.14$, $SD = 0.08$), $p = 1.00$.

However, results indicated that participants assigned to the message absent of a race-related ROP

were more motivated to join the program than participants assigned to the recruitment message

condition that was explicit about race ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 0.08$), $p = .001$.

Table 3 (3 x 2 Design) Student Motivation to Join

	Message Explicitness Condition											
	Control			Implicit			Explicit			All		
	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*
Black Speaker	5.17	0.79	61	5.06	0.85	53	4.74	1.04	54	4.99	2.68	168
White Speaker	5.10	0.77	53	5.06	0.71	59	4.70	0.99	57	4.95	0.82	169
All	5.14	0.78	114	5.06	0.78	112	4.72	1.01	111	4.97	1.75	337

Intention to Accept the Job Offer (3 x 2 Design)

H1c states, Black participants given an explicit race-related ROP recruitment message are less **likely to accept the job offer** from the recruiting organization as compared to those given an implicit message, who in turn, were more likely to accept than those given no message related to race. Results were partially supported revealing a significant difference in the intent to accept the offer between the explicit recruitment message ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 0.11$) and the implicit recruitment message ($M = 5.12$, $SD = 0.11$), $p = .03$. Also, results indicated no significant difference in the pattern of participants' intention to accept the offer between the implicit recruitment message and a message absent of race ($M = 5.28$, $SD = 0.11$), $p = .899$.

Table 4 (3 x 2 Design) Intention to Accept Offer

	Message Explicitness Condition											
	Control			Implicit			Explicit			All		
	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*
Black Speaker	5.41	1.18	61	5.06	1.30	53	4.76	1.51	54	5.08	1.33	168
White Speaker	5.16	1.27	53	5.21	1.13	59	4.59	1.28	57	4.99	1.23	169
All	5.29	1.22	114	5.14	1.21	112	4.67	1.39	111	5.03	1.28	337

Perception of Message Politeness (3 x 2 Design)

H1d states, Black participants given an implicit race-related ROP recruitment message perceive the message as more **polite** as compared to those given a message-absent of race, who

in turn, perceived the message as more polite than those given an explicit recruitment message. Results were partially supported indicating no significant difference between perception of message politeness by those given an implicit recruitment message ($M = 5.63$, $SD = 0.09$) and those given a message-absent of race ($M = 5.58$, $SD = 0.09$), $p = 1.00$. Also, results indicated no significant difference between perception of message politeness by those given a message absent of race and those given an explicit recruitment message ($M = 5.27$, $SD = 0.09$), $p = .060$.

Table 5 (3 x 2 Design) Perception of Message Politeness

	Message Explicitness Condition											
	Control			Implicit			Explicit			All		
	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*
Black Speaker	5.55	0.92	61	5.58	1.06	53	5.31	1.42	54	5.48	1.13	168
White Speaker	5.62	0.89	53	5.71	0.97	59	5.19	1.22	57	5.51	1.03	169
All	5.58	0.91	114	5.65	1.01	112	5.25	1.32	111	5.50	1.08	337

Perception of Speaker Credibility (3 x 2 Design)

H1e states, Black participants given an implicit race-related ROP recruitment message perceive the **source as more credible** as compared to those given a message-absent of race, who in turn, perceived the source as more credible than those given an explicit recruitment message. Results were partially supported indicating no significant difference between perception of source credibility for those given an implicit recruitment message ($M = 5.02$, $SD = 0.07$) and those given a message-absent of race ($M = 5.04$, $SD = 0.07$), $p = 1.00$. Also, results indicate no significant difference between perception of source credibility for those given a message-absent of race and those given an explicit recruitment message ($M = 4.81$, $SD = 0.07$), $p = .070$.

Table 6 (3 x 2 Design) Source Credibility

	Message Explicitness Condition											
	Control			Implicit			Explicit			All		
	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*n*
Black Speaker	5.05	0.82	61	5.06	0.81	53	4.89	1.02	54	5.00	0.88	168
White Speaker	5.03	0.68	53	5.01	0.73	59	4.70	0.82	57	4.91	0.74	169
All	5.04	0.75	114	5.03	0.77	112	4.79	0.92	111	4.95	0.81	337

Next, MANCOVA results for the hypotheses 2a-2e involved participants' preference for speaker identity, which was hypothesized to favor the Black recruiter over the White recruiter on the dependent variables. As mentioned above, the overall MANCOVA test was not significant for speaker identity, $F(5, 326) = .85$, $p = .51$, Wilk's $\lambda = .99$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$ showing there was no significant difference between preference for the race of the speaker, which confirms responses are consistent with assigned conditions.

The MANCOVA also tested the interaction effect for hypotheses 3a-3e involving how speaker identity and message explicitness about race and racism interact on the dependent variables of motivation to join, organizational attraction, speaker credibility, message politeness, and intention to accept the offer. No significant results emerged for the interaction between speaker identity and explicitness of race-related ROP message for H3a-e, $F(10, 652) = .57$, $p = .84$, Wilk's $\lambda = .98$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$ on dependent variables. Therefore, no further analyses were conducted as the hypothesis was not supported.

Multigroup ethnic identity measure (MEIM). Phinney's (1992) one-factor, 12-item ethnic identity covariate was significant, $F(5, 326) = 18.43$, $p < .001$, Wilk's $\lambda = .78$, partial $\eta^2 = .22$, meaning there were significant differences in the means across levels of the dependent variable across the message explicitness conditions.

Table 7 MANCOVA Results

Scale	Recruitment Message Absent of Race		Implicit Recruitment Message		Explicit Recruitment Message	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Organizational Attraction	5.56	0.10	5.50	0.10	5.07	0.10
Student Motivation	5.14	0.08	5.04	0.08	4.73	0.08
Intention to Accept Offer	5.28	0.11	5.12	0.11	4.70	0.11
Perception of Politeness	5.58	0.09	5.63	0.09	5.27	0.09
Source Credibility	5.04	0.07	5.02	0.07	4.81	0.07

Note. Controlling for ethnic identity.

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Dependent Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6
Organizational Attraction	5.38	1.13	—					
Student Motivation	4.98	0.88	.69**	—				
Intention to Accept Offer	5.04	1.30	.66**	.79**	—			
Perception of Politeness	5.50	1.10	.74**	.62**	.52**	—		
Source Credibility	4.96	0.82	.57**	.79**	.70**	.66**	—	
Ethnic Identity	4.94	1.15	.40**	.37**	.34**	.42**	.40**	—

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Chapter 5: Discussion

This study addressed the critical question of whether recruiters should provide race-related realistic organizational previews (ROP) to minority job candidates after candidates receive job offers and are in the *offer consideration phase* of organizational socialization. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to explore what, if any, features of race-related ROP recruitment messages enhance—or reduce—Black job candidates' organizational attraction, motivation to join the organization, and intention to accept a job offer as well as and their perception of a recruiter's credibility and the politeness of the message. In order to achieve this goal, this study considered the racial identity of the recruiter and the explicitness of a ROP message regarding race.

Results contribute to the literatures associated with organizational socialization, recruitment messaging, recruiter-newcomer interactions, social identity theory, social exchange theory, and politeness theory. The following pages outline the key contributions of these results for these varying literatures. As a preview, main contributions are listed here and then explained in detail throughout the following section. First, and taken holistically, this investigation provides evidence to support the idea that race-related ROP messages from a Director of Graduate Studies—be they explicit, implicit, or absent of race-related information—are each relatively adept at attracting Black candidates, despite communicating sensitive or potentially-unattractive race-related information. This result, in turn, contributes to three theoretical frameworks: social identity theory, social exchange theory, and politeness theory. Specifically, (a) a ROP message inspired by an SIT perspective of an explicit race-related ROP is least effective at achieving short-term organizational goals (i.e., organizational attraction, motivation to join, and intention to accept offer), (b) a ROP message inspired by SET leads us to expect that

the avoidance of voicing a race-related ROP is beneficial and most effective to achieve short-term organizational and recruiter image management goals (i.e., perceptions of recruiter politeness and credibility), and (c) an implicit race-related ROP message inspired by a combination of SIT, SET, and politeness may help achieve short-term organizational *and* recruiter image management goals. Success and effectiveness are determined based on mean scores on dependent variable scales. For example, the message that averaged the highest score on organizational attraction is the most successful message on that dependent variable. Again, these three points are explained in detail below.

Second, this study contributes to organizational socialization and recruitment scholarship a value argument to be made in light of a holistic interpretation of these results. These results can alleviate fears that speaking implicitly about race to recruits will undermine important and ethical efforts to achieve a more diverse workforce. Specifically, three benefits of giving an implicit ROP are explored: First, these results contribute to recruiter-newcomer interaction literature experimental evidence that there were no significant differences detected with speaker racial identity in terms of key outcomes in the recruitment of newcomers during the offer consideration phase. Second, this study demonstrated that no statistically significant differences were detected between a recruiter's credibility and the explicitness of the ROP recruitment message, regarding race and racism. Relatedly, and third, no matter the explicitness of the recruitment message related to race, no statistically significant differences were detected in terms of participants' perceptions of message politeness. Finally, a major cost of failing to provide a race-related ROP instead of an implicit race-related ROP is that such silence may create a perpetuation of rhetorical absence—a normalization of silence about difficult or sensitive

subjects (Bisel et al., 2011). The following paragraphs explores each of these contributions in detail.

Organizational Socialization Literature

Organizational socialization occurs through a process of indoctrination and training in which newcomers acquire the attitudinal, behavioral, cultural, social, and task skills from tenured organizational members, and tenured organizational members learn from and adapt to the newcomer (Schein, 1968; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). During the joint process of organizational socialization, organizational members seek to influence newcomers, while newcomers form their roles within the organization (Fisher, 1986; Jablin, 2001). Jablin's (1987) phase model of socialization proposes that this joint process unfolds in four phases: anticipatory socialization, encounter, metamorphosis, and exit. Of particular interest to this study is the *offer consideration* period experienced by job candidates—a period which somewhat overlaps between the anticipatory and entry phases, known as *pre-entry* (Kramer, 2010). During the offer consideration period, job candidates have been offered a position of membership by the organization but have not yet decided whether to accept that membership offer. The offer consideration phase is an under-examined period of organizational socialization; however, the period is especially relevant to investigations of workforce diversity in that recruitment efforts and interactions during this period can influence the candidate's decision to accept the offer and contribute a diverse perspective to the organization, and can be a springboard for normalizing accepted and expected future behavior (Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005).

This study directs scholarly attention to the official and early interactions between organizational members and minority job candidates. These early interactions may occur as interviews, during the offer consideration period when realistic job previews (RJP) and realistic

67

organizational previews (ROP) are present (Costigan, 1995; Kramer, 2010). Across previous RJP literature, scholars have found that providing an RJP can allow the newcomer to perceive the organization as having a positive climate, and as supportive, trustworthy, and honest. Realistic expectations provided by an RJP increases the candidate's ability to cope with the new position (Crow, Hartman, & McLendon, 2009; Dean & Wanous, 1984; Laker & Shimko, 1991). Due to the honesty of RJPs, they can dissuade applicants from joining the organization, but those who join tend to be more committed and less likely to turnover. ROP is a form of RJP and for this investigation, the point is especially relevant to minority job candidates. The results of this paper adds to that body of literature by directing attention to the ways race-related ROPs could have benefits for minority job candidates and organizations in the sense of managing expectations and providing a support system for the possibility of future racial events and for promoting the cultivation of diverse workforce. Specifically, this study expounds on ROPs as related to potential experiences relevant to the race and culture of the newcomer, that are not well attended to in the organizational communication literature.

Realistic job previews (RJPs) are often recommended by scholars who see them as a strategy for managing expectations as RJPs tend to provide newcomers with the task, attitudinal, and behavioral knowledge necessary to perform their organizational role effectively (Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007; Saks, Uggerslev & Fassina, 2007). By this definition, it seems likely that few RJPs include information related to race and racism. Amongst a plethora of topics than can be discussed in an ROP, pertinent to this investigation are ROPs that provide the cultural and social knowledge pertaining to that candidate's racial identity, which may increase identification with the institution and recruiter (Kramer, 2010). From this perspective, providing an implicit race-related ROP recruitment message can more adequately

socialize the newcomer because the newcomer is receiving an RJP in addition to an ROP with reference to their racial identity.

Based on the benefits and potential drawbacks of providing recruits with ROPs, an intellectual puzzle to be solved is: Do race-related ROPs dissuade Black recruits from being attracted to the recruiting organization and harm their perceptions of recruiters who voice them? Results of this experiment suggest the answer to this question is, no, at least not when voiced with politeness and equivocation implicitly. An important follow-up question to this is, if a race-related ROP is provided, what type of message is most adept at information-sharing during early attempts at recruiting candidates, especially when communicating sensitive or potentially-unattractive information pertinent to a job candidate's racial identity? Results suggest the answer to this question is an implicit race-related ROP message or a ROP message that avoids race are the most effective types of messaging to achieve recruiter image management goals. Considering organizational attraction (H1a), motivation to join (H1b), and likelihood to accept the offer (H1c), participants responded more favorably to receiving the implicit and absent recruitment messages, than the explicit race-related ROP message. However, no significant differences could be detected in participants' preference for a recruiter message that was implicit about race or absent of a comment about race altogether.

Theoretical Puzzle for Race-Related ROP Message Design

This investigation relied on insights taken from social exchange theory, social identity theory, and politeness theory in order to develop race-related ROP messages, which could be used to test the consequences of those messages in terms of minority job candidates' perceptions of the organization and recruiter. Of particular interest is minority job candidates' attitudes and perceptions related to organizational attraction, motivation to join the organization, likelihood to

accept the job offer, politeness of the message, and credibility of the speaker. These results offer

an opportunity to reflect on which of these theories best explain the pattern of minority

participants' responses to race-related ROP messages that varied by explicitness and speaker

identity.

Social exchange theory. Social exchange theory (SET) explains human behavior as the

product of weighing costs and benefits before making a decision (Homans, 1958). The theory

suggests that humans are rational decision makers who avoid options that present more costs

than benefits; instead, the theory proposes that decision makers select options with more benefits

than costs (Korte, 2009). Though the theory has other details and permutations, this weighing of

benefits against costs is a consistent feature of the theory and is pertinent to this study. SET has

been used to explain socialization phenomenon (Korte, 2009; Payne, Culbertson, Boswell, &

Barger, 2008) During anticipatory socialization, a SET perspective helps explain how individuals

select, enter, maintain, and end organizational prospects. Within this decision to accept

organizational membership is a consideration by the candidate of factors such as salary, time off,

intellectual freedom, identification with organizational members, taint of the type of job, and

upward mobility, among other considerations (Kramer & Miller, 2014; Parker, 2003).

Results of this investigation are consistent with social exchange theorizing in that pre-

entry recruitment messages involving explicit mention of the minority job candidate's racial

identity and the potential for negative experiences or challenges due to that racial identity made

the organization less attractive to Black recruits—although that reduction was relatively small in

terms of effect size observed (Allen, Orbe, & Olivas, 1999; Homans, 1958; Parker, 2003). In this

sense, a SET perspective may suggest that avoiding discussions of race-related ROPs during the

job-consideration phase is most ideal for the organization when recruiting a potential minority

newcomer. From the theoretical perspective of SET, results are consistent with the practice of not acknowledging difference of candidates' personal identities as being the safer option compared to explicit mention of race when wanting to increase focus on the benefits for potential minority job candidates'. When viewed narrowly or in isolation, these results from the SET perspective provide some support for the latent fear that discussing minority status could backfire and undermine organizational members' intention to attract and hire a diverse workforce. Viewed holistically and in combination with the potential benefits of an implicit race-related ROP (discussed below), these results provide some support for reducing a candidate's attention to possible future costs by also including the benefits, thereby making the organization more attractive to recruits (Homans, 1958). Overall, results of this investigation add to the organizational socialization literature a perspective that avoiding discussions of race during ROPs can be effective for recruiting Black candidates, but may not be ideal for the long term goal of retention. Though ROPs that do not acknowledge race may be effective at attracting and hiring a diverse workforce, it is the implicit race-related ROP that may be more effective at attracting, hiring, and retaining that diverse workforce and promoting organizational commitment of those minority job candidates

Social identity theory. Tajfel and Turner's (1985) social identity theory explains how individuals come to know who they are as a product of personal and social memberships they claim. These memberships are important sources of the self-concept and pride as they garner a sense of belonging in the social world (Tajfel & Turner, 1985). SIT has been used to explain socialization phenomenon (Flockhart, 2004; Iacoviello & Lorenzi-Cioldi, 2019). SIT predicts individuals are most likely to claim membership in new groups that are compatible and do not conflict with existing personal and tenured memberships (Stets & Burke, 2000). Although, in

order for a candidate to begin meshing their personal memberships with that of the organization, the memberships of the candidate and organization must be made salient for comparison. Without salience of memberships, the candidate may not be able to identify similar and differing memberships within the organization, thereby making assumptions of fit or lack of fit. From this theoretical perspective, SIT leads us to expect a pattern of responses among participants such that minority job candidates will favor recruitment messages that explicitly includes their racial identity (i.e., explicit message). The results of this study challenged the SIT framework, such that explicitness about race and racism during a ROP was less successful at achieving short-term organizational goals (i.e., organizational attraction, motivation to join, and likeliness to accept the offer) as compared to an implicit race-related ROP and ROP message that avoided race.

The SIT framework was less successful because the explicit message may have been interpreted as stressing a definite lack of fit in the organization based on the candidate's racial identity. In this way, the explicit condition may have created fear on the part of the applicant that their racial identity would not fit or mesh with the potential organizational identity. Though identity salience is important for informed decision making about joining an organization, the results support the recommendation for a less explicit approach (i.e., implicit message). Overall, results of this investigation add to the organizational socialization literature a perspective that explicit discussions of race during ROPs by recruiters risk making the organization appear less attractive to candidates as compared to implementing an implicit race-related or one devoid of discussions of race.

As demonstrated, the theoretical approaches of SET and SIT offer divergent recommendations for how Black candidates may respond to race-related ROP messages. SET focuses on the cost and benefits of a decision and may recommend a ROP message that does not

include race (Homans, 1958), whereas SIT focuses on meshing personal identities and may recommend an explicit race-related ROP message (Stets & Burke, 2000). Results of this study support both theories as being successful in achieving organizational goals if the recruiter provides an implicit ROP message that affords the balancing of the pros and cons of the SET perspective and attends to the need for identity salience of the SIT perspective.

Social exchange theory, social identity theory, and politeness theory. Politeness theory explains behavioral patterns of individuals interacting with one another. Politeness involves practices—especially linguistic adjustments (i.e., facework)—that softening the potential to threaten the public image (i.e., *face*) of those involved in an interaction. Facework (positive or negative) is an action taken to protect or correct against face threat. Generally, positive facework is helpful to creating and maintaining trusting relationships. A *positive face* can be achieved through positive face*work* and treating the other interactant in a kind and friendly manner (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Locher, 2008). A *negative facework* interaction can involve avoiding imposing on the interactant (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Locher & Watts, 2005). As language-use plays a crucial role in interpersonal communication (Brown & Levinson, 1987), the third race-related ROP message was crafted by meshing SET and SIT theoretical perspectives along with linguistic politeness that includes the personal identity of the candidate and the costs and benefits of joining the organization (i.e., implicit ROP message). In regards to explicitness of the ROP messages, the implicit message is located between the ROP message that avoids the mention of race and the explicit race-related messages based on least explicit to most explicit, respectively. The implicit race-related message involved the addition of ambiguity and equivocation that functioned to soften the message and the potential for self- and other- face threats (Morand, 2000). The equivocation of the implicit message served to soften the threat of

potential negative experiences and treated the candidate in a friendlier way, as compared to the explicit condition. The implicit race-related message stemming from SET, SIT, and politeness theory draws attention to the costs of racism, while concurrently using facework strategies to draw attention to the benefit of the organization's eagerness to support the candidate as an organizational member. An example of this is using the term "personal identity" instead of "race", and "different experience" instead of "negative experience."

Interestingly, on average, results of the investigation support participants considered the recruiter to be polite and credible in all conditions, regardless of message types (i.e., race-absent, implicit, and explicit) or speaker racial identity (i.e., Black or White). In other words, the means across all conditions tended to be high and exceed the midpoint of scales, suggesting that participants tended to think well of the organization and recruiter no matter the message condition. This result may be due to an interaction with two people in differing tiers of the organizational hierarchy (i.e., candidate and recruiter), as the recruiter may use less facework strategies and still be perceived as polite due to their organizational title as Director of Graduate Studies and perceived prestige of a graduate program (Locher & Watts, 2005). However, results of the investigation support that the implicit race-related ROP message, that used facework strategies, was more desirable than the explicit race-related message without facework strategies and had no statistically significant difference with the race-absent message—even though effect sizes are small.

This investigation adds to the organizational socialization literature a perspective that combines aspects of the SET and SIT theoretical perspectives combined with the addition of politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987). This contribution is significant as previous research discusses SET and SIT as separate foundational theoretical perspectives for

organizational socialization, but have yet to consider a combination of the two theories for application to the pre-entry phase. All things considered, the results support all three race-related ROP messages as being successful at achieving recruiter image management goals and short-term organizational goals, with the implicit ROP message being most effective because it has implications for more success in a long-term organizational goal of member retention.

Practical Implications for Providing an Implicit Race-Related ROP Message

The results of this study support well-intentioned organizational members who desire to recruit members of the Black community to join their organization. Results of this investigation offers support for providing an implicit race-related ROP recruitment message and avoiding a race-related ROP to recruit Black job candidates in a manner that achieves recruiter image management goals and short-term organizational goals. Admittedly, not voicing a race-related ROP message seems necessarily and comparatively easier than voicing one. Therefore, a critical question to answer is: Why should recruiters provide an implicit race-related ROP message instead of a ROP message that avoids race? In short, an implicit race-related ROP message can more adequately socialize the candidate and may achieve recruiter image management, short-term organizational goals, and has implications for achieving long-term organizational goals.

Rhetorical presence. First, pertaining to the racial identity of the recruiter, results revealed hypotheses 2a-2e, involving participants' preference for speaker identity, which was hypothesized to favor the Black recruiter over the White recruiter on the dependent variables of organizational attraction (H2a) motivation to join (H2b), intention to accept the offer (H2c), message politeness (H2d), and speaker credibility (H2e) were not supported. In addition, hypotheses 3a-3e involving how speaker racial identity and race-related ROP message explicitness interact on the aforementioned dependent variables were also not supported. This

means results did not detect that participants favored interactions with a Black recruiter over a White recruiter. In other words, for the present study, there was no statistically significant differences found for participants being attracted to an organization that provided a race-related ROP message from a Black recruiter as they were with a White recruiter.

This result is an important contribution to the recruitment literature because it discourages the passing of the conversational of race-related ROPs onto other organizational members who share the same or similar racial identity as the candidate (Chen & Starosta, 1996; Cooper, 2012; Freeman, 1998). This result provides support for a *dis*continuation of rhetorical *absence* by organizational members who do not share the racial-identity of the candidate. Rhetorical *absence* is the intentional and strategic exclusion of a premise or topic during the course of talk (Bisel et al., 2011). For this study, the premise that is excluded from ROP is messaging about race and racism, pertinent to the newcomer's racial identity. Calling the newcomer's attention to certain premises (i.e., rhetorical *presence*) about race and racism is important for the moment of the recruitment interaction and for developing a springboard for future interactions.

If organizational members avoid offering a race-related ROP message to a Black job candidate, it can be interpreted by the candidate to mean that discussions of racism in the here-and-now are off-limits in the organization (Bisel, 2018). The absence of race and racism in the ROP discourse can create communication norms of silence, which can make emotional and ethically-charged topics undiscussable; in turn, that undiscussability can make it less likely for social systems to improve and adapt on those undiscussed issues (Bisel, 2018). Therefore, for the benefit of the candidate and the organization, an implicit race-related ROP message is likely more preferred than the message that avoids the mention of race. This result should be

encouraging to recruiters who would like to engage in race-related ROPs, to utilize their interpersonal communication to discuss that student's potential experience pertaining to their racial identity, regardless of the racial identification of the recruiter (Chen & Starosta, 1996; Cooper, 2012; Freeman, 1998; Rowley, Sellers, Chavous & Smith, 1998).

Reduced voluntary exiting. The newcomer may be less likely to exit voluntarily (Phillips, 1998; Premack & Wanous, 1985), due to organizational members aiding minority job candidates in adjusting to problems and potential problems. An implicit race-related ROP message can also provide support for the job candidate, increase the candidate's coping ability, and appreciation of the organization for being honest (Costigan, 1995; Earnest, Allen & Landis, 2011). In turn, may also increase reporting of organizational wrongdoing to the department, and decrease reporting to a greater entity (i.e., EEOC). By providing an ROP, the implicit message potentially assists in creating more realistic expectations for joining that will result in lower turnover.

This investigation accomplished the initial phase of solving an intellectual puzzle and addressed the critical question; Do race-related ROPs dissuade Black recruits from being attracted to the recruiting organization and harm their perception of recruiters who voice them? The results suggest the answer to this question is, that they do not, if those race-related ROPs are implicit and employ politeness and equivocation. In fact, all of the conditions were considered attractive to the participants since all mean scores exceeded the mid-point of the scales. Although the implicit race-related ROP message had no statistical significant differences from the ROP message that avoids the mention of race, the researcher made three moralistic arguments for why the implicit race-related ROP message, was in fact, the better and most valuable of the three ROP message types. The implicit race-related ROP message is argued as most effective for achieving

recruiter image management goals, short-term goals, and long-term goals from a practical and moralistic perspective because it reduces rhetorical absence and can reduce voluntary turnover, allowing for normalizing discussions related to race and personal identities.

The data is fascinating because our worst fears of Black candidates being *un*attracted to the organization, *de*motivated from joining the organization, and *dis*couraged from accepting the job offer were not realized when presented with an implicit race-related ROP. In addition, regardless of the race of the recruiter and the explicitness of the race-related ROP message, the candidates still perceived the recruiter as credible and polite. This investigation provides enough data to start the scholarly conversation and exploration of how personal identities of recruits can have an influence on the offer consideration phase of organizational socialization.

Limitations

The experimental design of the current study is subject to limitations. For example, participants responded to a hypothetical recruitment interaction for a position in a graduate studies program. As 34.7% of participants have been in the position of considering graduate admission to a predominately White institution, it is possible that majority of participants were answering questions based on projections about recruiters from different organizational types as opposed to personal experience with recruiters of graduate programs from predominately White institutions.

A second limitation concerns the number of hypotheses that were not supported pertaining to the credibility of the recruiter and perceptions of message politeness. No support was found for a significant difference in perception of credibility and politeness across conditions, and that could be a result of the hypothetical situation, which lacks the context that an actual experience has.

78

A third limitation of this study concerns the immediacy in collecting perceptions of future actions of participants, as opposed to a longitudinal study that would collect the actual actions of participants. For example, immediately following the recruitment message, participants were asked about their intention to accept the job offer. Within this study design, the researcher was unable to collect data that confirmed an acceptance or denial of the offer, post the recruitment interaction.

Also, exploratory factor analyses (EFA) were used to assess the scale items for the covariate and the five dependent variables of interest. The adequacy of two scales served as a fourth limitation of this study: The "intention to accept the offer" scale and "organizational attraction" scale each had one factor loading less than .40 and that item was removed from each scale. These two items not loading well with the other scale items may be due to the hypothetical nature of the experimental design.

The final limitation that concerns this study pertains to the researcher not comparing the implicit race-related ROP message and recruitment message that avoids the mention of race to ensure they were successfully manipulated by the experimental materials in the final study. The decision to only compare implicit and explicit in the final study is due to a successful manipulation of all three race-related ROP messages in the pilot study.

Future Research

This investigation provides avenues for future research on recruitment interactions during the offer consideration phase of organizational socialization. Future studies should investigate this phenomenon across time in a longitudinal study. A longitudinal study would allow the researcher to collect data of confirmed job acceptances following the recruitment interaction. Also, longitudinal data would allow the researcher to collect additional information that

influenced the candidate's decision to accept or deny membership to the organization, as well as whether race-related ROPs improved members' later willingness to speak up about racially-charged problems experienced in the organization.

Future studies should examine narratives of candidates who experienced a race-related ROP message in a real-world recruitment interaction. Open-ended responses would help identify what elements of the messages were—or were not—attractive, supportive, credible, and polite during recruitment interactions. Furthermore, these retrospective narratives could be analyzed for the purpose of learning additional influences on acceptance or rejection of job offers, and how race-related ROPs influenced decisions to speak up about race and racism during their tenure at the organization.

Future studies should continue to explore how message designs influence the decision patterns of Black candidates. Specifically, future studies should utilize a social exchange theory combined with social identity theory and politeness theory perspectives to maximize the benefits and reduce the costs of providing a race-related ROP recruitment message to Black candidates.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This study contributed to the growing literature of organizational socialization within organizational communication scholarship. Specifically, this study explored what type of race-related ROP recruitment message would enhance organizational attraction, motivation to join the organization, and intention to accept a job offer from Black job candidates, who are offered a position into a predominately White institution (PWI). The study also explored whether a minority job candidate may perceive the recruiter as more or less credible and polite, depending on the explicitness of the recruitment message about race and the race of the recruiter. This study focused on the *offer consideration phase* of organizational socialization.

This investigation followed a 2 (Black male recruiter vs. White male recruiter) × 3 (absent, explicit, and implicit race-related ROP message) message-processing experimental design. Results found support for the use of all three race-related message designs, with the absent and implicit messages yielding no statistically significant difference from each other, but with both of them revealing several differences when compared to the explicit message. However, research demonstrates RJPs (and, by extension ROPs) tend to increase employee retention, therefore, the implicit ROP message strategy is superior to absent and explicit. Further, arguments were made for why the implicit-race related ROP message was most likely most desirable to reach short-term organizational goals and long-term organizational goals of retention. The results of this study provide support for race-related ROP messages being a strategy recruiters and organizational leaders could potentially use to recruit Black candidates into their organization.

This investigation contributes to theorizing about the *offer consideration phase* of organizational socialization answering the question: Do race-related ROPs dissuade Black

recruits from being attracted to the recruiting organization and harm their perception of recruiters who voice them? Results suggest the answer to this question is, no. In light of these results, the next question for well-intentioned organizational members who want to recruit members of the Black community to join their organization is: Which type of race-related ROP recruitment message will you provide?

References

Adame, E. A., & Bisel, R. S. (2019). Can perceptions of an individual's organizational

    citizenship be influenced via strategic impression management messaging?. *International*

    Journal of Business Communication, *56*(1), 7-30.

Adams, E. A., Kurtz-Costes, B. E., & Hoffman, A. J. (2016). Skin tone bias among African

    Americans: Antecedents and consequences across the life span. *Developmental*

    Review, *40*, 93-116.

Al-Jenaibi, B. (2011). The scope and impact of workplace diversity in the United Arab

    Emirates–An initial study. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Communicatio*, *5*(1), 147-174.

Alderfer, C. P. (1967). Convergent and discriminant validation of satisfaction and desire

    measures by interviews and questionnaires. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *51*(6), 509-

    520.

Alesina, A., & Ferrara, E. L. (2005). Ethnic diversity and economic performance. *Journal of*

    Economic Literature, *43*(3), 762-800.

Allen, W. R. (1992). The color of success: African-American college student outcomes at

    predominantly White and historically Black public colleges and universities. *Harvard*

    Educational Review, *62*(1), 26-45.

Allen, B. J. (1995). "Diversity" and organizational communication. *Journal of Applied*

    Communication Research, 23, 143-155.

Allen, B. J. (1996). Feminist standpoint theory: A black woman's (re) view of organizational

    socialization. *Communication Studies*, *47*(4), 257-271.

Allen, B. J. (1998). Black womanhood and feminist standpoints. *Management Communication*

    Quarterly, 11, 575-586.

Allen, B. J. (2011). *Difference matters: Communicating social identity.* (2nd edition). Long

      Grove, IL: Waveland.

Allen, B. J., Orbe, M. P., & Olivas, M. R. (1999). The complexity of our tears: Dis/enchantment

      and (in)difference in the academy. *Communication Theory*, *9*(4), 402-429.

Alvesson, M., Ashcraft, K. L., & Thomas, R. (2008). Identity matters: Reflections on the

      construction of identity scholarship in organization studies. *Organization*, *15*(1), 5-28.

Anderson, N., Ahmed, S., & Costa, A. C. (2012). Applicant reactions in Saudi Arabia:

      Organizational attractiveness and core self evaluation. *International Journal of Selection

      and Assessment*, *20*(2), 197-208.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of

      Management Review*, *14*(1), 20-39.

Atewologun, D., Sealy, R., & Vinnicombe, S. (2016). Revealing intersectional dynamics in

      organizations: Introducing 'intersectional identity work'. *Gender, Work &

      Organization*, *23*(3), 223-247.

Austin, J. T. (In press) "Fighting Mr. Sleepy": A metaphor for graduate student experiences.

      Health Communication.

Baird, L. L. (1990). The melancholy of anatomy: The personal and professional development of

      graduate and professional school students. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education:

      Handbook of Theory and Research*, (Vol. 6). New York: Agathon Press.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological

      Review*, *84*(2), 191-215.

Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives* (Vol. 8).

      Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bauer, T. N., Bodner, T., Erdogan, B., Truxillo, D. M., & Tucker, J. S. (2007). Newcomer

   adjustment during organizational socialization: A meta-analytic review of antecedents,

   outcomes, and methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(3), 707-721.

Beavers, A. S., Lounsbury, J. W., Richards, J. K., Huck, S. W., Skolits, G. J., & Esquivel, S. L.

   (2013). Practical considerations for using exploratory factor analysis in educational

   research. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, *18*.

Berinsky, A. J., Huber, G. A., & Lenz, G. S. (2012). Evaluating online labor markets for

   experimental research: Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk. *Political Analysis*, *20*(3), 351-

   368.

Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K. A., & Spell, C. S. (2012). Reviewing diversity training: Where we have

   been and where we should go. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *11*(2),

   207-227.

Bisel, R. S. (2018). *Organizational moral learning: A communication approach*. New York, NY:

   Routledge.

Bisel, R. S., Kelley, K. M., Ploeger, N. A., & Messersmith, J. (2011). Workers' moral mum

   effect: On facework and unethical behavior in the workplace. *Communication

   Studies*, *62*(2), 153-170.

Bisel, R. S., Zanin, A. C., Rozzell, B. L., Risley-Baird, E. C., & Rygaard, J. A. (2016). Identity

   work in a prestigious occupation: Academic physicians' local social constructions of

   distributive justice. *Western Journal of Communication*, *80*(4), 371-392.

   https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2016.1159326

Blk + in Grad School (2018). What is Blk + in Grad School?. *Medium*. Retrieved from

    https://medium.com/@blkingradschool/before-i-started-grad-school-i-didnt-know-what-

    to-expect-f2c8ef1aad89

Breaugh, J. A., & Starke, M. (2000). Research on employee recruitment: So many studies, so

    many remaining questions. *Journal of Management*, *26*(3), 405-434.

Bretz Jr, R. D., & Judge, T. A. (1998). Realistic job previews: A test of the adverse self-selection

    hypothesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(2), 330-337.

Brown, M. H. (1985). That reminds me of a story: Speech action in organizational

    socialization. *Western Journal of Communication*, *49*(1), 27-42.

Brown v. Board of Education. (1954) 347 U.S. 483.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 2).

    Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brown II, C. M. & Dancy II, E. T. (2010). Predominantly White institutions. In K. Lomotey

    (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of African American education* (pp. 524-526). Thousand Oaks, CA:

    Sage.

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source

    of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data?. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*(1), 3-5.

Bullis, C., & Bach, B. W. (1989). Socialization turning points: An examination of change in

    organizational identification. *Western Journal of Communication*, 53(*3*), 273-293.

Buzzanell, P. M., Long, Z., Anderson, L. B., Kokini, K., & Batra, J. C. (2015). Mentoring in

    academe: A feminist poststructural lens on stories of women engineering faculty of

    color. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *29*(3), 440-457.

Byrd, M. Y. (2017). Does HRD have a moral duty to respond to matters of social injustice? *Human Resource Development International, 21*(1), 3-11.

Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Harrison, R. V., & Pinneau, S. R. (1975). Job demands and worker health (Department of Health, Education and Welfare Publication No. 75-160). *Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*.

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1996). Intercultural communication competence: A synthesis. In B. R. Burleson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook, 19*, 353-384.

Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationships among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education, 39*(4), 323-340.

Civil Rights Act of 1964 § 7, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq (1964)

Colarelli, S. M. (1984). Methods of communication and mediating processes in realistic job previews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69*(4), 633-642.

Cooper, J. N. (2012). Personal troubles and public issues: A sociological imagination of Black athletes' experiences at predominantly White institutions in the United States. *Sociology Mind 2*(3), 261–271.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Sekerka, L. E. (2003). Toward a theory of positive change. In K. Cameron, J. Dutton and R. Quinn *Positive Organisational Scholarship*: *Foundation of a new discipline.* Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc.

Corcoran, M., & Clark, S. M. (1984). Professional socialization and contemporary career attitudes of three faculty generations. *Research in Higher Education, 20*(2), 131-153.

Costigan, R. D. (1995). Adaptation of traditional human resources processes for total quality environments. *Quality Management Journal*, *2*(3), 7-23.

Cox, S. A., & Kramer, M. W. (1995). Communication during employee dismissals: Social

exchange principles and group influences on employee exit. *Management*

Communication Quarterly, *9*(2), 156-190.

Crain, M., Poster, W., & Cherry, M. (2016). *Invisible labor: Hidden work in the contemporary*

world. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Crow, S. M., Hartman, S. J., & McLendon, C. L. (2009). The realistic job preview as a partial

remedy for nursing attrition and shortages: The role of nursing schools. *The Journal of*

Continuing Education in Nursing, *40*(7), 317-323.

Crumpacker, M., & Crumpacker, J. M. (2007). Succession planning and generational

stereotypes: Should HR consider age-based values and attitudes a relevant factor or a

passing fad?. *Public Personnel Management*, *36*(4), 349-369.

Dallimore, E. J. (2003). Memorable messages as discursive formations: The gendered

socialization of new university faculty. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *26*(2), 214-

265.

Dean, R. A., & Wanous, J. P. (1984). Effects of realistic job previews on hiring bank

tellers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69*(1), 2-26.

Eagle, N., Macy, M., & Claxton, R. (2010). Network diversity and economic

development. *Science*, *328*(5981), 1029-1031.

Earnest, D. R., Allen, D. G., & Landis, R. S. (2011). Mechanisms linking realistic job previews

with turnover: A meta-analytic path analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *64*(4), 865-897.

Ellis, R. A., & Taylor, M. S. (1983). Role of self-esteem within the job search process. *Journal*

of Applied Psychology, *68*(4), 632-640.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). (2016). Final Report of the EEOC Select

    Task Force on the Study of Harassment in the Workplace. *Washington. DC Retrieved*

    from: https://www. eeoc. gov/eeoc/task_force/harassment/index. cfm.

Fairhurst, G. T., Green, S. G., & Snavely, B. K. (1984). Managerial control and discipline:

    Whips and chains. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *8*(1), 558-

    593.

Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*,

    433-452.

Fey, W. F. (1955). Acceptance by others and its relation to acceptance of self and others: A re-

    evaluation. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 50, 274-276.

Flockhart, T. (2004). 'Masters and Novices': Socialization and social learning through the

    NATO Parliamentary Assembly. *International Relations*, *18*(3), 361-380.

Fisher, C. D. (1986) Organizational socialization: An integrative review. In K. M. Rowland & G.

    K. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management* (Vol. 4, pp.

    101-145). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Ford, D., Grantham, T., & Whiting, G. (2008). Culturally and linguistically diverse students in

    gifted education: Recruitment and retention issues. *Exceptional Children, 74*(3), 289-306.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *14*(2), 219-236.

Freeman, K. (1998). *African American culture and heritage in higher education research and*

    practice. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Galinsky, A. D., Todd, A. R., Homan, A. C., Phillips, K. W., Apfelbaum, E. P., Sasaki, S. J., &

    Maddux, W. W. (2015). Maximizing the gains and minimizing the pains of diversity: A

policy perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *10*(6), 742-748. DOI:

10.1177/1745691615598513

Garson, D. A. (2010). Statnotes: Topics in multivariate analysis: Factor analysis. Retrieved from

http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/statnote.htm

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Oakland,

CA: University of California Press.

Gillet, B., & Schwab, D. P. (1975). Convergent and discriminant validities of corresponding Job

Descriptive Index and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire scales. *Journal of Applied

Psychology*, *60*(3), 313-317.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York, NY: Anchor

Books.

Golde, C. M. (2000). Should I stay or should I go? Student descriptions of the doctoral attrition

process. *The Review of Higher Education*, *23*(2), 199-227.

Goldman, Z. W., Goodboy, A. K., & Weber, K. (2017). College students' psychological needs

and intrinsic motivation to learn: An examination of self-determination

theory. *Communication Quarterly*, *65*(2), 167-191.

Grusec, J. E., & Hastings, P. D. (Eds.). (2014). *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research*.

New York, NY: Guilford.

Hanover, J. M., & Cellar, D. F. (1998). Environmental factors and the effectiveness of workforce

diversity training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *9*(2), 105-124.

Harris, L., & Cronen, V. E. (1979). A rules-based model for the analysis and evaluation of

organizational communication. *Communication Quarterly*, *27*(1), 12-28.

Highhouse, S., Lievens, F., & Sinar, E. F. (2003). Measuring attraction to organizations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *63*(6), 986-1001.

Hill Collins, P. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (vol. 2). Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.

Hitchcock, J. (1998). *Decentering whiteness. Speech given at the 3rd National Conference on Whiteness.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hoffman, L. R., & Maier, N. R. (1961). Quality and acceptance of problem solutions by members of homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *62*(2), 401-407.

Holmes, W. T., & Parker, M. A. (2017). Communication: Empirically testing behavioral integrity and credibility as antecedents for the effective implementation of motivating language. *International Journal of Business Communication*, *54*(1), 70-82.

Hom, P. W., & Hulin, C. L. (1981). A competitive test of the prediction of reenlistment by several models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *66*(1), 23-39.

Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, *63*(6), 597-606.

Homer, S. O. (1979, September). *A field experimental study of the affective, intentional and behavioral effects of organizational entry expectations.* Paper presented at the 87th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.

Huq, A., (2017) Judging discriminatory intent. *Public Law and Legal Theory Working Papers*. 1-61. Retrieved from https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/public_law_and_legal_theory/662

Iacoviello, V., & Lorenzi-Cioldi, F. (2019). Collectivism and individualism in status hierarchies: Socialization and social identity explanations. *International Review of Social Psychology*, *32*(1).

Jablin, F. M. (1984). Assimilating new members into organizations. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *8*(1), 594-627.

Jablin, F. M. (1987). *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jablin, F. M. (2001). Organizational entry, assimilation, and disengagement/exit. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 732-818). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jackson, S. E., & Dutton, J. E. (1988). Discerning threats and opportunities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *33*(3). 370-387.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (1994). A university's faculty: Identifying who will leave and who will stay. *Journal for Higher Education Management*, *10*(1), 71-84.

Kaiser, H. F. (1974) An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrics*, *39*, 31–36

Karsten, J. L. (2013). A ten-year retrospective look at the NSF/GEO Opportunities for Enhancing Diversity in the Geosciences (OEDG) program. *American Geophysical Union*, Fall Meeting Abstract #ED54A-01

Keyton, J. (2011). *Communication and organizational culture: A key to understanding work experiences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kilduff, M., Angelmar, R., & Mehra, A. (2000). Top management-team diversity and firm performance: Examining the role of cognitions. *Organization Science*, *11*(1), 21-34.

Kimbrough, W. M. (1995). Self-assessment, participation, and value of leadership skills,

     activities, and experiences for Black students relative to their membership in historically

     Black fraternities and sororities. *Journal of Negro Education*, *64*(1), 63-74.

Kimbrough, W. M., & Hutcheson, P. A. (1998). The impact of membership in Black Greek-letter

     organizations on Black students' involvement in collegiate activities and their

     development of leadership skills. *Journal of Negro Education*, *67*(2), 96-105.

Korte, R. F. (2009). How newcomers learn the social norms of an organization: A case study of

     the socialization of newly hired engineers. *Human Resource Development*

     Quarterly, *20*(3), 285-306.

Kramer, M. W. (1993). Communication after job transfers: Social exchange process in learning

     new roles. *Human Communication Research*, *20*(2), 147-174.

Kramer, M. W. (2010). *Organizational socialization: Joining and leaving organizations* (Vol. 1).

     Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Kramer, M. W., & Miller, V. D. (2014). Socialization and assimilation. In L. L. Putnam & D. K.

     Mumby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational communication: Advances in*

     theory, research, and methods (pp. 525–547). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kristof-Brown A. L., Zimmerman R. D., & Johnson E. C. (2005). Consequences of individual's

     fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and

     person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, *58*, 281–342.

Laker, D. R., & Shimko, B. W. (1990). Controlling the turnover problem: The use of the realistic

     job preview "experience". *Hospitality Research Journal*, *14*(2), 57-62.

Law, D. Y. (1998). *An evaluation of a cultural diversity training program* (Doctoral dissertation,

     ProQuest Information & Learning).

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*(1), 34-47.

Lewis, S., & Cooper, C. L. (1995). Balancing the work/home interface: A European perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, *5*(4), 289-305.

Lievens, F., Van Hoye, G., & Anseel, F. (2007). Organizational identity and employer image: Towards a unifying framework. *British Journal of Management*, *18*, S45-S59.

Locher, M. A. (2008). Relational work, politeness, and identity construction. In Antos, G. and Ventola, E. (Eds.), *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*. (pp. 509–540). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Locher, M. A., & Watts, R. J. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research. 1*(1), 9-33.

Lorenzo, R., Voigt, N., Tsusaka, M., Krentz, M., & Abouzahr, K., (2018 January) How diverse leadership teams boost innovation. *Boston Consulting Group*. Retrieved from https://www.bcg.com/en-us/publications/2018/how-diverse-leadership-teams-boost-innovation.aspx

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *25*(2), 226-251.

Lucas, K. (2011). Socializing messages in blue-collar families: Communicative pathways to social mobility and reproduction. *Western Journal of Communication*, *75*(1), 95-121.

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*(2), 103-123.

Martin, E. (2006). Survey questionnaire construction. *Survey Methodology*, *2006*, 1-13.

Matthew, P. (2016, November). What is faculty diversity worth to a university?. *The Atlantic*.

    Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/11/what-is-faculty-

    diversity-worth-to-a-university/508334/

McCroskey, J. (1966). Scales for the measurement of ethos. *Communication Monographs 33*(1),

    65-72.

McGee, G. W., & Ford, R. C. (1987). Two (or more?) dimensions of organizational

    commitment: Reexamination of the affective and continuance commitment

    scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *72*(4), 638-641.

Miller, T. (2001). What it is and what it isn't: Cultural Studies Meets Graduate-student

    Labor. *Yale JL & Human.*, *13*(1), 68-94.

Miller, V. D., & Jablin, F. M. (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry:

    Influences, tactics, and a model of the process. *Academy of Management Review*, *16*(1),

    92-120.

Morand, D. A. (2000). Language and power: An empirical analysis of linguistic strategies used

    in superior–subordinate communication. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(3), 235-

    248.

Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and

    development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(4), 706-725.

Mumby, D. K. (1996). Feminism, postmodernism, and organizational communication studies: A

    critical reading. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *9*(3), 259-295.

Murray, A. I. (1989). Top management heterogeneity and firm performance. *Strategic*

    Management Journal, 10, 125-142.

Nemeth, C. J. (1992). Minority dissent as a stimulant to group performance. *In* S. Worchel, W. Wood, & J.A. Simpson (Eds.), *Group process and productivity* (pp. 95-111). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*, (2nd ed). McGraw-Hill: New York.

Olsen, D., & Maple, S. A. (1993). Gender differences among faculty at a research university: Myths and realities. *Initiatives*, *55*(4), 33-42.

Parker, P. S. (2003). Learning leadership: Communication, resistance, and African American women's executive leadership development. *Electronic Journal of Communication, 13*(4), 46-59.

Payne, S. C., Culbertson, S. S., Boswell, W. R., & Barger, E. J. (2008). Newcomer psychological contracts and employee socialization activities: Does perceived balance in obligations matter?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *73*(3), 465-472.

Pett, M. A., Lackey, N. R., & Sullivan, J. J. (2003). *Making sense of factor analysis: The use of factor analysis for instrument development in health care research*. Sage.

Phillips, J. M. (1998). Effects of realistic job previews on multiple organizational outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*(6), 673-690.

Phinney, J. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with adolescents and young adults from diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7,* 156-176.

Plaut, V. C., Sanchez-Burks, J., Buffardi, L., & Stevens, F. G. (2007). What about me? Understanding non-minority aversion to diversity initiatives in the workplace. *Unpublished manuscript, University of Georgia*.

Ploeger, N. A., & Bisel, R. S. (2013). The role of identification in giving sense to unethical

    organizational behavior: Defending the organization. *Management Communication*

    Quarterly, *27*(2), 155-183. DOI: 10.1177/0893318912469770

Popovich, P., & Wanous, J. P. (1982). The realistic job preview as a persuasive

    communication. *Academy of Management Review*, *7*(4), 570-578.

Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational

    commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of*

    Applied Psychology, *59*(5), 603-609.

Premack, S. L., & Wanous, J. P. (1985). A meta-analysis of realistic job preview

    experiments. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*(4), 706–

    719. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.70.4.706

Reeder, M. C., & Schmitt, N. (2013). Motivational and judgment predictors of African American

    academic achievement at PWIs and HBCUs. *Journal of College Student Development,*

    54(1), 29-42.

Reichers, A. E. (1987). An interactionist perspective on newcomer socialization rates. *Academy*

    of Management Review, *12*(2), 278-287.

Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects

    on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(3), 617-635.

Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation.

    Communication Education, *39*, 181–195.

Riketta, M. (2008). The causal relation between job attitudes and performance: A meta-analysis

    of panel studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(2), 472-481.

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 150-163.

Roberson, Q. M., Collins, C. J., & Oreg, S. (2005). The effects of recruitment message specificity on applicant attraction to organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *19*(3), 319-339.

Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *19*(3), 301-322.

Rowley, S. J., Sellers, R. M., Chavous, T. M., & Smith, M. A. (1998). The relationship between racial identity and self-esteem in African American college and high school students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(3), 715-724.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Organizational socialization: Making sense of the past and present as a prologue for the future. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *51*(2), 234-279.

Saks, A. M., Uggerslev, K. L., & Fassina, N. E. (2007). Socialization tactics and newcomer adjustment: A meta-analytic review and test of a model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *70*(3), 413-446.

Saks, A. M., Wiesner, W. H., & Summers, R. J. (1994). Effects of job previews on self-selection and job choice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *44*(3), 297-316.

Schein, E. H. (1968). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. *Industrial Management Review (pre-1986)*, *9*(2), 53-65.

Scott, C. R., Corman, S. R., & Cheney, G. (1998). Development of a structurational model of identification in the organization. *Communication Theory*, *8*(3), 298-336.

Settles, I. H., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2018). Scrutinized but not recognized:(In) visibility and hypervisibility experiences of faculty of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 1-13.

Sinanan, A. (2016). The value and necessity of mentoring African American college students at PWIs. *Journal of Pan African Studies, 9*(8), 155-166.

Sommers, S. R. (2006). On racial diversity and group decision making: Identifying multiple effects of racial composition on jury deliberations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *90*(4), 597-612. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.4.597

Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *63*(3), 224-237.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson Hall.

Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, *46*(2), 259-293.

Teven, J. J. (2007). Teacher caring and classroom behavior: Relationships with student affect and perceptions of teacher competence and trustworthiness. *Communication Quarterly*, *55*(4), 433-450.

Tinto, V. (1990). Principles of effective retention. *Journal of the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, *2*(1), 35-48.

Triandis, H. C., Hall, E. R., & Ewen, R. B. (1965). Member heterogeneity and dyadic creativity. *Human Relations*, *18*(1), 33-55.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). *Black (African-American) history month: February 2012.* Retrieved

from http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/facts_for_features_special_

editions/cb12-ff01.html

Van Maanen, J. (1975). Breaking in: Socialization to work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of*

work, organization, and society (pp. 67-120). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational

socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *1*, 209-264.

Waldeck, J. H., & Myers, K. K. (2007). Organizational assimilation theory, research, and

implications for multiple areas of the discipline: A state of the art review. *Annals of the*

International Communication Association, *31*(1), 322-367.

Walter, A. W., Ruiz, Y., Tourse, R. W. C., Kress, H., Morningstar, B., MacArthur, B., &

Daniels, A. (2017). Leadership matters: How hidden biases perpetuate institutional

racism in organizations. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership &*

Governance, *41*(3), 213-221.

Wanous, J. P. (1977). Organizational entry: Newcomers moving from outside to

inside. *Psychological Bulletin*, *84*(4), 601-618.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of

sensemaking. *Organization Science*, *16*(4), 409-421.

Wille, L., & Derous, E. (2017). Getting the words right: when wording of job ads affects ethnic

minorities' application decisions. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *31*(4), 533-

558.

Wright, T. (2016). Women's experience of workplace interactions in male-dominated work: The

    intersections of gender, sexuality and occupational group. *Gender, Work &*

    Organization, *23*(3), 348-362.

Footnotes

[1]**Participants for Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted prior to the full study to ensure participants perceived the experimental manipulations as intended (i.e., speaker racial identity and explicitness of race-related ROP). A sample of 202 adults participated in this pilot study. After removing participants who failed to answer three attention verification questions accurately, who did not identify as Black or African American, who were above or below the average time of survey completion, and those with excessive missing data, the final sample for the pilot after data cleaning consisted of 157 pilot study participants. The sample included 101 males, 43 females, and one participant identified as both male and female. The sample included the following sexual identities: 110 heterosexual/straight, two homosexual/gay/lesbian, 31 bisexual, and two asexual participants. Participants' age ranged from 20 to 58 years of age ($M = 31.30$, $SD = 6.71$) and lived in 37 states, with the largest amount of participants residing in California ($n = 25$).

Manipulation Checks for Pilot Study

Perception of speaker identity. Manipulation checks were conducted to ensure that participants perceived the racial identity of the department recruiter consistent with the condition to which they were randomly assigned. First, to ensure participants perceived the message originated from a department recruiter with a specific racial identity (i.e., Black or White), participants responded to a two-item, 7-point Likert-type measure (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Scale statements include "The recruiter is WHITE," and "The recruiter is BLACK" (See Appendix C for all scale items). The first scale (i.e., recruiter is WHITE) item was reverse coded. An independent samples *t*-test was computed utilizing a composite of the two items. As expected, results revealed that participants assigned to the Black recruiter conditions

102

($M = 5.30$; $SD = 1.57$) agreed significantly more with manipulation check items than participants assigned to the White recruiter condition ($M = 2.87$; $SD = 1.70$), $t(146) = 9.00$, $p < .01$. Thus, the racial identity of the speaker was successfully manipulated by the experimental materials.

Message explicitness about race and racism. Second, to ensure participants perceived the nature of the recruitment message as implicit or explicit about racism, participants completed a four-item, 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include: "The recruiter's message is explicit about racism" and "The recruiter's message is indirect about racism" (See Appendix C for all scale items). As anticipated, results revealed that participants assigned to the message explicit conditions ($M = 4.15$; $SD = 1.66$) agreed significantly more with manipulation check items than participants assigned to the message implicit condition ($M = 3.32$; $SD = 1.24$), $t(94) = -2.87$, $p < .01$. Thus, the explicitness of the race-related ROP message was manipulated successfully by the experimental materials.

Perception of situational realism. Third, to ensure participants perceived the nature of the ROP recruitment *situation* as realistic across conditions, participants completed a four-item, 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include: "The scenario felt realistic" and "This scenario reflects a credible situation." (See Appendix C for all scale items). There was no detected difference in realism of the recruitment situation across conditions as determined by a one-way ANOVA $F(17,133) = .97$, $p = .49$. Thus, the ROP recruitment situation was manipulated successfully by the experimental materials.

Perception of message realism. Fourth, to ensure participants perceived the nature of the ROP recruitment *messages* as realistic across conditions, participants completed a three-item, 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include: "The recruitment messages were unrealistic" and "No recruiter would have spoken that way." (See

Appendix C for all scale items). There was no detected difference in realism of the ROP message across conditions as determined by a one-way ANOVA $F(18,85) = .88$, $p = .61$. Thus, the race-related ROP recruitment message was manipulated successfully by the experimental materials. Altogether, the success of the manipulation checks implied that experimental materials were adequate for the full study and no changes were made.

Appendix A

Table 1 Hypotheses (2 x 3 Design)

Hypothesis	IVs	DVs	Analysis	Statistic
H1a: Black candidates given an implicit recruitment message have more **organizational attraction** towards a recruiting organization (i.e., graduate program) as compared to those given a message-absent of race, who will in turn, be more attracted to the program than those given an explicit recruitment message.	Message explicitness	Organizational attraction	One-way MANCOVA	F
H1b: Black candidates given an implicit recruitment message are more **motivated to join** a recruiting organization (i.e., graduate program) as compared to those given a message-absent of race, who will in turn, be more motivated to join the program than those given an explicit recruitment message.	Message explicitness	Student motivation	One-way MANCOVA	F
H1c: Black candidates given an implicit recruitment message perceive the message as more **polite** as compared to those given a message-absent of race, who in turn, perceive the message as more polite than those given an explicit recruitment message.	Message explicitness	Message politeness	One-way MANCOVA	F
H1d: Black candidates given an explicit recruitment message are less **likely to accept the job offer** from the recruiting organization as compared to those given an implicit message, who in turn, are more likely to accept than those given a message-absent of racism.	Message explicitness	Likelihood to accept the job offer	One-way MANCOVA	F
H1e: Black candidates given an implicit recruitment message perceive the **source as more credible** as compared to those given a message-absent of race, who in turn, perceive the source as more credible than those given an explicit recruitment message.	Message explicitness	Credibility	One-way MANCOVA	F

H2a: Black candidates have more **organizational attraction** towards a recruiting organization (i.e., graduate program) with a Black male recruiter as compared to a White male recruiter.	Racial identity of recruiter	Organizational attractiveness	One-way MANCOVA	*F*
H2b: Black candidates are more **motivated to join** a recruiting organization (i.e., graduate program) with a Black male recruiter as compared to a White male recruiter.	Racial identity of recruiter	Student motivation	One-way MANCOVA	*F*
H2c: Black candidates perceive a recruitment message from a Black male recruiter as more **polite** than one voiced by a White male recruiter.	Racial identity of recruiter	Message politeness	One-way MANCOVA	*F*
H2d: Black candidates are more **likely to accept the job offer** from the recruiting organization (i.e., graduate program) with a Black male recruiter as compared to one with a White male recruiter.	Racial identity of recruiter	Likelihood to accept the job offer	One-way MANCOVA	*F*
H2e: Black candidates perceive a Black male recruiter as more **credible** than a White male recruiter.	Racial identity of recruiter	Source Credibility	One-way MANCOVA	*F*
H3a: Speaker identity and message explicitness interact, such that Black candidates report greatest **organizational attraction** to the Black Recruiter *and* Implicit recruitment message as compared to all other combinations of race and explicitness.	Speaker racial identity, Message explicitness	Organizational attraction	One-way MANCOVA	*F*
H3b: Speaker identity and message explicitness interact, such that Black candidates report greatest **motivation to join** the recruiting organization (i.e., graduate program) in the Black recruiter *and* Implicit recruitment message as compared to all other combinations of race and explicitness.	Speaker racial identity, Message explicitness	Motivation to join	One-way MANCOVA	*F*

H3c: Speaker identity and message explicitness interact, such that Black candidates perceive the greatest **message politeness** in the Black Recruiter *and* Implicit recruitment message as compared to all other combinations of race and explicitness.	Speaker racial identity, Message explicitness	Message politeness	One-way MANCOVA	*F*
H3d: Speaker identity and message explicitness interact, such that Black candidates report the greatest **likelihood to accept the job offer** in the Black Recruiter and Implicit recruitment message as compared to all other combinations of race and explicitness.	Speaker racial identity, Message explicitness	Likelihood to accept the job offer	One-way MANCOVA	*F*
H3e: Speaker identity and message explicitness interact, such that Black candidates perceive the greatest **source credibility** of the Black Recruiter *and* Implicit recruitment message as compared to all other combinations of race and explicitness.	Speaker racial identity, Message explicitness	Source credibility	One-way MANCOVA	*F*

Appendix B

Recruitment messages

All Conditions

(Context given to all participants) Imagine you were recently accepted into a graduate program at a university and offered employment in the department. You are considering joining the program. You and all those accepted are invited for a day of meeting one another, touring the campus and facilities, chatting with faculty members, and learning about what to expect. The Director of Graduate Studies (i.e., Recruiter), who is in charge of recruiting graduate students, introduces himself to everyone and addresses the group.

The Recruiter of the Department is a [BLACK/WHITE MALE].

(Explicit/Implicit Condition): After the day's events, the Recruiter requests to talk to you and says, "I know your RACIAL IDENTITY/PERSONAL IDENTITY is/may not (be) well represented here. I am concerned/aware that you will/may have a NEGATIVE/DIFFERENT experience. I want you to know that we ABSOLUTELY DO NOT TOLERATE RACISM/ARE INVESTED IN YOUR EXPERIENCE. Should you encounter RACISM/CONCERNS, please tell me immediately. Leadership will HAVE YOUR BACK/LEND OUR EAR."

I. **Black male recruiter/absent recruitment message**

The Recruiter of the Department is a BLACK MALE.

II. **Black male recruiter/explicit recruitment message**

The Recruiter of the Department is a BLACK MALE.

After the day's events, the Recruiter requests to talk to you and says, "I know your RACIAL IDENTITY is not well represented here. I am concerned that you will have a NEGATIVE experience. I want you to know that we ABSOLUTELY DO NOT TOLERATE RACISM. Should you encounter RACISM, please tell me immediately. Leadership will HAVE YOUR BACK."

III. **Black male recruiter/implicit recruitment message**

The Recruiter of the Department is a BLACK MALE.

After the day's events, the Recruiter requests to talk to you and says, "I see your PERSONAL IDENTITY may not be well represented here. I am aware that you may have a DIFFERENT experience. I want you to know that we ARE INVESTED IN YOUR EXPERIENCE. Should you encounter CONCERNS, please tell me immediately. Leadership will LEND OUR EAR."

IV. White male recruiter/absent recruitment message

The Recruiter of the Department is a WHITE MALE.

V. White male recruiter/explicit recruitment message

The Recruiter of the Department is a WHITE MALE.

After the day's events, the Recruiter requests to talk to you and says, "I see your RACIAL IDENTITY is not well represented here. I am concerned that you will have a NEGATIVE experience. I want you to know that we ABSOLUTELY DO NOT TOLERATE RACISM. Should you encounter RACISM, please tell me immediately. Leadership will HAVE YOUR BACK."

VI. White male recruiter/implicit recruitment message

The Recruiter of the Department is a WHITE MALE.

After the day's events, the Recruiter requests to talk to you and says, "I see your PERSONAL IDENTITY may not be well represented here. I am aware that you may have a DIFFERENT experience. I want you to know that we ARE INVESTED IN YOUR EXPERIENCE. Should you encounter CONCERNS, please tell me immediately. Leadership will LEND OUR EAR."

Appendix C

Manipulation Check

I.   **Perception of speaker identity**

Thinking about the scenario you just read. Using the scale provided, please indicate how

much you agree with the following statements regarding the recruiter's IDENTITY.

IDENTITY. (1 = *Strongly disagree*, 7 = *Strongly agree*)

1. The recruiter is WHITE

2. The recruiter is BLACK

II. **Message explicitness about race and racism**.

Thinking about the scenario you just read. Using the scale provided, please indicate how

much you agree with the following statements regarding the recruiter's MESSAGE. (1 =

Strongly disagree, 7 = *Strongly agree*)

1. The recruiter's message danced around the issue of racism

2. The recruiter's message is indirect about racism

3. The recruiter's message did not make any reference to racism

4. [R]The recruiter's message did *not* say anything about racism.

III. **Realism Check**

Thinking about the scenario you just read. Using the scale provided, please indicate how

much do you agree with the following statements regarding the recruiting SITUATION.

(1 = *Strongly disagree*, 7 = *Strongly agree*)

a. Open ended
    i. Was this message realistic, why or why not?

110

      ii. Does this message seem like it could be given to a potential graduate student? Why or why not?

     iii. What would you suggest be done to increase the realism of the situation depicted?

     iv. What, if anything, could he have said in order to increase the likelihood of recruiting you to the department, given your racial identity?

  b. Closed ended

      i. I was able to imagine myself in the situation described.

      ii. The scenario reflects a situation that could happen in everyday life.

     iii. This scenario reflects a credible situation.

     iv. The scenario felt realistic

IV. Thinking about the scenario you just read. Using the scale provided, please indicate how much do you agree with the following statements regarding the recruiting MESSAGE. (1 = *Strongly disagree*, 7= *Strongly agree*)

      i. The recruitment messages were unrealistic

      ii. No recruiter could have said those things

     iii. No recruiter would have spoken that way

Appendix D

Organizational Attractiveness Scale
Reverse scored items are indicated by [R].

Instructions: Thinking about the scenario you just read, how much do you agree with the following statements about *attraction towards the department*. (1 = *Strongly disagree*, 7= *Strongly agree*)

1. For me, this department would be a good place to *study*.

2. I would not be interested in this department except as a last resort [Item Dropped]

3. This department is attractive to me as a place for graduate school.

4. I am interested in learning more about this department.

5. *Working* at this department is very appealing to me.

6. I would accept a graduate school offer from this department.

7. I would make this department one of my first choices as a graduate student.

8. I would exert a great deal of effort to *study* in this department.

9. I would exert a great deal of effort to *work* in this department.

10. I would recommend this department to a friend looking for a graduate program.

11. Graduate students are probably proud to say they *study* in this department.

12. Graduate students are probably proud to say they *work* in this department.

13. This is a reputable department to be a part of.

14. This department probably has a reputation as being an excellent *graduate program*.

15. This department probably has a reputation as being an excellent *place to work*.

16. I find this department a prestigious place to *study*.

17. I find this department a prestigious place to *work*.

18. There are probably many who would like to *work* in this department.

19. For me, this department would be a good place in which to *work*.

20. *Studying* in this department is very appealing to me.

21. There are probably many who would like to *study* in this department.

Appendix E

Student Motivation Scale

Instructions: Below is a list of adjectives. Thinking about the scenario you have just read, please indicate which of these adjectives best capture how you feel about *joining the department*.

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Motivated	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Unmotivated
Interested	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Uninterested
Attracted	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Repulsed
Don't want to study there[R]	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Want to study there
Inspired	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Uninspired
Unenthused [R]	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Enthused
Excited	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Not excited
Dreading it [R]	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Looking forward to it

Appendix F

Intention to Accept the Offer

Thinking about the scenario you just read, indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements about *accepting the offer to join the department*. (1 = *not at all likely*, 7 = *extremely likely*)

1) I intend to accept this offer.
2) I am likely to say yes to this offer.
3) ®I do not want to join this department.
4) ®I would not accept this offer to join the department.
5) ®I would be hesitant to join this department.
6) I would join this department.

Appendix G

Perception of Message Politeness

Instructions: Thinking about the scenario you just read, indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements about the *recruiter and his message*. (1 = *Strongly disagree*, 7= *Strongly agree*).

(Reverse scored items are indicated by [R].)

1. The recruiter was positive toward you.

2. The recruiter was understanding toward you.

3. The recruiter took great care not to impose on you.

4. The recruiter was appropriate.

5. The recruiter's message was proper.

6. The recruiter was polite.

Appendix H

Source Credibility Measure

Instructions: Below is a list of adjectives. Thinking about the scenario you just read, please indicate your feelings about *Recruiter of the Department*. Select the option toward either word that best represents your feelings.

[R] Reliable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unreliable
Uninformed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Informed
Unqualified	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Qualified
[R] Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unintelligent
[R] Valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Worthless
Inexpert	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Expert
[R] Honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dishonest
Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Friendly
[R] Pleasant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unpleasant
Awful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Nice
[R] Virtuous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sinful

Appendix I

Demographic Questions

1. In what year were you born? _____

2. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If you're currently enrolled in school, please indicate the highest degree you have received.
    (1) Attended some college or university
    (2) Associate's degree (e.g., AA, AS)
    (3) Bachelor's degree (e.g., BA, BS)
    (4) Master's degree (e.g., MA, MS, MEd)
    (5) Doctorate (e.g., PhD, EdD)
    (6) professional degree
    (7) Other not listed _____

3. How do you describe your gender identity? *(Mark all that apply)*
    (1) Female
    (2) Male
    (3) Transgender
    (4) Genderqueer
    (5) Agender
    (6) A gender not listed _____

4. How do you describe your sexual identity? *(Mark all that apply)*
    (1) Heterosexual/straight
    (2) Homosexual/gay/lesbian
    (3) Bisexual
    (4) Asexual
    (5) A sexuality not listed _____

5. With which racial and ethnic group(s) do you identify? *(Mark all that apply)*
    (1) American Indian or Alaskan
    (2) Asian
    (3) Black or African American
    (4) Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish
    (5) Middle Eastern or Northern African
    (6) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
    (7) White
    (8) Another race or ethnicity not listed above _____

6. How do you describe your disability/ability status? We are interested in this identification regardless of whether you typically request accommodations for this ability. *(Mark all that apply)*

(1) I do not identify with a disability or impairment
(2) A sensory impairment (vision or hearing)
(3) A learning disability (e.g., ADHD, dyslexia)
(4) A long-term medical illness (e.g., epilepsy, cystic fibrosis)
(5) A mobility impairment
(6) A mental health disorder
(7) A temporary impairment due to illness or injury (e.g., broken ankle, surgery)
(8) A disability or impairment not listed above _____

7. Please describe your salient personal identity(ies)/group membership(s) (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, religious affiliation, ability/disability, veteran status, parent/guardian status). _____

8. In which US state do you live?

9. What is your current job title: _____

10. How long have you held this position: _____

11. Does your current job duties involve any supervisory responsibilities: Yes/No
    a. If yes, Do you have any employees who report directly to you: Yes/No

12. Have you been employed by a college or university: Yes/No
    a. If yes, were you employed by the college or university as a:
        i.   Full-time employee
        ii. Part-time employee
    b. If yes, Were you employed while attending the college or university as a student: Yes/No

Appendix J

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)

Think about your identity as a Black/African American person. Use the numbers below to

indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your racial

identity. (1 = *Strongly disagree*, 7 = *Strongly agree*)

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about being Black, such as
    its history, traditions, and customs.
2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly Black members.
3. I have a clear sense of my Black ethnic background and what it means for me.
4. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by being Black.
5. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to (Black).
6. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group (Black).
7. I understand pretty well what being Black means to me.
8. In order to learn more about my Black ethnic background, I have often talked
    to other people about my ethnic group.
9. I have a lot of pride in my Black ethnic group.
10. I participate in cultural practices of my own Black ethnic group, such as special food,
    music, or customs.
11. I feel a strong attachment towards my own Black ethnic group.
12. I feel good about my Black cultural or ethnic background.

Recruitment Script

Hello,

We are conducting an academic survey about your perception and potential reaction to recruitment messages from a recruiter while considering joining an organization.

To be eligible, you must be 18 years or older, be able to understand English, and identify as Black/African American to participate in this study.

If you agree to be in this research, you will be asked to read a recruitment message from a hypothetical recruitment interaction and then answer questions about the scenario you read and other demographic information.

We estimate it will take you approximately 30 minutes to complete the survey. Please note that you can access the survey only once.

Your answers are important to us we need truthful ones. Please do not rush through the survey. In order to compensate you, we will look at how much time it took you to complete the survey and whether you completed all attention verification questions correctly. Only those questionnaires that do will be compensated.

At the end of the questionnaire you will be given a validation code – please return here and enter this code and submit your HIT.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and participation.

Appendix L

Consent Form

Consent to Participate in Research at the University of Oklahoma

[OU-NC IRB Number: 10994   Approval Date: 9/9/19

You are invited to participate in research about your perceptions about recruitment messages while considering joining an organization. You must be 18 years or older to participate.

If you agree to participate, you will complete this online survey in which you will read a recruitment message from a hypothetical recruitment interaction and then answer questions about the scenario you read. We estimate it will take you approximately 30 minutes to complete the survey.

There are no risks or benefits from participating in this study.

If you agree to participate in this study, complete the questionnaire in full and pass all attention verification questions, you will receive $2 through your Amazon Mechanical Turk account

Your participation is voluntary and your responses will be anonymous.

After removing all identifiers, we might share your data with other researchers or use it in future research without obtaining additional consent from you.

Even if you choose to participate now, you may stop participating at any time and for any reason.

Data are collected via an online survey system that has its own privacy and security policies for keeping your information confidential. No assurance can be made as to their use of the data you provide.

If you have questions about this research, please contact me at Jasmine Austin at Jtaustin02@ou.edu (337-247-5120) or my research advisor Dr. Ryan Bisel at ryanbisel@ou.edu.

You can also contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board at 405-325-8110 or irb@ou.edu with questions, concerns or complaints about your rights as a research participant, or if you don't want to talk to the researcher.

Please print this document for your records. By providing information to the researcher(s), I am agreeing to participate in this research.