UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

COMMUNICATING VALUE-IN-DIVERSITY CAMPAIGNS: THE ROLE OF REACTANCE AND INOCULATION IN ACCOMPLISHING ORGANIZATIONAL AIMS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

JEANETTA D. SIMS
Norman, Oklahoma
2008

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/319130

COMMUNICATING VALUE-IN-DIVERSITY CAMPAIGNS:
THE ROLE OF REACTANCE AND INOCULATION
IN ACCOMPLISHING ORGANIZATIONAL AIMS

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

BY

_____
Dr. Michael Pfau, Chair

_____
Dr. Meta G. Carstarphen

_____
Dr. Glenn J. Hansen

_____
Dr. Patrick C. Meirick

_____
Dr. Claude H. Miller

© Copyright by JEANETTA D. SIMS 2008
All Rights Reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The OU communication department faculty members who serve on this committee of mentors have been invaluable in my development as a junior scholar. To me, mentorship is providing a smoother path and guided lessons for your mentee to follow. Certainly each committee member has contributed to my scholarly growth and communication knowledge, while providing their own unique examples of how to instruct, be a colleague, and work in the professoriate.

First to Dr. Glenn Hansen, I am extremely indebted to you for your willingness to serve on the committee and familiarize yourself with my research interests and more specifically with this research project in such a short amount of time. Your readiness to assist during Dr. Johnson's absence is a wonderful indication of the spirit of cooperation and focus on scholarship that I have found during my time in the communication department at OU.

From Dr. Patrick Meirick, I was first exposed to a research taskforce and the process of how informal inquiries and questions lead to research design, sectioned literature reviews, and data collection. It was an insightful taskforce that gave me the conceptual framework for both the research process and for the utility of content analysis in my research interests.

From Dr. Amy Johnson, I learned the value of statistical analysis and its ability to provide results to certain researcher-devised questions. Her instruction outlined the limitations and boundaries associated with the use of certain tools in an organized and efficient fashion which made comprehension at the time easier as well as made my ability to revisit the use of certain methods in the future more palatable.

From Dr. Claude Miller, I learned the value of interdisciplinary work to creative inquiry, the forgotten role of affect and emotion, and to have a sense of curiosity in the interrelationships of key concepts with other concepts, theories and contextual areas. The directed focus on understanding the nuances associated with theoretical frameworks has always given way to asking, "What happens if. . . .?" This questioning and curiosity have become a fail-proof way of never running out of research questions or research projects, provided your understanding of the key elements of a theory is accurate.

From Dr. Meta Carstarphen, I learned valuable techniques and approaches for teaching diversity and diversity-related curriculum in an inclusive, soft spoken, experiential, and student-driven fashion. Her insights prompted me to re-think the role of diversity in public relations and to re-consider my methodological assumptions related to the study of diversity. And, definitely her encouragement and unofficial questioning/pressure enabled us to both complete the accreditation in public relations process. Even if the exposure came in my last year of doctoral coursework, I'm grateful for having been in the classroom of at least one African American female professor in all of my years of college education.

Finally, from Dr. Michael Pfau, I learned. . . (probably, what have I not learned might be more appropriate, but I'll do my best to summarize). . . the importance of systematic reasoning and the role of logic in theory development, while formulating research designs and testing new areas of inquiry. His emphasis on bringing students along for the research ride, creating a community of scholars and idea exchange, being well read, encouraging students through difficult personal times, forcing a timeline for

work completion, drafting the full prospectus, reviewing work in an unreasonably quick turnaround time, having a research pipeline, advancing theory and its associated nuances, and testing theory in new contextual areas have all immeasurably influenced my academic life and left an indelible mark on what the Academy is/should truly be about and on what my role in it is/should be.

Additional OU faculty, Dr. Young Kim, Dr. Dan O'Hair, and Dr. Elaine Hsieh played a vital role in my scholarly thinking and focus as I took their respective courses. To the entire OU faculty, especially those who contributed to my doctoral education and to those who serve on my committee, I am grateful to all of you and thankful for my chosen window of time in the communication department where I had an opportunity to be mentored by and to learn under your instruction.

To make the completion of the doctoral coursework and dissertation possible, God blessed me with the world's best support system which has provided me with more strength, encouragement, and assistance in ways that I never knew I would need, nor do I feel I deserve. My husband, Damon, has been a fantastic, steadfast presence in allowing guilt-free time and doing whatever was needed (loading software, ordering a laptop, fixing the car, watching the kids, cooking meals, bringing me trays of food while I worked, watering the flowers, cleaning house, etc.) for me to focus on my studies. He has tolerated me carrying my work everywhere - hauling books on vacation, writing papers on road trips, and completing work for exams at family reunions. Despite it all, he has given his full assurance, support and faith in my abilities and encouraged me in pursuing and advancing in my chosen career. My parents, Darnell and Lena Davis, and my in-laws, Earl and Dorothy Sims, have been

enthusiastic child care providers, great listeners, and wonderful cheerleaders in this effort. Their dining room tables have served as my own personal office while they ushered my kids away after brief visits and brought me home-cooked meals, checked on my progress, and fussed over my lack of sleep. To compliment my immediate and extended family, I have been blessed with a wonderful church family, the South Edmond Church of Christ, who have provided wisdom, spiritual focus, and encouragement throughout the doctoral process and the personal challenges that Damon and I have experienced along the way. They have cleaned house, brought food, gone grocery shopping, given thoughtful gifts, watched the kids, decorated my home, and performed other random acts of kindness that they thought I needed. With such a reservoir of support, I know I'm spoiled, but I prefer to call it being very, very blessed.

Also, my support system includes a host of wonderful friends, research assistants, and colleagues. Thanks to Lisa Sedlacek, Atoya Sims, and Taylor Tidwell for their voluntary efforts at data collection, coding, and data entry. As volunteers on the dissertation project, they attended meetings, adhered to requested deadlines, and did so with what-else-do-you-need, amazingly respectful dispositions. I'm not sure what I did to deserve their help, but I'm extremely grateful for them and the way they have contributed to the project. Thanks to the following friends who endured the OU journey, who allowed me to share in research and exchange ideas, and who served as personal encouragers along the way: Brian Houston, Jennifer White, Bobi Ivanov, Kimberly Parker-Ivanov, Eileen Gilchrist, Shelley Wigley, Michel Haigh, Brandi Goldman, and Toni Soriko. Finally, thanks to the following faculty and colleagues who span several universities for their encouragement in my degree completion and/or for

their specific assistance in completing the dissertation: Dr. Jeffrey Hobbs, Dr. Ron Bever, Dr. Bailey McBride, the late Dr. Tony Alley, Dr. Penny Eubank, Dr. Larry Jurney, Dr. Philip Patterson, Mr. Phil Reagan, Dr. Jeanine Varner, the CCCU Women's Leadership Development Institute Gang, Dr. Herma Williams, Dr. Michael Shirley, Dr. Stacia Wert-Gray, Dr. Donna Carlon, Dr. Bobi Ivanov, Dr. Kimberly Parker-Ivanov, Dr. Stefan Genchev, Dr. Russ Jones, Dr. Janice Williams, Dr. John Camey, Dr. Barbara Parrish, Dr. Robert Buchanan, Dr. David Hartmann, Dr. Geoff Willis, Dr. Mickey Hepner, Dr. Mihai Nica, Mr. Allen Arnold, Dr. Soba Bahouth, Dr. Robert Terrell, Ms. Shelley Myatt, Ms. Christy Anderson, Dr. Jerry Allison, Dr. K.J. Tullis, Dr. Suzanne Clinton, Dr. Kelly Moyers, Mr. Phillip Jeck, and Ms. Rachel Lopez.

Finally, this dissertation and the completion of this degree is dedicated to my kids – to the memory of Anthony, to the inward and outward beauty as well as keen intellect of Maicel, to the fun-loving, focused, and handsome Savion, and to the little Baby Sims yet to come. Though what your mom has done is fairly unimportant and meaningless to you at the time of this writing, my hope is that this example of completion serves as a model for you to follow in pursuing your own endeavors – that you would strive in an honorable fashion doing your best to behave in a way that God, family, church, friends, colleagues, and community will find favorable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES xii

ABSTRACT xiii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION: ORGANIZATIONAL DIVERSITY AND ITS IMPORTANCE 1

Diversity as a Relevant Enterprise for Organizations 2
Diversity and the Academy 5
Defining Diversity in the Academy 5
Diversity Research in the Academy 8
Social Identity Theory 8
Embedded Intergroup Relations Theory 9
Racioethnicity and Gender 9
Organizational Demography 10
Ethnology 12

II. VALUE-IN-DIVERSITY CAMPAIGNS: A MIXED-MESSAGE, MIXED-MOTIVE AND MIXED-REACTION ORGANIZATIONAL EFFORT 14

III. PSYCHOLOGICAL REACTANCE:UNDERSTANDING THE IMPACT OF VALUE-IN-DIVERSITY MESSAGES 19

Psychological Reactance 20
The Theory and its Propositional Logic 21
Psychological Reactance Research 24
Extreme Discrepant Attitudes and the Political Context 25
Marketing Context 26
Interpersonal Context 27
Counseling Context 28
Health Context 30
Organizational Context 32
Empirical Research Explained by Reactance Theory 33
Psychological Reactance and Value-in-Diversity Campaigns 34
Overall Reactance 35
Magnitude of Reactance 36
Attitudinal Impact of Reactance 38
Attraction of Restricted Freedoms 39
Message Strategies and Reactance 40

Restoration of Freedom 42

IV. INOCULATION THEORY: AN ANTIDOTE TO PROTECT VALUE-IN-DIVERSITY ATTITUDES 43

Inoculation Theory 44
Historical Originations 45
McGuire's Inoculation Process and its Original Mechanisms 46
Threat 47
Refutational Preemption 48
Criticism of Original Mechanisms 49
New Mechanisms in the Inoculation Process 51
Involvement 51
Emotion 52
Attitude Accessibility 54
Associative Networks 55
Inoculation's Role in Value-in-Diversity Campaigns 56
Inoculation as an Antidote 57
Inoculation and Reactance 61
Schemas and the Inoculation Process 61
Schema Activation and Accessibility 67

V. METHODS 69

Participants 69
Design and Independent Variables 69
Experimental Materials 71
Procedure 75
Variables and Measures 77
Covariates 77
Dependent Measures 79

VI. RESULTS 86

H1 & H5: Reactance, Campaign Messages, and Majority Members 86
H1: Overall Reactance 87
H5: Attraction of Restricted Freedoms 87
H2-H4: Campaign Messages, Reactance, and Diversity Status 88
H2-H3: Magnitude of Reactance 90
H4: Attitudinal Impact of Reactance 91
H6-H7: Campaign Message Strategies and Restoration of Freedom 93
H6: Message Strategies and Reactance 94
H7: Restoration of Freedom 95
H8, H9b, & RQ3: Overall Influence of Inoculation 96
H8 & H9b: Overall Inoculation 98

RQ3: Inoculation and Reactance 98
H9a & RQ1-RQ2: Inoculation, Involvement, Threat and Diversity Status Condition 99
H9a: Inoculation as an Antidote 100
RQ1: Threat and Diversity Status 101
RQ2: Involvement and Diversity Status 101
H10a & H11a: Inoculation's Impact on Schemas 102
H10a: Inoculation's Influence on Schema Representations 102
H11a: Inoculation's Influence on Schema Accessibility 103
H10b & H11b: Inoculation, Schemas, and Attitudinal Resistance 103

VII. DISCUSSION 106

The Role of Psychological Reactance in Accomplishing Organizational Aims 107
Psychological Reactance and Value-in-Diversity Campaigns 108
Impact of Reactance from Value-in-Diversity Campaigns 109
Message Strategies and Value-in-Diversity Campaigns 110
The Role of Inoculation Theory in Accomplishing Organizational Aims 113
Inoculation as an Antidote for Anti-Diversity Attacks 113
Inoculation and the Role of Schemas 117

VIII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH 119

LIST OF REFERENCES 121

APPENDICES 151

Appendix A: Phase 1: Inoculation & Control Messages 151

Appendix B: Phase 2: Campaign & Control Messages 158

Appendix C: Phase 3: Attack Messages 169

Appendix D: All Questionnaires 176

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. 3 Most Prevalent Approaches to Different Identities in Interdisciplinary Diversity Literature 144

2. Principle Component Analytic Results for the Network Heterogeneity Measure 145

3. Principle Component Analytic Results for Attraction of Restricted Freedoms Measure 146

4. Phase 2 Means for Majority Participants as a Function of Campaign Message Condition 147

5. Phase 2 Means for Campaign Message Recipients as a Function of Diversity Status Condition 148

6. Phase 2 Means for Majority Participants as a Function of Campaign Message Type and Postscript Type 149

7. Means for Inoculated Participants as a Function of Diversity Status Condition 150

ABSTRACT

This investigation seeks to illuminate important considerations for carrying out value-in-diversity campaigns with the eventual aim of helping organizational messages be more persuasive, more influential, and less likely to generate reactance. Using Brehm's (1966; Brehm & Brehm, 1981) psychological reactance, it is predicted that value-in-diversity campaign messages provoke reactance among majority members of an organization. The magnitude of reactance, the impact of reactance upon attitudes, and the impact of reactance upon attraction of the restricted freedoms is explored as well as implicit/explicit message strategies and the restoration of freedoms. In addition, using McGuire's (1961, 1962, 1964, 1970) inoculation theory, this research investigates avenues for protecting value-in-diversity attitudes from slippage once organizational diversity initiatives are underway. Also, this investigation offers schemas as an alternative mechanism for the way in which inoculation promotes resistance. In the areas of psychological reactance, results indicated that value-in-diversity campaign messages do generate some symptoms of reactance (greater threat to freedom and more anger-related negative affect) with all manifestations of reactance (greater threat to freedom, more anger-related negative affect, more negative source evaluations and less favorable attitudes) being experienced by majority organizational members as compared to minority members. Campaign messages with explicit language elicit greater threat to freedom with no negative attitudinal implications, while campaign messages with a restoration postscript reduce threat to freedom. For inoculation, results failed to support an overall inoculation effect, but instead indicate a more nuanced path to resistance within the organizational diversity context. Minority members

experienced greater threat to susceptibility of their pro-diversity attitudes, and inoculation posed as a viable strategy for conferring attitudinal resistance to attack among organizational members with higher involvement levels. No support for the predictions related to schemas was found in this investigation.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: ORGANIZATIONAL DIVERSITY AND ITS IMPORTANCE

Diversity is both a big challenge and an opportunity of great value. . . The aim is to understand this growing phenomena, without undervaluing its complexity and richness and to move towards a more inclusive and truly committed stakeholder approach.

- Silvia Ravazzani (2006, p. 11)

More than 40 years ago, Davis (1963) predicted the increasing representation of older workers and minority groups in the total workforce population. He contended this increase would have enormous significance for the modern corporation not only because of traditional hiring and firing policies, but also because of the attitudinal shift needed by most corporations in dealing with their constituents. Davis argued that changing demographics would propel the interests of the corporation into making the "greatest possible use of trained ability, regardless of race, religion, sex, age, or any other basis of ascribing status" (p. 135).

Today, others in writing about workforce predictions and statistics (Johnston, 1991; Johnston & Packer, 1987), echo the shifting demographics of Davis' (1963) sentiments, and many suggest companies with strategies that adequately attract and develop diverse workforces will reap a competitive advantage (Cox, 2001; Cox & Blake, 1991; Esty, 1988; Hoecklin, 1995; Johnston, 1991). The push for diversity

initiatives, diversity programs, and diversity training has fueled an increased focus on "different identities" and transported diversity to the forefront of many organizational agendas. Propelled by numerous factors, diversity has become a relevant enterprise for organizations and a pertinent area of academic interest.

Diversity as a Relevant Enterprise for Organizations

Several key issues make diversity relevant to today's organizations. The shifting U.S. population has resulted in an increase in Hispanics, now the largest minority population in the United States (Rose, 2002), as well as an increase in African Americans, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders (Wilson, Gutierrez, & Chao, 2003). Today, 30% of the U.S. population consists of ethnic minorities, and by 2050 half of the U.S. population is estimated to be people of color (Nelson & Quick, 2006).

Along with racial and ethnic population shifts, organizations are also experiencing an older (people over 65 will comprise 20% of the workforce in 2020) and more female (with women making up more than 60% of the workforce) workforce (Nelson & Quick, 2006). Population shifts are likely to impact organizations in at least three ways. First, it changes the landscape of those an organization is capable of employing. Second, it changes the makeup of organizational cross-functional teams popularized in the 90s. Finally, it changes the nature of the environments that organizations must adapt to in order to maintain their solvency.

Along with a shifting U.S. population, legal ramifications make diversity a relevant enterprise as well. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1974, the Age Discrimination Act of 1967, and the Americans

with Disabilities Act of 1990, just to name a few key legislative measures, have all forced organizations into a new reality of accounting for organizational actions.

Economic ramifications of the shifting U.S. population exist as well, primarily in the form of multi-ethnic emergent markets. Kern-Foxworth (1991) credits Gibson (1969, 1978) for being the first to recognize multi-ethnic markets as consumers worthy of company efforts to increase market share. The African American consumer market became valuable enough for identification and for being a part of several companies' efforts to create new target markets. Since Gibson's books, which spoke of the significant return on investment for companies that focused on African American communities as markets, mutli-ethnic markets soon became viewed as untapped areas in the marketplace.

The African American consumer market grew twice the rate of Whites in the 80s, and Blacks constitute the majority in several United States cities like Atlanta and Memphis. With an increased disposable income amount over $800 billion, Kern-Foxworth (1991) predicted the "African American consumer market will be a viable asset in all aspects of American business" (p. 27). Future projections for the growth of Blacks is for this population to grow about 10% in each decade, while the growth rate for Whites is 2.5% (Wilson et al., 2003).

Perhaps, the Hispanic consumer market has been the most rapidly growing of the minority markets. The Hispanic population grew by 30% between 1980 and 1987, prompting a revamping of the English-only language use by employees and in collateral materials of corporations. No business was immune from the ramifications of

a growing Hispanic population, and future projections are for the Hispanic community to grow at a rate of 25% in each decade until 2050 (Wilson et al., 2003).

The Asian American and Pacific Islander consumer markets doubled in the 80s (Kern-Foxworth, 1991), and have the steepest growth rate predictions at just under 30% in each decade until 2050 (Wilson et al., 2003). The Native American consumer market is perhaps the least talked about among multi-ethnic markets; however, the growth rate of this population is expected to be about 10% in each decade until 2050 (Wilson et al., 2003).

The increase in numbers, however, reflects only small portions of the challenges that multi-ethnic markets bring. Each respective group has a different set of "habits and tastes depending on cultural values and customs deriving from their respective national origins" (Kotcher, 1995, p. 7). The growth of multi-ethnic consumer markets has already prompted discussions concerning the ramifications for professionals (Fry, 1992; Kern-Foxworth, 1991; Kotcher, 1995). Questions about the levels of preparedness in America's industry for a new racially- and ethnically-mixed America, perhaps serves as the catalyst for organizations to adjust and meet the demands associated with emergent multi-ethnic markets and diversity.

The presence and influence of these dominant factors, from the shifting U.S. population and legal ramifications to the economic impact of multi-ethnic markets and the aging and more female workforce, have proven Davis' (1963) prediction to be true and have forced a "commitment to diversity-oriented organizational interventions" (Carter, 2000, p. 4). As a result, for organizations, diversity has become a relevant and necessary enterprise. In addition, inside the academy, across a variety of disciplines,

diversity scholarship has increased in an effort to keep pace with or stay ahead of the new organizational reality.

Diversity and the Academy

Along with increased attention outside the Academy, diversity has become a "buzzword" in academic organizational literature (Allen, 1995) with a very broad, theoretical and empirical voice. From the divergent conceptions of ethnic identity among academicians (Kim, 2002) to debates over diverse work group performance (see Copeland, 1988; Cox, 1993; Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991; Esty, 1988; Mandell & Kohler-Gray, 1990; Marmer-Solomon, 1989 for studies of how diverse workgroups outperform their homogenous counterparts and see Shephard, 1964 and Ziller, 1973 for studies which suggest too much diversity is problematic for group performance), scholars themselves along with organizations are forced into a new reality of discovering what it means to manage, handle, understand, predict, or capitalize on organizational diversity.

Defining Diversity in the Academy

Though, "the concept of identity appears to be at the core of understanding diversity in organizations" (Nkomo & Cox, 1996, p. 339), defining diversity within the academy has not been met with agreement among scholars. In addition, scholars have not reached collective agreement on a single definition for organizational diversity. Jackson and Ruderman (1995) contend, "the term *diversity* is not a well-established scientific construct. There is no consensus yet on what diversity means, nor is there consensus about which types of phenomena define the domain of *diversity research*" (p. 3).

A variety of restrictive and inclusive conceptual definitions have been offered in the extant interdisciplinary literature for describing what it means to consider organizational diversity. Cox (1993) suggests managing diversity means "planning and implementing organizational systems and practices to manage people so that the potential advantages of diversity are *maximized* while its potential disadvantages are *minimized*" (p. 9). Thomas (1990) explains managing diversity is "managing in such a way as to get from a heterogeneous work force the same productivity, commitment, quality, and profit that we got from the old homogeneous work force" (p. 109). In defining diversity, Cross, Katz, Miller, and Seashore (1994) restrict the term's meaning to focus on what is typically viewed as issues of discrimination – racism, sexism, heterosexism, classism, ableism, etc. Finally, Jackson, Stone, and Alvarez (1993) extend diversity to be much more inclusive by suggesting the term "refers to situations in which the actors of interest are not alike with respect to some attribute" (p. 53).

Perhaps the value of definitions offered by Cox (1993) and Thomas (1990) is their attempts to tie diversity to an organization's performance, thus connecting successful attempts at managing diversity to improved profit or shareholder value. However, more recent interdisciplinary literature reveals the central premise of what it means to manage organizational diversity is not tied to an organization's performance; although, success or failure in the area will likely have bottom-line consequences and implications (Cox, 1993; Cox & Blake, 1991; Cox et al., 1991; Harris & Moran, 1991; Mandell & Kohler-Gray, 1990; Marmer-Soloman, 1989). Instead, the key component of managing organizational diversity lies in whether or not the organization allows different types of people to perform, to become members, and to have power – or in

other words to fully make a contribution. A number of factors weigh in on this definition – the majority culture, the minority culture, an individual's social identity, prevailing ideologies, and the structural process of power existing within the organization itself, to name just a few.

Given this re-framed focus on diversity, the definition offered by Nkomo and Cox (1996), acknowledges the heart of diversity as identities being managed. They define diversity as "a mixture of people with different group identities within the same social system" (p. 339). Brewer, von Hippel, and Gooden (1999) incorporate organizational dynamics into their definition. They suggest managing diversity means the "achievement of full integration of members of minority social categories into the social, structural, and power relationships of an organization or institution" (p. 337).

By combining the Nkomo and Cox (1996) and Brewer et al. (1999) definitions with the desire of individuals to make a contribution in organizations in which they choose to be associated, the working definition for this investigation emerges. Organizational diversity is managing the full contributions of people with *different identities* into the social, structural, and power relationships of an organization or institution. Numerous diversity dimensions exist which could serve as the area of difference associated with *different identities* present in an organization including age, race, ethnicity, social class, religion, sexual orientation, job tenure, national origin, and sex to name a few – all of which have been investigated by scholars as focal dimensions associated with the study of diversity. The focal diversity dimension for this investigation will be racioethnicity.

Diversity Research in the Academy

The depth and variety of theoretical approaches to investigations on diversity are as varied as the number of definitional approaches to the construct previously offered. However, the consistent theme among empirical inquiries is the investigation of factors, processes, and experiences resulting from the presence of *different identities* in organizations and work groups. This overview of diversity research is organized and grouped by the major orientations to the treatment of *different identities* in the study of organizations offered by Nkomo and Cox (1996). The top three dominant approaches are summarized in Table 1. For a more extended discussion of the key attributes offered by each approach along with the challenges associated with varying approaches see Sims (2005). The empirical findings discussed with each approach are not exhaustive, but will be representative of the types of studies being conducted in the Academy in each area.

Social Identity Theory. Tajfel's (1978) social identity theory (SIT) has been a commonly used theory in diversity research (Martins, Milliken, Wiesenfeld, & Salgado, 2003). Kramer and Brewer (1984) conducted a series of experiments in which it was proven subgroup differentiation can interfere with the cooperative behavior displayed within social groups. They conclude "if subgroup identities are salient, implicit social competition may interfere with effective work group cooperation" (p. 56). However, Northcraft, Polzer, Neale, and Kramer (1995) suggest the likelihood of uncooperative behavior or other behavioral manifestations are not likely to occur in subgroups with little interdependence. Northcraft et al. suggest the greater issue for

subgroups is that social categorization provides a means for members to misconstrue positive interaction for diametrically opposed preferences.

Embedded Intergroup Relations Theory. Along with SIT, Alderfer and Smith's (1982) embedded intergroup relations theory (EIRT) has been predominantly used to study women and minorities in diversity-related research (Nkomo & Cox, 1996). One significant finding by Alderfer, Alderfer, Tucker, and Tucker (1980), who studied race relations among White and Black managers in racial groups, is that members of other racial groups socialized more with each other than with other racial groups and that members tended to view their own racial group as exhibiting this pattern less than the others. In addition, intergroup effects were found operating at not only the interpersonal level, but also at the interest group and systemic levels as had been supported in previous research (Alderfer, 1977). Alderfer and Smith (1982) suggest their studies (Alderfer, 1977; Alderfer et al., 1980) show "marked hierarchical intergroup effects and power differentials are evident in the way group members assessed their own advantages and disadvantages in the allocation of resources by the organization" (p. 58).

Racioethnicity and Gender. Several studies provide valuable insights into racioethnic differences associated with organizational diversity. In gauging White mens's and racial minorities' reactions to a layoff scenario, Mollica (2003) found that different identity groups perceived diversity management uniquely. White men saw the layoff as less fair when other White men were disproportionately laid off in an active-diversity context versus an inactive-diversity context, whereas racial minorities' perceptions were not influenced by the diversity context. Racial minorities perceived

the layoff as more fair to their group in an active-diversity context when White men were disproportionately laid off.

Also, Martins et al. (2003) examined whether or not the racioethnic diversity of the organizational context influenced racioethnic group members' experiences. The scholars studied group member experiences in two different organizational contexts – one that was more racioethnically diverse than the other. Martins et al. found a group's racioethnic diversity has stronger negative effects on its members' experiences in the more homogeneous context than in the more heterogeneous one.

Organizational Demography. Along with racioethnic approaches, a number of scholars have focused on how other demographic variables (besides race, ethnicity, and gender) influence all workgroups within an organization. Bowen and Blackmon (2003) argue the experiences of gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees have been underresearched. Using the spiral of silence theory, Bowen and Blackmon posited the effects of diverse workgroups on whether or not invisible minorities (gays, lesbians, and bi-sexuals) chose organizational voice or silence. They contend heterogeneous workgroups can "create the potential for valuable contributions but also disrupt workgroup cohesion and communication" (p. 1409).

Also, Bowen and Blackmon (2003) explained that members of the invisible minority can disclose or "choose to reveal [their sexual orientation] and risk social isolation or other negative effects, or choose to conceal or evade" (p. 1410). Since the presence of a gay man or lesbian in a work group is not often an observable attribute (similar to race, ethnicity, and gender), Bowen and Blackmon argue that sexual

orientation offers a new dimension to the challenges associated with organizational diversity.

Other studies related to this approach provide key findings on diversity-related initiatives in organizations. Kossek, Markel, and McHugh's (2003) study found work group members in units with the greatest organizational demography change over an eight-year period did not necessarily agree nor hold positive perceptions regarding diversity changes (over time the organization had increased its overall representation of White women 36% and its minority representation 41%). The authors contend focusing on organization demography changes without developing supportive group norms and a positive organizational climate will result in inadequate diversity change strategies.

Another study by Kanter (1977) suggests demographic shifts in organizations are likely to be viewed negatively as tokenism (which is defined as 15% or less) until sufficient "tipping points" (which is defined as 35% or more) are reached. Also, Kanter (1977) suggests Allport's (1954) social contact theory (which posits the more contact with a particular outgroup, the fewer negative stereotypes and other evidences of prejudice of that particular group over time) may not apply in organizations until critical mass or tipping levels have been reached.

Other findings related to diversity efforts from the organizational demography approach include the following: incremental structural change may not improve an organization's climate and instead may even hurt it in the short-run (Kossek et al., 2003); the occurrence of backlash and resistance among senior males (Bailyn, 2000);

and increased competition and negative gender dynamics between women at higher organizational levels and women at lower organizational levels (Ely, 1995).

Ethnology. Nkomo and Cox (1996) prefer to use the term ethnology for describing this approach instead of ethnography, because ethnology is the branch of anthropology that is concerned with cross-cultural comparisons of similarities and differences, rather than attempts to understand and describe a specific culture. They define this area as "any group identity to which distinctive cultural traits may be identified by systematic research" (p. 345).

From this perspective, scholars have offered several cultural variables for contrasting and understanding cultural differences. Hofstede's (1980, 1983) cultural dimensions (including individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, and masculinity-femininity) have been used to identify variations among the cultures of more than 40 countries. Additionally, Hall's (1976) low- and high-context communication, Triandis' (1994) structural tightness, Parson's (1951) pattern variables concept, and Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1960) value orientations provide additional insights into several key distinctions between cultures. Each of these scholars contend people of different nationality groups will vary along the above distinctions which creates the need for recognition of how cultures differ. Harris and Moran (1991) argue for the necessity of valuing cultural differences and managing for cultural impacts on different cultural identities present in organizations.

While numerous studies have attempted to classify national cultures and have been successful, Hofstede's (1980, 1983) four dimensions are perhaps the most cited and heuristic across multiple disciplines. His work has yielded tables of country

positions on each of his cultural dimensions with key explanations for business areas affected along with the individual scores of each country studied. Scholars who have tested Hofstede's work with a Chinese bias (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987) found three of his four dimensions were supported or correlated in their research, and the fourth dimension was replaced with a Confucian work dynamism dimension which provided insight into universalism versus particularism (which is the degree to which truth is viewed as an absolute versus truth being viewed as dependent upon who speaks).

In summary, interdisciplinary scholarly works have investigated a number of organizational diversity processes over the past 20 years ranging from the value of understanding the role of dominant identity (Ely, 1995) to the importance of exploring cross-functional teams (Northcraft et al., 1995) and work group performance (Cox et al., 1991; Mandell & Kohler-Gray, 1990; Marmer-Solomon, 1989). However, while studies focus on the persuasive efforts of diversity as a change agent strategy or the group processes at play in the integration of diversity efforts, none have explored the communication strategies by which value-in-diversity campaigns can better contribute to organizational aims, which is a worthwhile endeavor given the mixed reactions that organizational members are likely to have about an organization's diversity efforts.

CHAPTER II

VALUE-IN-DIVERSITY CAMPAIGNS: A MIXED-MESSAGE, MIXED-MOTIVE AND MIXED-REACTION ORGANIZATIONAL EFFORT

The more significant problem is that *most employers have an organizational culture that is somewhere between toxic and deadly when it comes to handling diversity.* The result is that the presence of real diversity is unsustainable as a characteristic of the organization.

- Taylor Cox, Jr. (2001, p. 12)

Certainly, the polarization or lack of presence of different types of people in organizations has emerged as a focal topic among corporate professionals and scholars. Yet for many organizations, the desire to capitalize on diversity has been met with a grim reality of competing ideologies and overall a lack of "rigor, theoretical development, and historical specificity" (Nkomo & Cox, 1996, p. 338). Serious challenges prohibit leveraging diversity that make for disappointing results. According to Cox (2001), organizations often misdiagnosis or superficially diagnose diversity as a problem of insensitivity rather than assessing corporate culture and climate. In addition, failing to pursue a systematic approach as well as to understand the fairly lengthy and flat learning curve that requires a more steadfast diversity effort both contribute to an organization's set of challenges.

Despite these challenges, value-in-diversity attitudes that generate organizational campaigns and initiatives still persist. This value-in-diversity attitude is

a line of thinking that not only encourages the integration of *different identities*, but also maintains the organization's overall performance, creativity, marketing, problem-solving, and quality of decision-making is superior with a more diverse workforce (Cox, 1993). Ely (1995) suggests, "The management literature is rife with advice that organizations should value diversity in order to enhance organizational effectiveness" (p. 161). She explains the value-in-diversity attitude is "a major shift in thinking from the management strategies of an earlier era, which called for color blindness and urged indifference to 'irrelevant' cultural and physical characteristics such as race, sex, religion, and national origin" (p. 161).

While much of scholarly research and thinking supports the value-in-diversity concept, the notion has not always engendered such support. Shephard (1964) contends that too much diversity in problem-solving groups can be dysfunctional because the differences in communication styles, cultural barriers, and points of view make decision-making impossible due to a lack of commonality. Also, Ziller (1973) argues diversity violates group cohesiveness in the following three ways: (1) it leads to lower cohesiveness because of status incongruence when members are not accustomed to having a female, lesbian, or African American supervisor, (2) it leads to lower cohesiveness because perceived similarity increases attraction; thus perceived dissimilarity creates lower cohesiveness, and (3) it fails to account for how people seek homogeneity in groups for conformity which they rely upon to conduct self-evaluations.

So, even though not all scholars agree with the value-in-diversity concept (Shephard, 1964; Ziller, 1973), numerous scholars (Cox et al., 1991; Harris & Moran,

1991; Mandell & Kohler-Gray, 1990; Marmer-Soloman, 1989) contend "when properly managed, diverse groups and organizations have performance advantages over homogenous ones" (Cox, 1993, p. 17). Despite arguments against the value of diversity, pro-diversity thinking in organizations and in the Academy has prevailed.

The communication of value-in-diversity messages tends to be the focal point of an organization's diversity campaign efforts. Yet, very little research has focused upon how one can maximize the effectiveness of value-in-diversity messages by understanding the likely response they generate from various majority and minority organizational members.

Communicating the value of diversity can be a challenging notion for organizations seeking to improve profits or shareholder value. Value-in-diversity campaign messages do not fall in an aseptic environment of well-intentioned aims void of mismatched organizational member perceptions (Alderfer et al., 1980), organizational member disagreement (Kossek et al., 2003) and backlash or resistance (Bailyn, 2000). On the contrary, value-in-diversity campaign messages exist in an organizational climate quite laden with distrust from perceived power differentials (Alderfer & Smith, 1982), social competition (Kramer & Brewer, 1984), uncooperative behavioral manifestations (Northcraft et al., 1995), and mixed negative reactions about the fairness of the organization's actions (Mollica, 2003). Even positive interactions among different identities have the potential to be misconstrued, particularly in organizational groups with little interdependence (Northcraft et al., 1995).

The extant literature then documents that the prevailing organizational reality for value-in-diversity campaigns is often an environment of mixed dialectics and

tensions. Mixed messages exist where an organization's espoused values fail to live up to the toxicity of its culture. Mixed motives are present when the dominant coalition or top management team's efforts are conflicted between leveraging the different strengths associated with a more diverse workforce and managing to generate elements of cohesion while minimizing the differences. Additionally, mixed reactions exist as organizational members often desire an improved, peak-performing organization, but are often resistant to some of the very initiatives that could make organizational success possible.

A major challenge faced by an organization seeking to adapt to diversity, then, is how best to communicate its intentions within an often emotionally-charged and divisive atmosphere that can be present prior to the organization's diversity message, during the organization's diversity message, or as a direct result of the organization's diversity message. Thus, strategies, which can illuminate both a path of supportive acceptance and a path of least resistance, can be of great value to organizations in their value-in-diversity campaign efforts.

Given the lack of diversity-related empirical works that explore the process, influence, and outcomes associated with various communication strategies, this investigation seeks to illuminate important considerations for carrying out value-in-diversity campaigns with the eventual aim of helping organizational messages be more persuasive, more influential, and less likely to generate reactance. Rather than focusing upon the experiences and perceptions of minorities (e.g., Alderfer & Smith, 1982; Kossek & Zonia, 1993), this study redirects diversity research to majority members of an organization who serve as the targets of value-in-diversity campaign messages.

Using Brehm's (1966; Brehm & Brehm, 1981) psychological reactance, it is predicted that value-in-diversity campaign messages provoke reactance among majority members of an organization. The magnitude of reactance, the impact of reactance upon attitudes, and the impact of reactance upon attraction of the restricted freedoms is explored as well as implicit/explicit message strategies and the restoration of freedoms.

In addition, this research investigates avenues for protecting value-in-diversity attitudes from slippage once organizational diversity initiatives are underway. Using McGuire's (1961, 1962, 1964, 1970) inoculation theory, this study posits the usefulness of inoculation as an antidote and strategy to protect value-in-diversity attitudes that come under attack in an organization seeking success in its diversity efforts. Also, this investigation offers schemas as an alternative mechanism for the way in which inoculation promotes resistance.

CHAPTER III

PSYCHOLOGICAL REACTANCE: UNDERSTANDING THE IMPACT OF VALUE-IN-DIVERSITY MESSAGES

For students of persuasion, [psychological reactance] theory suggests that attempts to limit the freedom of receivers in responding to a persuasive message may represent bad strategy.

- Gerald Miller (1967, p. 293)

Repeatedly perceptual differences on an organization's diversity efforts have been confirmed in empirical works (Martins et al., 2003; Mollica, 2003). Based on social group membership (Brewer, 1995; Kramer & Brewer, 1984), organizational work group membership (Alderfer, 1987; Alderfer & Smith, 1982), race and gender (Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Martins et al., 2003; Mollica, 2003), personality traits (Chen & Hooijberg, 2000), and demographic dimensions (Bowen & Blackmon, 2003; Kossek et al., 2003), research has proven individuals view an organization's value-in-diversity efforts from competing perspectives. While these studies have focused on the experiences, group processes, and perceptions of minority members in an organization, none have primarily focused on majority members, and none have used psychological reactance as an explanatory vehicle for the impact of value-in-diversity campaigns or interventions.

A number of scholars have called for research on diversity issues to focus on the majority members of an organization. Chen and Hooijberg (2000) suggest the

success of value-in-diversity efforts is contingent upon the commitment of top management as well as the "general support of not only women and minority members, but also the members of the majority" (p. 2393). Additionally, Sims (2005) contends "shifting research focus to the dominant group can yield interesting insights for improving attempts at organizational diversity" (p. 23). Ely (1995) argues exploring dominance and the role of dominant identity can be useful in helping organizations accomplish their diversity goals.

Though serious problems arise when research focuses on the majority as a reference point for understanding or valuing minority experiences and perceptions (Jackson, 2003), the target audience for most value-in-diversity campaign messages is the majority members of an organization. "Whites will still comprise the majority of the population and perhaps hold on to their positions of leadership, power, and control in organizations" (Carter, 2001, p. 4), despite the shifting demographics in the U.S. population. Thus, research which focuses on effective messages and strategies for reaching the majority in value-in-diversity campaigns would prove beneficial. Brehm's (1966) theory of psychological reactance provides a promising venue for investigating the motivational responses of organizational members who experience value-in-diversity messages in campaigns.

Psychological Reactance

In a time where social influence and persuasion has turned applied, in real time, and with large segments of the population (Burgoon, Alvaro, Grandpre, & Voulokakis, 2002), exploring psychological reactance within the context of organizational diversity has great merit. Determining intentional and informed strategies based on formative

research should be the goal of any persuasive campaign (Pfau & Parrott, 1993), and this definitely holds true within the context of an organization's diversity change efforts.

Since psychological reactance focuses on the effects of communication (message structure, features, and content) on various target groups (Burgoon et al., 2002), the theory provides an excellent venue for investigating the impact of value-in-diversity campaign messages upon members of an organization. This section provides an overview of reactance theory, its propositional logic, and its empirical support before exploring the usefulness of psychological reactance theory in understanding the impact of value-in-diversity campaign messages.

The Theory and its Propositional Logic

While the restriction of major freedoms (e.g., the freedom of speech or the freedom to earn money to make a living) can create obvious frustrations for individuals, psychological reactance theory proposes that the infringement of minor freedoms occur more frequently than one might ordinarily suspect. Brehm (1966) suggests the notion that "less salient restrictions of freedom are a pervasive aspect of daily life" (p. v). So, the theory explains how individuals respond when their freedoms are threatened or eliminated, and it was among the first to suggest that "*any message* aimed at changing one's current attitudes and behaviors might, in fact, be perceived as a threat to freedom, whether in the best interest of the intended persuadee or not" (Burgoon et al., 2002, p. 215). A key explanation is offered by Brehm (1966).

> It is reasonable to assume, then, that if a person's behavioral freedom is reduced or threatened with reduction, he will become motivationally aroused. This

> arousal would presumably be directed against any further loss of freedom and it would also be directed toward the re-establishment of whatever freedom had already been lost or threatened (p. 2).

Thus, psychological reactance theory is "conceived as a motivational state directed toward the re-establishment of the free behaviors which have been eliminated or threatened with elimination" (Brehm, 1966, p. 9). Once psychological reactance is experienced, "reactance enhances the attractiveness of the threatened or eliminated behavior, causing the individual to strive for its restoral" (Miller, 1967, p. 293). The theory is operative and assists in the explanation of free behaviors, threatened or eliminated freedoms, and the re-establishment of freedoms.

Psychological reactance theory holds a number of key assumptions (Brehm, 1966). First, the theory assumes that for any given person there is a set of behaviors that he or she may engage in at the moment or some time in the future. Since each person has a set of free behaviors, he or she will experience reactance whenever their set of behaviors is eliminated or threatened with elimination. Also, once a specific free behavior is threatened or eliminated, the individual is likely to find the free behavior more attractive.

Along with core assumptions of the theory, Brehm (1966) offers a variety of reasoned explanations for the magnitude of reactance. He suggests the more important the free behavior is to the individual, the greater the magnitude of reactance will be. Importance is based on the value of a specific free behavior to satisfy an individual's needs. So, the magnitude of reactance may be increased when no other alternatives exist to satisfy the needs that the threatened (or eliminated) freedom satisfied. Brehm

(1966) explains “it is *not* necessary for the relevant needs to be of great magnitude at all times for the free behavior to have high importance at all times. It is only necessary that the individual believe he *might* have the needs in question” (p. 5).

Additional explanations for the magnitude of reactance are that the greater the proportion of free behaviors that are threatened or eliminated, the greater the magnitude of reactance will be, and the greater the threat to free behaviors, the greater the magnitude of reactance will be. When an individual’s free behavior is threatened, the person may also be threatened by the immediate elimination of other free behaviors as well as the future elimination of the same threatened free behavior. The magnitude of reactance in this case is also contingent upon the likelihood that the threat will be carried out (Miller, 1967). Additionally, an individual’s free behavior may be threatened by the elimination of or threat to *another person’s* free behavior as well as an individual’s free behavior (Brehm, 1966).

Some final variables offered in Brehm’s (1966) initial theory that provide greater nuance to the magnitude of reactance are justification and legitimacy. Justification and legitimacy are regarded as “complicated variables” (Brehm, 1966, p. 7). Justification occurs when another individual offers rationale or reasoning for threatening or eliminating the free behavior, and legitimacy occurs when the source speaks with authority or authenticity about the threatened or eliminated free behavior.

While justifying and/or legitimacy may impact the magnitude of reactance, “the lack of justification and legitimacy are not necessary conditions for the occurrence of reactance” (Brehm, 1966, p. 8). As a result of the nuances associated with these variables, initial research on reactance theory held justification and legitimacy constant.

The direct manifestation of reactance is behavior directed toward restoring the free behavior that has been threatened or eliminated. Restoration or re-establishment of freedoms can be direct or socially implicated. “Direct re-establishment of freedom means enagaging in that behavior which one has learned one cannot or should not engage in” (Brehm, 1966, p. 10). Social implication is re-establishing freedom vicariously through someone else who happens to have the same or similar free behavior threatened or eliminated. An individual might give up a freedom when he or she determines there is no way to re-establish or restore the freedom (Brehm & Brehm, 1981).

Psychological Reactance Research

While Brehm (1966) offered a variety of empirical support in confirmation of psychological reactance theory, Miller (1967) in his book review of Brehm’s work contended that the initial research supporting the theory lacked rigor in experimental design, data analysis, and interpretation. Additionally, Miller critiqued that elaborate conclusions from a chi-square analysis were “a good deal of interpretative mileage to get from a significant chi square” (p. 293). Initial marginally significant findings from early studies were improved upon in subsequent research through the use of more carefully constructed experimental conditions as well as larger sample sizes (Mazis, Settle, & Leslie, 1973).

Despite his early criticisms, Miller’s (1967) prediction that psychological reactance theory would generate a great deal of research has proven true. From 1966 to 1981, which has been referred to as the first wave of psychological reactance research (Burgoon et al., 2002), through to the present, the theory has offered great promise for

understanding intrapsychic, information processing. This section summarizes the interdisciplinary breadth and relevance of the theory. While the research summarized in this section is not exhaustive of all reactance studies, this discussion will provide a backdrop of the type of contexts and the type of research associated with this theoretical approach.

Extreme Discrepant Attitudes and the Political Context. Smith (1979) focused on individuals in extreme disagreement with a persuasive message to see if one method (enabling them to provide arguments in support of their position) would serve as an appropriate freedom-enhancing procedure that could attenuate reactance. She reasoned that "the prior bolstering would amount to an exercise of the freedom to be threatened by the forthcoming message" (p. 114). Smith's findings confirmed her hypothesis – that when individuals were given an opportunity to bolster their pre-existing opinions prior to a threatening message, there were no boomerang effects (which are associated with psychological reactance) among those individuals. Her research suggests there may be value in exploring other methods which can reveal how the counterforce of psychological reactance can be moderated or eliminated.

In the political context, Miller (1976) investigated mere exposure, psychological reactance, and attitude change in an effort to develop more reasonable strategies for political campaigns. He reasoned that if reactance effects were temporal, then long-term exposure would be a more effective campaign strategy. However, if reactance effects were more enduring, then moderate exposure (to reduce reactance arousal) or massive exposure followed by no exposure would likely be a better strategy. The results of his study indicate "while reactance might lower evaluative

ratings for those subjects who were previously neutral, those subjects who initially held slightly positive attitudes toward the persuasive message might" (p. 232) act upon their attitudes with more exposure.

Marketing Context. Mazis et al. (1973) explored reactance theory by investigating Miami consumer responses to a law which prohibited the use of phosphates in laundry detergents and comparing them to consumers in Tampa where no phosphate ban was passed. The scholars used reactance theory's premise that a freedom which has been restricted will appear more attractive to an individual (Brehm, 1966; Brehm & Brehm, 1981). Compared with individuals in Tampa, Miami housewives considered phosphate detergents to be more effective. Their experiment explored sub-groups of Miami consumers as well. In Miami, housewives who were forced to switch to a different detergent brand (switchers) were compared to housewives who were given the opportunity to continue using their pre-existing brand (non-switchers). As a result of their reduction of choice, Mazis et al. found switchers rated their new no-phosphate detergent brand as less effective than non-switchers. Additionally, a third of switchers (compared to only 4% of non-switchers) maintained they used more no-phosphate detergent per washing and a third of switchers (compared to less than 10% of non-switchers) felt they had to use more extra ingredients (e.g., bleach, fabric softener, etc.) with each load of no-phosphate detergent. Mazis and colleagues suggest "the attitudes of switchers and nonswitchers were predicted by reactance theory" (p. 394), and the authors suggest longitudinal research is needed to explore the permanence of consumer reactance.

In a different marketing study, Lessne and Notarantonio (1988) investigated the effects of limits in retail advertisements. Since reactance theory holds that the creation of barriers serves to increase the attractiveness of the restricted freedom, the scholars operationalized a barrier as a limit on the allowed quantity of sodas in an advertisement. Their study confirmed reactance theory by finding that advertising limits can increase the attractiveness of products; however, the amount of the limit must be carefully determined. The authors caution, "The Limit 2 treatment was so limiting, apparently, that it resulted in diminished attraction, relative to the Limit 4 treatment" (p. 41).

Interpersonal Context. Wright, Wadley, Danner, and Phillips (1992) predicted that mild expressions of preference would create lower levels of reactance among female undergraduates when judging the attractiveness of men whereas strong expressions of preference would create attitudinal resistance. The results of their study confirmed their predictions and placed importance on Brehm's (1966) propositional logic concerning the importance of balancing "persuasive and reactance forces which will determine the ultimate effect of an attempt to influence an interpersonal judgment" (p. 90).

Hockenberry and Billingham (1993) investigated psychological reactance and violence in dating relationships. The scholars posited that men would have higher reactance scores than women and that individuals in violent relationships would have greater reactance scores compared to those in nonviolent relationships. The scholars found support for both of their predictions and suggest that "sex differences on a subscale measuring open defiance or rebellion against the norms and prohibitions of

others are not surprising" (p. 1206) since men tend to establish their sense of self through autonomy more than women. However, it should be noted that Hockenberry and Billingham's findings (1993) conflict with other research where no sex differences were found (Hong, 1990; Hong, Giannakopoulos, Laing, & Williams, 1994), and Brehm and Brehm (1981) argued reactance should not prevail more in men versus women.

Nail and Van Leeuwen (1996) explored competing perspectives on reactance by investigating the effectance versus self-presentational views. The views offer two separate interpretations of reactance. The effectance view is consistent with Brehm's (1966) initial conceptualizations and suggests an individual is attempting to reestablish effective control when a personal freedom is threatened. However, the self-presentational view suggests an individual is most concerned with projecting autonomy and indicating his or her refusal to accept the lower status associated with giving in to having their personal freedom threatened. The scholars suggest their data supports the self-presentational view; however they emphasize that this framework likely explains reactance phenomena in *certain*, not all cases. Their study confirms the importance of understanding interpersonal processes since they affect the expression of reactance.

Counseling Context. Dowd and Wallbrown (1993) sought to understand the human motivation which creates the forces of reactance. The scholars investigated personality attributes associated with psychological reactance to understand how to improve client counseling. They found defensiveness, aggression, dominance, autonomy, and non-affiliation to be the personality pattern of clients who were more psychologically reactant. Dowd and Wallbrown suggest the reactant person is likely to

be regarded as a leader with great confidence, but will probably not be easily influenced by a counselor.

Hellman and McMillan (1997) conducted another study which investigated the relationship between psychological reactance and a personality characteristic. The scholars explored conflicting research in reactance literature on the theory's links to self-esteem. Their findings indicate that the behavioral freedom factor of the Hong (1992) Psychological Reactance Scale acts as a suppresser variable between self-esteem and freedom of choice. "When behavioral freedom was controlled, the partial correlation coefficient between self-esteem and freedom of choice increased and was statistically significant" (p. 137).

Seibel and Dowd (2001) sought to more fully develop the psychological profile of a reactant person by comparing different personality disorders with psychological reactance. The scholars predicted that the passive-aggressive and dependent personality groups would show the lowest reactance when compared to the obsessive-compulsive and borderline personality groups (which would show the highest reactance). The findings of their study confirmed their prediction that reactance differs across personality disorders, and the personality disorder group means reflected a trend as they predicted, even though not all differences were significant. The scholars suggest a larger sample size would likely have found more significant differences among groups.

Buboltz, Johnson, and Woller (2003) investigated whether or not family-of-origin variables could predict a client's tendency to exhibit reactance. Since few studies have focused upon the predictors of high or low levels of psychological reactance, understanding the family-of-origin variables likely to generate the highest levels of

reactance would enable counselors to better address the emotional and behavioral manifestations of reactance in their clients. The scholars found five family-of-origin variables that could be used to predict reactance – family conflict, family cohesion, achievement orientation, independence, and moral-religious emphasis. Among the variables, greater amounts of family conflict predicted lower levels of psychological reactance, and all other variables predicted higher levels of psychological reactance.

Seemann, Buboltz, Jenkins, Soper, and Woller (2004) explored the impact of ethnic and gender differences and psychological reactance in the context of multicultural counseling. Because of the levels of distrust that minorities have of counseling, the scholars predicted that African Americans would demonstrate higher levels of reactance than Caucasians and that a significant gender difference would be found independent of ethnicity. Seemann et al.'s primary hypothesis that African Americans would display higher levels of reactance was supported. Also, the results duplicated Hockenberry and Billingham's (1993) findings that men were more reactant than women. They suggest "an important addition to this finding is that ethnicity and gender are apparently unrelated in terms of psychological reactance" (p. 173).

Health Context. Fogarty and Youngs (2000) investigated the relationship between patient noncompliance and psychological reactance. The scholars investigated noncompliance by using physician tone (either authoritative or partnership) and patient choice. They predicted less noncompliance would result from an authoritative advice-giving tone and that patients who were given little say in the specification of a regimen would be less likely to comply with the physician's advice. Neither of their predictions was supported. Despite their failed predictions, the authors contend that "correlational

data do support reactance as a concept pertinent to patient compliance," (p. 2382) and they cite several design problems which rendered their study inadequate for fairly testing psychological reactance theory.

Buller and colleagues (2000) reasoned that health campaign messages which used more deductive arguments would provoke psychological reactance and resistance to sun safety advice, while messages which used more inductive arguments might not threaten parents' freedoms. The scholars had a lack of reactance effects in their research which explored the impact of language intensity as well as argument style in health campaign messages. They suggest campaign planners "need to be concerned with provoking reactance among nonintenders only when they aim to produce immediate changes in behavior. When changes are desired at some future time, messages can be employed that provoke reactance initially, provided messages are processed by the receivers and their content can be recalled when decisions to act arise in the future" (Buller et al., 2000, p. 271).

Grandpre, Alvaro, Burgoon, Miller, and Hall (2003) investigated adolescent reactance and anti-smoking campaigns using psychological reactance as an explanation for the impact of types of messages employed in anti- and pro-smoking media campaigns. The scholars suggested reactance theory could explain adolescent receptivity to pro-smoking messages and predicted a number of reasoned hypotheses related to the impact of controlling (explicit) and implicit messages on message evaluation, derogation of sources, and behavioral intentions. Their findings confirmed their hypotheses which suggest that implicit pro-smoking messages (which were being used by tobacco companies) result in more positive evaluations of message sources

because they do not restrict their freedoms as do explicit anti-smoking messages. Additionally, their findings suggest "that specific message factors (e.g., controlling language) cue reactive responses" (p. 362) and that the reactive responses occur most prevalently at the beginning of adolescence.

Organizational Context. Vrugt (1992) investigated psychological reactance in an organizational setting with a university that promoted the preferential treatment of women in its academic staff functions. The scholars posited that psychological reactance would be greater among individuals with higher rather than lower self-esteem and that lecturers would experience a greater magnitude of reactance than professors since the preferential treatment was more threatening to them (because they were in lower rank positions). Their findings confirmed psychological reactance theory in that those who perceived greater threat had more negative attitudes toward the preferential treatment and toward the perceived legitimacy of the preferential treatment. However, their results did not confirm their expected differences between lecturers and professors, although there was a trend in their predicted direction.

Steensma and Erkel (1999) applied reactance theory to an organization's efforts at implementing Total Quality Management (TQM). The scholars predicted that the greater the externally imposed pressure to become TQM certified, the greater the reactance would be and the lower the willingness to implement TQM steps would be. Their findings suggest that external pressures to certify provoke reactance; however they do not lower an individual's willingness to implement TQM steps. The scholars contend that while psychological reactance "might be a negative effect of the pressure

to strive for [TQM] certificates, the risk that this pressure results in negative attitudes toward the striving for very high Total Quality seems to be low" (p. 1080).

Kirchler (1999) investigated the impact of an employer's tax obligations on employers' reactance, attitudes toward tax evasion, tax morale, and likely attempts to avoid paying taxes. Since taxes limit an employer's ability to make autonomous decisions about his or her business, Kirchler reasoned taxation would likely be perceived as restrictive of the business owner's freedoms. The results of his study supported his predictions on employer reactance and stronger attitudes toward tax evasion as a way to escape the perceived loss of choice. However, while the restriction of freedoms was linked to behavioral tendencies, the data did not support changes in tax morale.

Sachau, Houlihan, and Gilbertson (1999) explored the magnitude of employee reactance to complying with supervisors' requests. They found that employees' scores on trait reactance were the best predictors of employee self-reports of compliance with supervisory requests.

Empirical Research Explained by Reactance Theory. While the above research directly explores variables related to reactance, some scholars use psychological reactance to explain the results of their research. "Since reactance acts counter to pressure on the individual to change, obtaining no change obviously means that the pressure to change was created, but that it was cancelled out by reactance. Thus, no change on the dependent variable proves both the intended process and the reactance process as well" (Brehm, 1966, p. 129).

An example of a study in which psychological reactance is used to explain research results is Clark's (1994) investigation. Using a jury case involving first degree murder, Clark investigated the impact of censoring a minority who argued persuasively against the majority. He found a positive relationship between the amount of censorship and minority influence. Clark explains the finding by using psychological reactance theory and suggests that when "the majority had the opportunity to present its position, any attempt to tell an individual that the minority message must be ignored should pose a threat to the person's freedom and result in a greater acceptance of that message" (p. 336). Thus, the greater the amount of censorship, the greater the threat to an individual's freedom, and the more attractive or influential the minority message becomes.

Psychological Reactance and Value-in-Diversity Campaigns

While the empirical work on reactance theory includes a variety of organizational contexts (Kirchler, 1999; Sachau et al., 1999; Steensma & Erkel, 1999; Vrugt, 1992), none have investigated the degree to which psychological reactance can explain the motivational responses present in an organization's value-in-diversity campaign efforts. Since reactance theory holds that a freedom is "an expectancy and can be held with more or less certainty" (Brehm & Brehm, 1981, p. 5), the benefits and values latent in diversity campaign messages are likely regarded as freedoms by organizational members. Depending upon the message strategies selected by organizations, the restriction of these freedoms is likely to be a viable force in explaining the nature of majority member reactions to value-in-diversity campaigns.

Miller (1967) suggests "that successful persuasion may sometimes involve the maintenance of an illusion of choice, even though every attempt is focused on eliciting a particular response" (p. 293). Perhaps this is the challenge of the persuasive goals sought from value-in-diversity campaigns. By using psychological reactance theory to illuminate the impact of value-in-diversity campaign messages, a number of hypotheses are posited which can enable organizations to understand the impact of their campaign messages.

Overall Reactance

Wright and colleagues (1992) contend psychological reactance results in two outcomes for social influence attempts – either adoption as a result of persuasion taking place or resistance as a result of reactance occurring. The challenge for campaign planners lies in managing the forces which create reactance so that persuasion can take place.

Because the magnitude of reactance depends upon the *perceived* importance of a threatened freedom (Brehm, 1966; Brehm & Brehm, 1981), one would expect the perceived threat of value-in-diversity campaign messages to be higher among majority members of the organization who have the most to lose from the benefits espoused in the campaigns and thus are likely to face more restrictions on their freedoms.

Brehm's (1966) propositional logic has been repeatedly confirmed in the extant literature without serious criticism; so, there should be no question that reactance occurs when freedoms are restricted. Since value-in-diversity messages focus upon methods which encourage the representation of and contribution of minorities in an organization, the messages can be considered an infringement upon the freedoms of

majority members of an organization. Thus, this investigation posits that value-in-diversity campaign messages will provoke reactance among majority members in an organization who receive value-in-diversity campaign messages as compared to majority members who receive no value-in-diversity campaign message:

> *H1*: For majority members of an organization who receive value-in-diversity campaign messages, compared to those who do not, value-in-diversity campaign messages generate psychological reactance.

Magnitude of Reactance

Though research on racioethnicity and gender has been the primary demographic dimension of diversity research (Nkomo & Cox, 1996), reactance research which incorporates these variables has been somewhat conflicting. Some reactance research supports the notion that men are more reactant than women (Hockenberry & Billingham, 1993; Seemann et al., 2004), while other research suggests no sex differences exist (Brehm & Brehm, 1981; Hong, 1990; Hong et al., 1994), and one study has confirmed a relationship between racioethnicity and reactance (Seemann et al., 2004).

In diversity research "the effects of race and gender on diversity programs have been well established" (Chen & Hooijberg, 2000, p. 2396). The extant literature on diversity suggests the effects of racioethnicity and gender upon reactance to value-in-diversity campaign messages will be more pronounced and definite. Jones (1986) and Fernandez (1981) found non-Whites believed race had hindered their advancement, and Beehr, Tabor, and Walsh (1980) found Blacks were more likely than Whites to say race is a factor in promotion decisions. Chen and Hooijberg (2000) found gender and

minority status each significantly predicted support for value-in-diversity programs such that women were more supportive than men and racial minority members were more supportive than racial majority members. Other studies have found the same effects (e.g., Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Martins et al., 2003; Mollica, 2003). This investigation posits greater reactance among majority members of an organization based on the same predicted patterns that have been found in previous diversity research:

> *H2*: Value-in-diversity campaign messages generate a greater magnitude of reactance among majority members of an organization as opposed to minority members of an organization.

Several studies in the extant literature suggest the homogeneity or heterogeneity of environments will have varying impacts on reactance levels. Seemann et al. (2004) suggested one explanation for their findings about African American clients is that they "likely do not display the same levels of reactant behaviour when with racially similar therapists because the expected threat to personal freedom is absent (or reduced) and the client likely perceives a greater level of understanding with the racially similar therapist" (p. 174). This suggests the impact of a more homogenous situational environment would create varying levels of reactance depending upon the racial mix of the individuals present. For minorities, being in a more homogenous environment for counseling reduces reactance because a greater perceived level of understanding is achieved. However, for majorities being in a more homogenous environment and hearing value-in-diversity campaign messages increases reactance because the messages infringe upon the greater levels of trust already established.

In diversity research, Kanter (1977) suggests demographic shifts in organizations are likely to be viewed negatively until greater heterogeneity is achieved. Also, Kossek and Zonia (1993) found support for the notion that gender heterogeneity is significantly related to valuing efforts to promote diversity. These findings suggest that value-in-diversity campaign messages would pose less of a threat to the freedoms of organizational members when members already interact in heterogenous networks. On the other hand, value-in-diversity campaign messages would infringe upon freedoms when individuals interact in more homogenous networks. Thus, this investigation posits:

> *H3*: Value-in-diversity campaign messages generate a lesser magnitude of reactance among organizational members who interact in more heterogeneous networks.

Attitudinal Impact of Reactance

Since psychological reactance is a theory "specifically formulated to address threats to attitudinal and behavioral freedoms" (Grandpre et al., 2003, p. 350), the theory should provide a framework for understanding the attitudinal impact of value-in-diversity campaign messages. If the impact of reactance were a friendly boost to targeted attitudes, persuaders would be less concerned about the negative ramifications associated with reactance. On the contrary, though, a concerning element related to the outcome of reactance is the negative attitudinal impact or boomerang effect. The result of attempts to assert or persuade towards a specific position can result in an individual "avoiding opinion compliance or positive influence" (Brehm, 1966, p. 117) as well as re-establishing their freedom by moving away from the advocated position.

Mazis et al. (1973) attributed the differential attitudes expressed by switchers and non-switchers in their study to the outcome of reactance. Switchers, who were more reactant because they were forced to switch products, held more negative attitudes. In addition, Vrugt's (1992) work demonstrated the presence of more negative attitudes about the measure investigated and toward the perceived legitimacy of the measure among participants in the more reactant treatment condition than in the less reactant, less threatening treatment condition.

Reactance research, then, has proven that individuals who perceive greater threat to their freedoms hold more negative attitudes and evaluations than individuals who perceive lower threat to their freedoms (e.g., Grandpre et al., 2003; Kirchler, 1999; Mazis et al., 1973; Vrugt, 1992). Thus, this investigation posits that value-in-diversity campaign messages will generate more negative evaluations among majority members, who are reasoned to be more reactant and more threatened, as compared to minority members of the organization:

> *H4*: Among majority members of the organization, value-in-diversity campaign messages generate more negative attitudes toward (a) the preferential treatment of minorities, and (b) the perceived legitimacy of the value-in-diversity campaign when compared to minority members.

Attraction of Restricted Freedoms

Research in the marketing context supports the notion that restricting freedoms generates increased levels of attractiveness toward the freedoms which are restricted (Lessne & Notarantonio, 1988; Mazis et al., 1973). Even Clark's (1994) investigation supports Brehm's (1966) propositional logic that threatening an individual's freedoms

leads to greater attraction of the threatened freedom. Since value-in-diversity campaign messages typically espouse attractive opportunities available for minorities that are not as equally available for majorities, those same opportunities will be perceived as restricted freedoms by majority members of an organization.

Since Brehm's (1966) logic concerning the attractiveness of restricted freedoms has been supported repeatedly in empirical research, one can expect the majority members of an organization to exhibit increased attraction toward the benefits espoused in value-in-diversity campaign messages for minorities. Thus, this investigation posits that value-in-diversity campaign messages will increase the attractiveness of opportunities mentioned in the messages among majority members in an organization as compared to minority members of the organization:

> *H5*: For majority members of an organization who receive value-in-diversity campaign messages, compared to those who do not, value-in-diversity campaign messages generate greater attraction of restricted freedoms, such as the opportunities espoused in the value-in-diversity campaign message.

Message Strategies and Reactance

"A persuasive message will be perceived as a threat to a receiver's freedom of attitudinal choice if the source exerts strong pressure to accept a single position" (Smith, 1979, p. 112). The threat, when experienced, will produce an attitude change that is either reduced or that is against the intended positive effects or recommended position (Brehm, 1966, Brehm & Brehm, 1981; Smith, 1979). The goal of value-in-diversity campaigns should be to minimize reactance so that persuasion among the

majority members of an organization can take place, since these individuals tend to be the principal targets of value-in-diversity campaigns.

Both strategies of message exposure (Miller, 1976) and argument style (Buller et al., 2000) have been investigated in reactance research, but the forcefulness of messages recently investigated (Grandpre et al., 2003) appears to be the best fit for application in value-in-diversity campaigns.

Grandpre et al. (2003) caution the greatest challenge for campaign designers is to "create implicit messages that result in desired outcomes without stipulating the parameters of possible options in the messages themselves" (p. 364). The research of these scholars in adolescent health campaigns suggests that more controlling or explicit messages will provoke greater reactance levels and more negative evaluations, while more implicit messages will result in less reactance and more positive evaluations. Thus, this investigation posits that value-in-diversity campaign messages which are more implicit (less controlling) will garner less threat to freedom and more positive evaluations among majority members in an organization:

> *H6*: Majority members, who receive value-in-diversity campaign messages that use controlling (explicit) language, as opposed to less controlling (implicit) language, (a) experience a greater threat to freedom, (b) hold more negative attitudes toward the preferential treatment of minorities, and (c) hold more negative attitudes toward the perceived legitimacy of the value-in-diversity campaign.

Restoration of Freedom

Along with explaining the motivational arousal individuals experience when freedoms are threatened, Brehm (1966) suggests individuals also will seek to re-establish or restore their behavioral freedoms after they have been eliminated or threatened. These restoration efforts may be direct (e.g., engaging in the threatened behavior to re-establish the freedom) or indirect (watching a second person engage in the threatened behavior which re-establishes the freedom vicariously).

In recent reactance research (Miller, Lane, Deatrick, Young, & Potts, 2007), the use of a restoration postscript has been employed successfully to offer individuals an alternative restoration approach. Miller and colleagues (2007) reasoned, "We believe it should be possible to disguise the overt nature of a persuasive message and/or immediately restore a threatened freedom by attaching a short postscript message to the end of the main persuasive message" (p. 225). The postscript message re-affirms the individual's right to choose and suggests any decisions are ultimately up to the individual who has the freedom to determine their own behavior. The impact of the restoration postscript is to enhance the persuasive influence of the message by reducing the perceived threat to freedom posed by the message. Thus, this investigation posits that value-in-diversity campaign messages with a restoration postscript, as opposed to campaign messages with no restoration postscript, will reduce majority member perceived threats to freedom:

> *H7*: Among majority members, a restoration postscript will reduce the perceived threat to freedom posed by value-in-diversity campaign messages.

CHAPTER IV

INOCULATION THEORY: AN ANTIDOTE TO PROTECT VALUE-IN-DIVERSITY ATTITUDES

A believer's faith in his culture's ideological truism tends to have a spurious strength, analogous to the deceptive physical robustness of an animal brought up in a germ-free environment. Both are extremely vulnerable to attacking material and both gain resistance from pre-exposure to a weakened dose of the threatening material.

- William J. McGuire (1970, p. 64)

Perhaps the most seriously deceptive and fatal flaw associated with an organization's value-in-diversity aims is for the organization to focus only on the *reassurance* of its well-intentioned diversity efforts assuming diversity to be a universal axiom or truism among organizational members without recognizing the vulnerability of member value-in-diversity attitudes to attacks that are likely to occur throughout the implementation of organizational activities and messages. Reassurance alone as a strongest defense creates the greatest defenselessness and the weakest resistance to any ensuing attacks (McGuire, 1970; McGuire and Papageorgis, 1961).

An interdisciplinary literature review including research in organizational communication (e.g., Allen, 1995, 2004), management (e.g., Cox, 1991, 1993), psychology (e.g., Brewer, 1995; Brewer et al., 1999), organizational behavior (e.g., Alder, 2002; Alderfer, 1987; Cox & Nkomo, 1990), and human resources management

(e.g., Kossek et al., 2003) reveals the presence of several dominant theoretical frameworks and common concepts offered for approaching the study of *different identities* in the Academy. However, empiricism has not yet focused on the value of promoting protection or resistance to influence given the mixed negative reactions associated with value-in-diversity messages that are likely to make attitudes cave under pressure.

The communication of value-in-diversity messages tends to be the focal point of an organization's diversity campaign efforts. Yet, very little research has focused upon how one can protect value-in-diversity attitudes from slippage once the negative backlash (Bailyn, 2000) and negative experiences (Martins et al., 2003) associated with diversity occur. McGuire's (1964) inoculation theory, which has been the most-traveled road to resistance in social influence, provides a promising venue for investigating an organization's ability to protect value-in-diversity attitudes which come under attack in the process of implementing an organization's diversity efforts.

Inoculation Theory

In acknowledging the initial promptings that would eventually lead to inoculation theory, McGuire (1970) wrote, "When I realized that social scientists had neglected the ways to immunize people against persuasion, I redirected my research – with more than a little feeling of virtue and relief" (p. 36). After spending a number of years researching with the persuaders, McGuire switched sides, but stayed within the theoretical realm of social influence. This section provides a historical review of inoculation theory along with the original and new mechanisms associated with the

process of resistance before offering the role of inoculation in protecting pro-diversity attitudes.

Historical Originations

McGuire's (1961) inoculation theory was advanced in a historical time period where American soldiers had been systematically brainwashed by Koreans in the Korean War (McGuire & Papageorgis, 1961; Szabo & Pfau, 2002). The forced exposure situations (which were the experiences of American prisoners of war) served as a catalyst for questioning the selective exposure tendency (Klapper, 1957) which was regarded in its time as the "most basic principle yet revealed by communication research" (McGuire, 1970, p. 37).

Since the selective exposure tendency postulates that people seek out information which affirms their existing beliefs and actively avoid information which is contrary to their beliefs, the underlying logic of the principle fails to address forced exposure situations or unanticipated situations that people find themselves unable to avoid. McGuire and Papageorgis (1961) summarized, "While defense-by-avoidance is likely to be highly effective for belief maintenance so long as the person can adequately regulate his own exposure to arguments, it has the disadvantage of leaving him poorly prepared to resist counterarguments should he be involuntarily exposed to them" (p. 327). They go on to suggest that the lack of exposure to counterarguments not only leaves one with a belief system that has greater vulnerability, but it also fails to prepare an individual for successfully responding to future attacks.

The empirical work of Lumsdaine and Janis (1953), who investigated resistance to counterpropaganda using one-sided and two-sided messages, also served as an

impetus for McGuire's (1961) work. These scholars investigated the impact of counterpropaganda using the notion that Russia had produced its first atomic bomb. Participants were exposed to transcriptions of a radio program which advocated Russia's ability to produce the bombs in quantity. While some participants were exposed to messages in support of Russia's ability to produce the bombs (one-sided messages), other participants were exposed both to messages in support of and messages against Russia's ability to produce the bombs (two-sided messages). Two groups of subjects (which had both received one-sided and two-sided messages) were also exposed to counterpropaganda (an argument which took the opposite of the original position advocated). The outcome of their research revealed that the two types of messages were equally persuasive; however, when subjects were exposed to counterpropaganda, the two-sided messages were "decidedly superior to the one-sided presentation" (p. 315) in preserving subjects' opinions.

So, on the heels of research by Lumsdaine and Janis (1953) and motivated by the real-world "political indoctrination of captive audiences" (McGuire and Papageorgis, 1961, p. 327), McGuire (1961) posited inoculation theory. His analogy was borrowed from the field of medicine.

McGuire's Inoculation Process and its Original Mechanisms

McGuire (1961) posited inoculation theory as the process by which individuals receive "weakened, defense stimulating forms of the counterarguments" (p. 327) which serve as an inoculation procedure against belief attacks. In the same way that individuals receive a weakened form of an infectious virus to develop an immunity capable of combating the viral infection itself, McGuire posited that the use of

countering inoculation treatments carry threat which causes an individual to create counterarguments that confer resistance. Thus, the original mechanisms that are critical to McGuire's (1961) inoculation theory are threat and refutational preemption. Additionally, it is important to note that McGuire believed the inoculation process to be most germane in protecting cultural truisms or those beliefs that have been maintained in "a germ-free ideological environment" (McGuire, 1964, p. 200).

Threat. In inoculation theory, threat is the degree to which one perceives that his or her belief is vulnerable, and Pfau (1997) calls threat the "most distinguishing feature of inoculation" (p. 137). McGuire (1964) suggested that threat is a precursor to resistance in that an individual must be made aware of the vulnerability of his truism. McGuire reasoned that inoculative pre-treatments must overcome two difficulties in protecting against persuasive attacks: (1) that the individual is unpracticed in defending his or her belief, and (2) that the individual will be unmotivated to pursue the practice of defending his or her belief. Threat becomes the motivator that the belief or the truism is subject to change. In the late 1980s scholars began taking a more critical look at the amount of perceived threat elicited in empirical research; however, McGuire never measured elicited threat (Compton & Pfau, 2004a).

The notion that an individual already maintains the advocated position, belief, or truism that is vulnerable is an underlying assumption of inoculation theory. Only pre-existing attitudes or truisms are capable of being inoculated and are in need of protection from vulnerability.

McGuire and Papageorgis (1962) posited that forewarning was an extrinsic threat, and that it should work with the intrinsic threat of realizing that there are

counterarguments to an attitude. They found that forewarning enhanced immunity, and that combining extrinsic with intrinsic threat is stronger than either form of threat standing on its own. Forewarning alone is not as effective as refutational preemption being accompanied by forewarning. More recently, Compton (2004) confirmed that the use of additional forewarning or double forewarning in inoculation messages significantly elicits more threat; however, the additional threat failed to increase resistance in his investigation.

Refutational Preemption. McGuire (1961) identified defense-by-refutation as another key mechanism to the path of resistance. Once an individual believes his position to be vulnerable, the next step becomes identifying the best way to protect against the attack. Refutational preemption refers to "defenses which involve pre-exposing the person to the mention of counterarguments against his beliefs together with a detailed refutation of these counterarguments" (McGuire, 1961, p. 184). Since the selective exposure tendency (Klapper, 1957) maintains that people will not actively seek out information that is counter to their original position, the value of refutational preemption is in exposing individuals to weakened forms of the arguments so they are better able to maintain their original position when the real attack messages occur. McGuire (1961) suggests these types of "pre-exposures" are "analogous to inoculating with a weakened virus a person who has been raised in a germ-free environment" (p. 184).

The value of refutational preemption is in giving receivers specific content that they can use to strengthen their attitudes against change (Pfau et al., 1997a). McGuire merely assumed the existence of such a mechanism because he operationalized

refutational preemption in only one of his studies (Papageorgis & McGuire, 1961). Papageorgis and McGuire (1961) did not find a difference in counterarguing output between those receiving refutational preemption and those in the control condition.

McGuire's early research (McGuire, 1962; McGuire & Papageorgis, 1962) compared refutational and supportive treatments. Refutational treatments provided arguments contrary to the initial attitude and responses to those arguments, while the supportive treatments simply bolstered the initial attitude (similar to Lumsdaine and Janis' one- and two-sided messages). Resistance occurs in the use of a refutational treatment because the receiver is motivated to produce more refutations because of counterarguments or forewarning. Unlike refutational treatments, the use of a bolstering strategy was only effective if the recipient was motivated to generate reasons for holding the attitude (McGuire, 1964). The bolstering effect is short lived, and research supports the idea that refutational treatments work better than supportive (bolstering) treatments (Crane, 1962; McGuire, 1962; McGuire & Papegeorgis, 1961).

Criticism of Original Mechanisms. While several scholars have offered competing explanations for resistance (Tannenbaum, 1966; Tannenbaum, Macaulay, & Norris, 1966; Tannenbaum & Norris, 1965), others have weighed in with criticism on the original mechanisms of inoculation theory. The challenges have been unsuccessful, but they are worthy of mentioning because they have played a role in the development and refinement of inoculation theory.

The fact that McGuire never measured elicited threat has been a main complaint among some scholars (Farkas & Anderson, 1976; Kiesler, Collins, & Miller, 1969). After conducting their investigation, Farkas and Anderson (1976) argued "there is no

independent assessment of the messages that have been used in inoculation theory. They have not been standardized in terms of their informational content, and there is no evidence for their presumed difference in threatening power" (p. 264). These scholars contended that without threat, inoculation theory simply fails to be applicable.

Pfau (1997) explains that McGuire and other researchers "relied on the inference of threat" (p. 138) by incorporating the concept into experimental manipulations despite the lack of measurement. In addition, he contends that subsequent studies, particularly in more recent years, have measured threat levels (Pfau & Burgoon, 1988; Pfau, Kenski, Nitz, & Sorenson, 1990; Pfau, Park, Holbert, & Cho, 2001; Pfau, Tusing, Koerner, et al., 1997a). Also, Szabo and Pfau (2002) summarize that although McGuire failed to adequately operationalize threat, extant research demonstrates that "threat is positively related to increased attitude resistance" (p. 236).

Similar to the criticism offered about threat, Benoit (1991) contends "there has been no test of the assumed mechanism of inoculation theory: that refutation defenses provoke more counterarguments to attacking messages than supportive defenses" (pp. 220-221). Benoit's study investigated the potential of refutational preemption in generating counterarguments in route to resistance as opposed to supportive or bolstering defenses. Also, he investigated the potential of the inoculative process to work on controversial topics (unlike the cultural truisms used previously by McGuire). The results of Benoit's study revealed no support for the superiority of refutation preemption over supportive defenses, and no support for the process of resistance through the use of counterarguments. His study did reveal that highly involved participants spend more cognitive effort processing messages than those who are less

highly involved. Benoit (1991) suggested, “the failure to confirm inoculation theory’s hypothesized mechanism for inducing resistance points to the need for another theoretical approach to understanding the nature of resistance to persuasion on controversial topics” (p. 226).

A particularly challenging aspect of Benoit’s study is that he omitted “threat” which McGuire (1961) suggests is necessary for the inoculative process to be successful in conferring resistance. Thus, ironically Benoit’s findings which appear to challenge inoculation theory actually further validate McGuire’s original mechanisms. Benoit’s findings, *that absent threat*, refutational preemption was not superior to supportive defenses and that moderately involved participants did not report greater counterarguing simply re-affirms the importance of “threat” and stands as evidence of the necessity of both mechanisms being at work in the path to resistance.

New Mechanisms in the Inoculation Process

Despite attacks (e.g., Farkas & Anderson, 1976; Smith, 1982; Tannenbaum, 1966), the original assumptions that underlie McGuire’s (1964) inoculation theory have withstood criticism and empirical research. Pfau et al. (2003) argue “there is no question that inoculation works” (p. 39), and unveiling the mechanisms involved in how it works has been the continued focus of scholarly investigation, particularly in the past decade. Several scholars have attempted to identify how inoculation treatments conferred alternative, but complimentary (along with threat and refutational preemption) paths to resistance.

Involvement. Research supports the active role of involvement in conferring resistance (e.g., Chen, Reardon, Rea, & Moore, 1992; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979; Pfau,

1992; Pfau, Tusing, et al, 1997a). Though issue involvement has been defined differently among scholars (Pfau et al., 2003), a consensus exists among several scholars that involvement affects the degree to which individuals are motivated to process information (Burnkrant & Sawyer, 1983; Chaiken, 1980; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Compton and Pfau (2004a) argue that "issue involvement is a precondition for threat, and therefore, determines the boundary conditions for inoculation theory" (p. 12). Pfau (1992) suggests involvement serves as a precondition to resistance.

Recent investigations in inoculation theory have sought to provide more encompassing explanations for the way in which involvement promotes resistance in the inoculative process. Pfau, Tusing, and colleagues (1997a) followed up a study by Pfau (1992) to determine the role of issue involvement in conferring resistance. They define issue involvement as "the importance or salience of an attitude object for a receiver" (Pfau, Tusing, et al., 1997a, p. 190) and found that greater involvement levels confer resistance in a path that functions independently of threat.

Unlike Pfau and colleagues (1997a) who investigated issue involvement as an independent variable, Compton & Pfau (2004b) investigated issue involvement as a dependent variable and found inoculation treatments increased base involvement levels. Similarly Pfau, Compton, and colleagues (2004), found involvement levels not only increased after inoculation, but also influenced other variables in the resistance process as well.

Emotion. Until Lee and Pfau's (1997) research, inoculation theory had remained predominantly cognitive with no investigations which explored affective processes – a framework the authors suggest had been "overlooked" in inoculation

research. The scholars compared the effectiveness of cognitive and affective inoculation treatments in promoting resistance to cognitive and affective attacks. Lee and Pfau reasoned that cognitive treatments would be more effective because they contained both threat and a higher quality of refutational materials, while affective treatments would be less effective because they lacked quality of refutation materials. Lee and Pfau's (1997) findings revealed means in the direction of their predictions; however, the differences were not significant. They suggested that "the failure in confirming these hypotheses may be attributed to the unsuccessful manipulations of affect among the inoculation treatments" (p. 29). However, their findings did reveal that both affective-positive and affective-negative inoculation treatments conferred resistance. Also, their results suggest that cognitive treatments are able to deflect cognitive and positive affective attacks, but they are not effective against negative affective attacks. Also, affective treatments are able to protect against cognitive, but not affective attacks.

Pfau, Szabo, Anderson, Morrill, et al. (2001) conducted a second study on the role of affect in inoculation theory. Their research investigated the impact of cognitive, affective-anger, and affective-happiness inoculation treatments and found that all treatments confer resistance. The scholars suggested that "practitioners should find the robustness of inoculation across message approaches to be particularly useful. They can employ the inoculation strategy to foster resistance to influence and, at the same time, may elect either cognitive or affective message content" (p. 242).

Within the marketing context, Ivanov (2006) explored the impact of affective, cognitive, and combined (affective and cognitive) inoculation messages upon

protecting affective- or cognitive-based attitudes. In addition, affective and cognitive attack messages were both used. His results revealed that matching inoculation strategies with the attitude base provides the most superior results, combined inoculation messages provided the second best results, and mismatched inoculation messages were least effective.

Finally, the role of emotion in inoculation has also been investigated within the context of crisis communication (Wigley, 2007). Wigley found that both affective and cognitive inoculation treatments were successful in protecting an organization's corporate reputation following a crisis. In addition, the investigation revealed that affective inoculation treatments generated more affective-based counterarguments, while cognitive inoculation treatments generated more cognitive-based counterarguments. In this study, participants rated affective counterarguments significantly stronger than cognitive counterarguments.

Attitude Accessibility. More recently, Pfau, Roskos-Ewoldsen, and colleagues (2003) found that attitude accessibility is another way that inoculation treatments elicit resistance. The complementary path to resistance suggests inoculation treatments elicit attitude accessibility, which enhances attitude strength, which in time, contributes to resistance to influence.

The work of several scholars (Fazio, 1990; Roskos-Ewoldsen, Apran-Ralstin, & St. Pierre, 2002; Roskos-Ewoldsen & Fazio, 1997) provided the background for the 2003 inoculation investigation. Roskos-Ewoldsen and colleagues (2002) posited that a person has an accessible attitude when the attitude can be quickly and effortlessly retrieved from memory after the person is exposed to the corresponding attitude object.

Attitudes can be automatically accessible from memory, or they can be extremely hard to tap. Attitude accessibility is measured by how long it takes the receiver to evaluate an attitude object (Fazio, 1990). Roskos-Ewoldsen and Fazio (1997) explain, "Beliefs that are easy to retrieve from memory are highly accessible, whereas beliefs that are difficult to retrieve are low in accessibility" (p. 109).

The role of inoculation treatments in rendering attitudes more accessible likely occurs because the inoculative process presents the object and the belief in conjunction with one another multiple times (Roskos-Ewoldsen & Fazio, 1997). Roskos-Ewoldsen (1997) found that the associative strength between the object and its evaluation will be automatically activated from memory when the receiver encounters the attitude object. He also found that accessible attitudes are more resistant to influence. Pfau, Roskos-Ewoldsen, and colleagues (2003) summarize that their "study is the first to suggest that inoculation works, in part, through the mechanism of attitude accessibility" (p. 47).

Associative Networks. Associative network mechanisms have been used widely within social psychology to explore a variety of topics including recall (e.g., Cohen, 1981; Stangor & McMillan, 1992), stereotypes (e.g., Devine, 1989; Gaertner & McLaughlin, 1983), and affect (e.g., Bower & Mayer, 1985; Singer & Salovey, 1988). However, the wealth of associative network literature, which is prominent in social psychology (Smith, 1998), had never been fully applied to the theory of inoculation until a most recent study by Pfau and colleagues (2004).

Associative networks are regarded as spider-like structures in long-term memory comprised of cognitive and affective nodes (Smith, 1998). In their study, Pfau and colleagues (2004) reasoned that inoculation treatments alter associative networks

in a variety of ways: (1) by adding new nodes to the network, (2) by facilitating additional linkages between nodes, (3) by making the network more resistant to change, and (4) by altering node strength (the weight of an individual node within the network).

The results of the study confirmed associative networks as a new mechanism by which inoculation confers resistance. As predicted, inoculation treatments increased the number of nodes and linkages within networks; however, the treatments did not impact the weighting of nodes, nor the proportion of nodes classified as warrants versus claims. In time, the changes in the associative networks did confer resistance to counterattitudinal attacks.

Haigh (2006) later investigated the impact of inoculation on associative networks predicting that inoculation would result in larger associative networks based on increased nodes and links within the network and greater network weight. Her research results were conflicting because those in the control condition had more nodes, links, and greater associative network strength than those in the inoculation condition. However, those in the inoculation condition did have greater nodes classified as affective and greater affective associative network strength.

Inoculation's Role in Value-in-Diversity Campaigns

McGuire's shift *from* persuasion to summarize contemporary approaches *to inducing resistance* to persuasion has been a useful endeavor. He reasoned, "The preoccupation of many social scientists with techniques for social influence has provoked increasing interest in techniques for developing resistance to persuasion" (1970, p. 36). McGuire's shift to a focus on resistance to influence is an additional

direction of this present investigation which posits aiming empirical inquiry at not just diversity campaign strategies, but also at protecting already existing value-in-diversity attitudes from slippage.

Inoculation as an Antidote

Borrowing from a medical analogy, McGuire (1961) posited inoculation theory as the process by which individuals receive "weakened, defense stimulating forms of the counterarguments" (p. 327) which serve as an inoculation procedure against belief attacks. In the same way that individuals receive a weakened form of an infectious virus to develop an immunity capable of combating the viral infection itself, McGuire posited that refutational (or countering) inoculation treatments carry threat (the degree to which one perceives his or her belief is vulnerable) which causes an individual to create counterarguments that confer resistance.

McGuire's (1964) original path to resistance (refutational inoculative treatments which contain threat which triggers counterarguments that lead to resistance) has been unsuccessfully challenged by some scholars who offered competing explanations for resistance (Tannenbaum, 1966; Tannenbaum et al., 1966; Tannenbaum & Norris, 1965). Recently, Pfau and colleagues (1997a, 2001, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2008) have repeatedly confirmed that threat and refutational preemption confer resistance as McGuire originally posited. Additionally, numerous studies have proven the effectiveness of inoculation treatments at maintaining preexisting attitudes which come under attack by counterattitudinal persuasive messages (McGuire, 1961, 1962, 1964; McGuire & Papageorgis, 1962; Papageorgis & McGuire, 1961; Pfau,

Compton, et al., 2004; Pfau, Roskos-Ewoldsen, et al., 2003; Pfau, Szabo, et al., 2001; Pfau, Tusing, et al., 1997a; Pfau, Tusing, et al., 1997b).

Since it is widely accepted that inoculation works (Pfau et al., 2003), the theory's functionality has been successfully tested in a number of contexts including commercial advertising (e.g., Compton & Pfau, 2004b; Pfau, 1992), marketing (e.g., Ivanov, 2006), public relations (Burgoon, Pfau, & Birk, 1995; Wan & Pfau, 2004; Pfau, Haigh, Sims, & Wigley, 2007; Wigley, 2007), political communication (e.g., An & Pfau, 2004; Pfau & Burgoon, 1988; Pfau & Kenski, 1990; Pfau et al., 1990; Pfau, et al., 2002), organizational communication (e.g., Haigh, 2006), health campaigns (e.g., Godbold & Pfau, 2000; Pfau, Van Bockern, & Kang, 1992; Szabo & Pfau, 2002), and higher education (Compton & Pfau, 2008). Thus, this investigation posits that in comparison to individuals who receive no inoculation, for those individuals who receive an inoculation pretreatment:

H8: Value-in-diversity inoculation messages confer attitudinal resistance following exposure to messages attacking the value-in-diversity concept.

McGuire's (1961) insistence on the threat component of inoculation theory, though supported in research, was never measured until the late 1980s (Compton & Pfau, 2004a). Pfau (1997) suggests threat refers to the recognition of an attitude's vulnerability, and he posits threat is a distinguishing feature of inoculation. Szabo and Pfau (2002) contend threat "is operationalized as a warning of possible future attacks on attitudes and the recognition of attitude vulnerability to change" (p. 235). Threat motivates individuals to protect attitudes, which creates resistance to counterpersuasion (Pfau & Kenski, 1990).

While diversity research confirms minorities and non-minorities have divergent perceptions on an organization's diversity efforts (Alderfer, 1977; Alderfer et al., 1980; Mollica, 2003), no diversity investigations provide support for the amount of threat levels likely generated by minorities and non-minorities. Jones (1986) and Fernandez (1981) found non-Whites perceived race has hindered their advancement, and Beehr and colleagues (1980) found Blacks were more likely than Whites to say race is a factor in promotion decisions. The perceptual differences between minorities and non-minorities found in these studies provide support for reasoning there will likely be a difference in the amount of threat generated by inoculative treatments. So, investigating the amount of attitude vulnerability generated by inoculative treatments would be helpful in understanding how diversity messages are processed by majority and minority members of an organization. Thus, this research question investigates the amount of threat or attitude vulnerability generated by value-in-diversity inoculation messages between minorities and non-minorities:

RQ1: Do minority or majority members of an organization experience greater threat after exposure to value-in-diversity inoculation messages?

Research supports the active role of involvement in conferring resistance (e.g., Chen et al., 1992; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979; Pfau, 1992; Pfau, Tusing, et al., 1997a). Though issue involvement has been defined differently among scholars (Pfau et al., 2003), a consensus exists among several scholars that involvement affects the degree to which individuals are motivated to process information (Burnkrant & Sawyer, 1983; Chaiken, 1980; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986).

Compton and Pfau (2004a) argue that "issue involvement is a precondition for threat, and therefore, determines the boundary conditions for inoculation theory" (p. 12). Pfau (1992) suggests involvement serves as a precondition to resistance.

Recent investigations in inoculation theory have sought to provide more encompassing explanations for the way in which involvement promotes resistance in the inoculative process. Pfau, Tusing, and colleagues (1997a) followed up a study by Pfau (1992) to determine the role of issue involvement in conferring resistance. They suggest issue involvement is "the importance or salience of an attitude object for a receiver" (Pfau, Tusing, et al., 1997a, p. 190) and found that greater involvement levels confer resistance in a path that functions independently of threat.

Unlike Pfau and colleagues (1997a) who investigated issue involvement as an independent variable, Compton & Pfau (2004b) investigated issue involvement as a dependent variable and found inoculation treatments increased base involvement levels. Similarly Pfau, Compton, and colleagues (2004) found involvement levels not only increased after inoculation, but also influenced other variables in the resistance process as well. Thus, this investigation posits two hypotheses related to the role of issue involvement and an additional research question investigating involvement levels between minorities and non-minorities.

H9a: For those individuals who receive value-in-diversity inoculation Messages, the tendency of inoculation to confer resistance to persuasive attacks is most pronounced among individuals who report higher levels of involvement.

H9b: For those individuals who receive value-in-diversity inoculation messages, compared to those who do not, inoculation messages enhance base involvement levels.

RQ2: Do minority or majority members of an organization experience greater involvement levels after exposure to value-in-diversity inoculation messages?

Inoculation and Reactance

Given the powerful empirical support of inoculation and the "broad blanket of protection" (Pfau, 1997, p. 137) the strategy provides, it seems feasible to suspect that inoculation may have some impact on the motivational arousal state of reactance. No inoculation research has considered the process of reactance in light of the mechanisms associated with resistance, and no reactance research has used inoculation messages in understanding the effects of message strategies upon reactance. Thus, this investigation posits a research question exploring the ability of inoculation to reduce reactance as a consequent of value-in-diversity campaign messages:

RQ3: In comparison to individuals who receive no inoculation, does inoculation reduce the level of reactance to value-in-diversity campaign messages?

Schemas and the Inoculation Process

Few can deny the rich empirical tradition of McGuire's (1964) inoculation theory; however, Compton and Pfau (2004a) reason "there is still much to discover about the way inoculation works" (p. 48). This investigation borrows schemas from the field of psychology, which have been the most popular models of mental representations in social psychology for the past two decades (Smith, 1998). Schemas serve as a viable candidate for offering new insights into the way inoculation messages

confer resistance, and a focus on schemas continues down the path of integrating key conceptual frameworks from social psychology research into social influence investigations.

Recent inoculation research (Haigh, 2006; Pfau et al., 2005) has pointed to social psychology in an effort to explain complementary paths that lead from inoculation to resistance. The research confirmed that inoculation modifies the structure of associative networks, which are spider-like structures in long-term memory (Collins & Loftus, 1975; Smith, 1998), and this modification contributes to resistance (Pfau et al., 2005). The distinction to be made here between associative networks and schemas is integrating a top-down, "in sum" approach (schemas) to the already-existing bottom-up, "in part" approach (associative networks) offered in the current inoculation literature. Though current references to schemas (Compton & Pfau, 2004) in the inoculation literature reference schemas synonymously with associative networks, the social psychological literature treats these as two separate, but related entities that both reside in long-term memory (Smith, 1998; Wyer & Carlston, 1994). A brief comparison of the two concepts' originations and conceptualizations should enhance understanding.

In line with the gestalt psychologists' view that the whole is more than the sum of its parts, Bartlett (1932) is responsible for schema theories because he advanced an opposing perspective to the notion that knowledge was a collection of isolated elements. Essentially, he argued that people organized past experience and behavior into structures that facilitate subsequent understanding and behavior. Once these structures become activated, they "lead to systematic biases and distortions in

interpretations (Weary & Edwards, 1994, p. 293). On the other hand, the origins of associative networks can be traced to thinkers (e.g., Locke and Hume) who held that concepts arise from associations that are repeatedly paired (Smith, 1998). Associative networks are conceptualized as specific nodes being linked together via a spreading activation after a specific node is activated. Upon activation, "excitation spreads along the pathways that connect [the node] to other concept nodes" (Wyer & Carlston, 1994, p. 44).

The key conceptualization difference, then, is between schemas as knowledge structures with more sophisticated, broader representations and associative networks as "elementary nodes without internal structure" (Smith, 1998, p. 402). With one conceptualization, a summative structure is imposed over information, and in the other, bottom-up processing exists where meanings are derived from connecting nodes via a cognitive domino effect. The impact of associative networks, as confirmed in the extant literature, upon inoculation is to alter the network's structure by adding nodes and linkages among nodes (Pfau et al., 2005). The operationalization used to tap associative networks was concept maps which allowed participants to share their cognitive elements along with the connections among them. This investigation seeks to explore a top-down, summative approach afforded through the conceptualization of schemas. Though related to associative networks because both reside in long-term memory with their own unique roles, understanding the impact of schemas in the process of resistance is a worthwhile, but as yet uninvestigated arena.

Kean and Albada (2003) suggest "schemas are knowledge structures that organize information in memory about our past experiences" (p. 283). They are

"subjective 'theories' about how the social world operates (and) are derived from generalizing across one's experiences with the social world" (Markus & Zajonc, 1985, p. 98). Schemas contain "abstract generic knowledge that holds across many particular instances (Fiske & Taylor, 1991, p. 98). Fiske and Dyer (1985) describe this process as beginning with a collection of individual components and ending with an integrated unit with strong connections among those original component parts. Resnick (1994) suggests a schema "superimposes a structure on the pieces" (p. 475).

Since schemas are assumed to represent "general knowledge rather than episodes bound to particular times and contexts" (Smith, 1998, p. 403), they offer a viable explanation for an individual's past experiences and memory structure about an inoculation topic. The conceptualization of schema as prior knowledge describes the knowledge-state of an individual prior to, during, and after an inoculative treatment. Prior to the inoculative treatment, the individual has a schema or prior knowledge that he or she relies upon to "just 'know'" (Smith, 1998, p. 404).

During the inoculative process, schemas become the target of refutational preemption about a topic. Pfau and colleagues (2004) state the refutational preemption "raises arguments contrary to the initial attitude and then systematically refutes them" (p. 7). In this way, the target of the inoculative treatment about a topic becomes the individual's prior knowledge or schema about the topic.

Since a schema is assumed to represent general knowledge (Kagan, 2002; Kean & Albada, 2003; Smith, 1998), one can reason an inoculative treatment alters the general knowledge represented by a schema in some way. Kean and Albada (2003) explain "as one has new experiences, or witnesses others' experiences, these real world

moments feed the schemas as well" (p. 283). Since new information cannot be subtracted from knowledge, but merely "fed" or shifted or adjusted into the existing knowledge structure, the process of pre-exposing an individual to weakened arguments and then systematically refuting them, must expand or broaden representations in a schema. Thus this investigation posits:

> *H10a*: For majority members who receive value-in-diversity inoculation messages, inoculation messages alter diversity initiative schema representations making them (a) more expansive, (b) more relevant and (c) more specific.

Since the conceptualization of schemas are broad-based knowledge representations that hold across contexts (Fiske & Dyer, 1985; Fiske & Taylor, 1991), expanded schemas can be logically conceptualized as broader knowledge representations stored in long-term memory and capable of being retrieved or accessed. Thus the expanded representations of a schema (as a result of the inoculative treatment) can be conceptualized to hold or remain with the individual across contexts for later use when the topic is experienced again.

In summarizing schematic mechanisms agreed upon by social psychology theorists, Smith (1998) states schemas have a two-fold function of 1) interpreting related information, and 2) directing attention to information. Similarly, Marshall (1995) offers the following four functions of schemas including 1) recognizing additional experiences 2) accessing a generic framework 3) drawing inferences, and 4) utilizing skills and procedures. Together, these multiple schematic functions serve several purposes that "influence evaluations and other judgments" (p. 403) and that process unexpected or inconsistent information. This suggests the expanded

representations of a schema (as a result of the inoculative treatment) can now be used to both interpret related information about the topic and to direct attention to information about the topic for processing as well as carrying out other functions.

Social psychology research supports multiple schema functions with notable findings. Studies by Bartlett (1932) and Schank and Abelson (1977) found evidence of people's abilities to draw on their knowledge to fill in the gaps and interpret information. Other studies (Pichert & Anderson, 1977; von Hippel, Jonides, Hilton, & Narayan, 1993) confirm schematic knowledge directs attention to schema-relevant, rather than irrelevant details.

Since expanded schemas are capable of holding broadened representations, as they carry out their functions, it can be logically deduced that the general knowledge structure of a schema will function just as conceptualized when attack messages are experienced. The expanded representations in a schema (as a result of the inoculative treatment) will carry out the functions of interpreting the attack message on the inoculation topic (filling in gaps when necessary) and will also direct attention to related or inconsistent information on the inoculation topic. The functions of the schema, as an expanded knowledge structure, to both interpret the attack about the inoculation topic and to direct attention to relevant attack details about the inoculation topic promotes greater resistance. Thus, by chaining these schematic conceptualizations and functions together, this investigation posits:

H10b: For majority members who receive value-in-diversity inoculation messages, the tendency of inoculation to confer attitudinal resistance to persuasive attacks is most pronounced among individuals who report altered diversity initiative schema representations.

Schema Activation and Accessibility

Social psychologists have conceptualized that schemas become activated in an "all-or-none" (Smith, 1998, p. 403) fashion when the subject of a particular schema is experienced or as the result of some stimuli (Carlston & Smith, 1996). Kean and Albada (2003) contend schemas are "strengthened by repeated experiences until the entire structure can be used as an all-or-none entity" (p. 283). Smith theorizes "a schema can be activated by explicit thought about its topic or by an encounter with relevant information" (p. 403).

Since McGuire's (1964) original conceptualization of inoculative treatments is a procedure of information that contains "defense-stimulating forms of counterarguments" (p. 327), an inoculative treatment serves as the stimulus or relevant information for activating a schema. When a schema is activated, the whole representation of knowledge about the topic of the schema is made accessible (Kean & Albada, 2003; Marshall, 1995; Smith, 1998). In this way, an activated schema accesses all of the general knowledge about a particular encounter and brings the knowledge to bear for carrying out the multiple functions discussed earlier. As a result, when inoculative treatments serve as a stimulus for activating a schema, all of the expanded representations of the schema are used in the functional processes about the inoculation

topic. The schema's activation and accessibility is all (upon activation) or none (absence of a stimulus and thus not activated).

Smith (1998) suggests a schema's accessibility has no implications or probability of altering other schemas upon activation and explains that schemas have varying levels of accessibility "which are influenced by recent or frequent use" (p. 403). Thus, the more use of information represented by a schema, the more accessible the schema becomes.

Based on the logic of this conceptualization of schema accessibility and McGuire's (1964) original conceptualization of inoculation treatments, it can be posited that inoculation treatments not only expand representations of a schema, but they also increase the schema's level of accessibility by making frequent use of the representations in the schema. Also, it can be posited that the more frequent or greater use of representations of a schema creates a schema that is more likely to confer resistance when used for schema functions. Thus, this investigation posits:

> *H11a*: Among majority members, value-in-diversity inoculation messages increase a diversity initiative schema's level of accessibility, making the schema more accessible, and thus more available to use when interpreting new information.
>
> *H11b*: For majority members who receive value-in-diversity inoculation messages, the tendency of inoculation to confer attitudinal resistance to persuasive attacks is most pronounced among individuals who report an increased accessibility of their diversity initiative schema.

CHAPTER V

METHODS

The purpose of this investigation was to examine the efficacy of psychological reactance in explaining the motivational responses to value-in-diversity campaign messages as well as the usefulness of inoculation theory in protecting value-in-diversity attitudes from slippage. For the first time, inoculation's impact on schemas was examined as well.

Participants

Participants were undergraduate students recruited from the college of business in a midwestern university. Participants were told they would be taking part in a study about message processing and attitude inventory. A total of 548 students (265 male and 283 female) completed the study, which was administered in three phases. The study's retention rate from Phase1 to Phase 3 was 91%. An independent samples t-test was computed to ensure no systematic differences existed between participants who completed all phases of the study and those who did not. No significant differences were found on the variables of gender, ethnicity, trait reactance, attitude toward the issue, and issue involvement. This suggests the attrition rate is based on participants randomly dropping out of the study rather than some systematic mechanism.

Design and Independent Variables

This investigation employed a 2 x 2 x 5 factorial design. Independent variables were diversity condition (majority and minority), inoculation treatment condition (control and inoculation), and value-in-diversity campaign message condition (control,

explicit with postscript, explicit with no postscript, implicit with postscript, and implicit with no postscript).

While organizational diversity often represents a broad class of components including religion, sexual orientation, social status, job tenure, age, economic class, and physical ability just to name a few, the focus of the value-in-diversity messages for this investigation was racioethnic and gender diversity. Allen (1995) contends racioethnicity is salient because it "usually is physically observable, its roots lie in affirmative action/equal employment opportunity programs, and it references the fastest rising groups" (p. 144) likely to impact an organization. Mollica (2003) suggests organizational diversity is difficult to manage because identity groups are focused on race and gender. Also, Kossek and Zonia (1993) suggest most diversity programs center around racioethnicity and women.

Consistent with diversity research on racioethnicity and gender summarized by Nkomo and Cox (1996), this investigation placed both racioethnic minorities and White women in the minority diversity demographic group and White men in the majority diversity demographic group. The racio-ethnic makeup of participants in this investigation was African American (*n* = 77, 14% of the sample), American Indian/Alaskan Native (*n* = 24, 4% of the sample), Asian or Pacific Islander (*n* = 62, 11% of the sample), Caucasian/White (*n* = 338, 62% of the sample), Hispanic American (*n* = 27, 5% of the sample), and Other (*n* = 20, 4% of the sample). The "Other" category was used to ensure the list of ethnicity categories was mutually exhaustive. Since participants engage in self-identification ethnic processes, the use of this category gave participants who did not identify with the other ethnic categories a

place to respond. Prior attitude, issue involvement, network heterogeneity, and trait reactance were treated as covariates in the analysis.

The effectiveness of the pretreatments in conferring resistance to the onset of value-in-diversity attacks was assessed by comparing the attitudes of those who received an inoculation message with those who received a dummy message (about visiting Oklahoma's State Parks) rather than the inoculation message. The effectiveness of the messages in eliciting reactance among those in the majority was assessed by comparing the reactance levels of those who received value-in-diversity campaign messages with those who received a dummy message (about kite flying in Oklahoma). Those who received dummy messages served as controls in the inoculation treatment and value-in-diversity campaign message conditions.

Those participants assigned as controls participated in all assessments conducted during the study; however, they were assigned to read dummy messages rather than the inoculation or value-in-diversity campaign message. Reliability of all scales was gauged using Cronbach's coefficient alpha.

Experimental Materials

To administer the three phases of this investigation, the researcher prepared multiple messages. For Phase 1, in which participants were inoculated, two inoculation messages about racial and gender diversity initiatives and one control message were created (see Appendix A). For Phase 2, in which participants were exposed to an organization's value-in-diversity campaign message, four value-in-diversity campaign messages and one control message was created (see Appendix B). For Phase 3, in

which participants received a message attacking racial and gender diversity initiatives, two attack messages were created (See Appendix C).

The heart of the logic and rationale offered in the inoculation and campaign messages came from the extant diversity research. According to Cox and Blake (1991), the following five primary factors are used to support value-in-diversity messages: (1) attracting and retaining the best available human talent; (2) enhanced marketing efforts; (3) higher creativity and innovation, (4) better problem solving, and (5) more organizational flexibility. Allen (2004) offers increased creativity, productivity, and profitability, as well as enhanced public relations and improved service quality as rewards of valuing difference. These factors were incorporated into the pro racial and gender diversity initiative inoculation messages and the organization's value-in-diversity campaign messages that were written.

The Phase 1 inoculation messages ranged in length from 403 to 410 words. Along with incorporating the factors referenced above, the first paragraph of the inoculation messages was designed to elicit threat. McGuire (1970) defined threat as a warning of impending and potentially influential attack against the position on the issue supported by the participant. The remainder of each inoculation message raised arguments contrary to a participant's pro position on the issue of racial and gender diversity initiatives and then provided systematic answers to those arguments (see Appendix A).

Because threat is a prerequisite for inoculation (McGuire, 1962; Pfau, 1997), inoculation messages were pre-tested prior to use in this investigation. A one-way ANOVA was computed to assess elicited threat for those inoculated and those not

inoculated (control). The results revealed that those inoculated indicated significantly higher threat levels than those in the control condition ($F(1,163) = 3.99$, $p < .05$, $eta^2 = .02$). Thus, inoculation messages were determined to operate as planned by generating significantly more threat among participants in the inoculation condition ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.36$) than those in the control condition ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.38$).

The Phase 2 value-in-diversity campaign message summarized diversity intervention efforts from the participants' own organization or university. The value-in-diversity campaign message incorporated the primary factors referenced above in addition to current diversity efforts being used by similar institutions in implementing diversity initiatives (Hale, 2004). The organization's value-in-diversity campaign message was altered to create four variations (see Appendix B), 2 (explicit or implicit) x 2 (restoration postscript or filler postscript). To manipulate the value-in-diversity campaign message to create explicit (or controlling) language, imperative and controlling terms such as "should," "ought," "must," and "need" were used, while less controlling language such as "could," "can," "may," and "might want to" was used to create the implicit (or less controlling) version (Lanceley, 1985; McLaughlin, Schutz, & White, 1980; Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci, 2006).

To ensure that value-in-diversity campaign messages differed significantly in message type the messages were pre-tested prior to use in this investigation. Value-in-diversity campaign messages using more controlling language should be perceived as more explicit than the value-in-diversity campaign messages using less controlling language, which are designed to be implicit messages. A paired samples t-test was computed to ensure participants rated the explicit message as significantly more

explicit than the implicit message. The results revealed that the campaign messages operated as planned with the message using more controlling language (M = 5.25, SD = 1.55) being rated as significantly more explicit (t (70) = 6.00, $p < .001$) than the message using less controlling language (M = 3.84, SD = 1.68).

For Phase 3, the researcher prepared two messages attacking racial and gender diversity initiatives. The attack messages mirrored the arguments offered against value-in-diversity messages in the extant literature. Shephard (1964) contends that too much diversity in problem-solving groups can be dysfunctional because the differences in communication styles, cultural barriers, and points of view make decision-making impossible due to a lack of commonality. Also, Ziller (1973) argues diversity violates group cohesiveness in the following three ways: (1) leads to lower cohesiveness because of status incongruence when members are not accustomed to having a female, lesbian, or African American supervisor, (2) leads to lower cohesiveness because perceived similarity increases attraction; thus perceived dissimilarity creates lower cohesiveness, and (3) people seek homogeneity in groups for conformity which they rely upon to conduct self-evaluations. The arguments offered by Shephard (1964) and Ziller (1973) along with those referenced by Hale (2004) were incorporated into the attack messages.

The Phase 3 attack messages ranged in length from 579 to 583 words. This word count adheres to the stipulation of Pfau, Roskos-Ewoldsen, et al. (2003) that attack messages be longer than the inoculation messages because attacks need to contain multiple counterarguments and blended attack strategies.

Inoculation, attack, and value-in-diversity campaign messages were evaluated for written comprehensibility using Becker, Bavelas, and Braden's (1961) Index of Contingency, which measures the reconstructability of sentences or readability. This approach seeks to ensure consistency in the writing style and word choice of messages by considering the use of nouns, pronouns, and total words used in each message. A similar index score indicates equivalence. The index scores for all messages ranged from 14.50 to 15.20.

Procedure

This study was conducted in three phases with the first phase having two sets of questionnaires. In Phase 1, participants were asked to provide basic demographic information. Next, attraction toward opportunities referenced in the value-in-diversity campaign was assessed along with trait reactance. After trait reactance had been assessed, participants finished the questionnaire designed to tap representations in their diversity schemas, determine the frequency of recollection of representations in their diversity schemas, assess the heterogeneity of their networks, assess their prior attitudes, and determine their issue involvement levels.

After the first questionnaire was completed, the researcher scrutinized responses on participant attitude, involvement, and diversity demographic. Based on those responses, participants were assigned to conditions. Selection was random except the participants were assigned to conditions based on their diversity demographic and care was taken to insure that each of the cells in the design reflected an approximate equivalence of low-, moderate-, and high-involved participants. Since only attitudes

that are preexisting are capable of being inoculated, only participants who indicated that they held a positive value-in-diversity attitude were included in the study.

After the researcher had assigned participants to conditions, previously prepared experimental booklets were given to participants. The booklets contained an inoculation message supporting the value-in-diversity position (except for those assigned to the inoculation control condition who received a "dummy" message) and a questionnaire to assess threat, attitude toward the issue, attitude strength, attitude certainty, and issue involvement. Phase 1 was conducted over a period of three days.

Next, Phase 2 experimental booklets were prepared for participants. Phase 2 booklets contained a value-in-diversity campaign message and a questionnaire to assess threat to freedom, credibility of the message source, anger-related negative affect, attitude toward the issue, attitude toward the preferential treatment of racial minorities, attitude toward the preferential treatment of women, attitude toward the perceived legitimacy of the value-in-diversity campaign, and attraction of restricted freedoms, such as the opportunities available in the value-in-diversity campaign message.

Phase 3 booklets contained an attack message opposed to the value-in-diversity position and a questionnaire to assess attitude toward the position advocated in the attack message, attitude certainty, attitude strength, representations in the diversity schema, the frequency of recollection of representations in the diversity schema, perceived threat to freedom, credibility of the message source, anger-related negative affect, and attraction of restricted freedoms. Phase 2 occurred approximately one week after Phase 1, and Phase 3 occurred approximately one week after Phase 2.

Variables and Measures

Covariates. Receiver's prior attitudinal position toward the topic was assessed in Phase 1 using Burgoon, Cohen, Miller, and Montgomery's (1978) measure which was developed for use in resistance research. The six bipolar adjective pairs were: foolish/wise, unacceptable/acceptable, wrong/right, unfavorable/favorable, bad/good, and negative/positive. The alpha reliability score for this measure was $\alpha = .94$ ($n = 547$).

Issue involvement, operationalized as the "importance or salience of the topic" (Pfau et al., 1997a, p. 18) was assessed at Phase 1 prior to inoculation and after inoculation using an abbreviated version of the Personal Involvement Inventory (PII) (Zaichkowsky, 1985). Six items of the PII were used in the study including: insignificant/significant, doesn't/does matter to me, unimportant/important, of no concern/of much concern, means nothing/means a lot, and irrelevant/relevant. The alpha reliability score for issue involvement was $\alpha = .97$ ($n = 548$) prior to inoculation at Phase 1 and $\alpha = .97$ ($n = 548$) after inoculation at Phase 1.

Network heterogeneity, operationalized as the racioethnic makeup of participant social networks, was created for use in this investigation. The five items included: "The friends I interact with on a regular basis represent a mixture of various races and ethnic groups (Nhfriend)," "The family members I interact with on a regular basis represent a mixture of various races and ethnic groups (Nhfamily)," "On my job, the people I interact with represent a mixture of various races and ethnic groups (Nhjob)," "In my classes, the students I interact with on a regular basis represent a mixture of various races and ethnic groups (Nhclass)," and "In volunteer groups,

religious groups, or social organizations, the people that I interact with represent a mixture of various races and ethnic groups (Nhgroups)." To test the validity of the measure, a principle component analysis was completed using the steps outlined by Norusis (2004). See Table 2 for a summary of the analytic results for network heterogeneity. Factors were extracted using the principal component analysis method which revealed one component (Eigenvalue = 2.40) that accounted for 47.96% of the variance. However, the loading of one of the factors (Nhclass) was too low at .60. A second principle component analysis, in which this factor (Nhclass) was removed resulted in a single component (Eigenvalue = 2.153) with a more stable structure that accounted for 53.82% of the variance with loadings ranging from .65 to .83. Thus, the scale items used to create the measure for this investigation were Nhfriend, Nhjob, Nhgroups, and Nhfamily, and the four items were measured on a 7-point strongly agree/strongly disagree Likert scale. The alpha reliability score for network heterogeneity which was assessed in Phase 1 was $\alpha = .71$ ($n = 548$).

Trait reactance, operationalized as "a unique personality characteristic people exhibit across situations" (Miller et al., 2007, p. 221), was assessed in Phase I using Hong and Faedda's (1996) measure which consists of the following 11 items: "I become frustrated when I am unable to make free and independent decisions," "It irritates me when someone points out things which are obvious to me," "I become angry when my freedom of choice is restricted," "Regulations trigger a sense of resistance in me," "I find contradicting others stimulating," "When something is prohibited, I usually think, 'That's exactly what I am going to do'," "I resist the attempts of others to influence me," "It makes me angry when another person is held

up as a role model for me to follow," "When someone forces me to do something, I feel like doing the opposite," "I consider advice from others to be an intrusion," and "Advice and recommendations usually induce me to do just the opposite." The items were measured on a 7-point strongly agree/strongly disagree Likert scale. The alpha reliability score for trait reactance in this investigation was $\alpha = .76$ ($n = 548$).

Dependent Measures. Threat elicited by inoculation treatments was measured using five bi-polar adjective pairs, which have been used in recent inoculation studies (e.g., Pfau et al., 1997a; Pfau, Szabo et al., 2001). This variable was assessed at Phase 1 following the administration of the inoculation treatments. Participants in inoculation and control conditions responded to the prospect that they could come in contact with persuasive information that might cause them to rethink their position. The scale items used were: unintimidating/intimidating, nonthreatening/threatening, not risky/risky, not harmful/harmful, and safe/dangerous. The alpha reliability score for the threat measure in this investigation was $\alpha = .96$ ($n = 547$).

Schemas, operationalized as "knowledge structures that organize information in memory about our past experiences" (Kean & Albada, 2003) was assessed in Phase 1 and Phase 3. Several studies (e.g., Hajek & Giles, 2005; Harwood, 1998; Kean & Albada, 2003; Mather & Johnson, 2000, 2003) have investigated schemas by having participants write or review stories and narratives. This investigation mirrored the approach taken in these studies (e.g., Hajek & Giles, 2005; Kean & Albada, 2003) where the story scenario created a need for participants to report their knowledge on the focal topic of investigation. Though positive and negative elements, as well as specifics, could have been offered in the scenario, the instructions were purposely

vague and non-directional to allow participants to assign detail and mood or emotion to the events as they deemed fit.

Participants were instructed to create a story based on the following information. Then, participants were given the following information: “You are on your way to attend a meeting on your campus about the value of your school’s efforts to promote a more diverse campus: to increase racial and gender diversity, especially among faculty and students. What kinds of things do you expect to be discussed at the meeting? What types of people will attend and speak at the meeting, and what will these people say about your university’s efforts? Add any details that you would like about the individuals involved in the meeting, the setting, or the activities.”

Participant schema representations were examined using content analysis with each story as the unit of analysis. Two undergraduate students served as the coders for schemas and were trained for approximately an hour and a half using a Code Book and Code Sheets. Afterwards, each coder independently coded a sub-sample (n = 100 or 10%) of the stories. Intercoder reliability was assessed using Scott’s (1955) pi for nominal data and Rosenthal’s (1984) formula for interval level data. The three categories for coding were: expansive (operationalized as how long stories were and coded based on word count of the story), relevance (operationalized as having story elements that were connected to the diversity initiatives issue and coded using a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 was irrelevant and 7 was very relevant), and detail (operationalized as having story content that was specific and concrete and coded using a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 was abstract or vague and 7 was very specific or concrete). The intercoder reliability for word count was .89, for relevance was .83, and

for detail was .84. The overall intercoder reliability across all categories for this investigation was .85.

Schema accessibility, operationalized as the frequency of recollection of the all-or-none representations contained in a schema, was assessed in Phase 1 and 3. Since Smith (1998) suggests a schema's accessibility has varying levels "which are influenced by recent or frequent use" (p. 403), participants were asked to estimate the frequency of their recollections of diversity using a 0-100 point probability continuum, where 0 indicates "no recollection" and 100 indicates "constant recollection." This probability continuum has been used in previous inoculation studies to measure attitude certainty (Pfau et al., 2004), receiver likelihood of purchasing the brand supported in an advertising message (Pfau, 1992), likelihood to seek information about a candidate (Pfau et al., 2001), and likelihood of voting (Pfau & Burgoon, 1988; Pfau et al., 1990). The probability continuum used previously in these studies was adapted to measure schema accessibility for this study. Participants were asked to estimate how frequently within the past week they recollected diverse student populations in higher education and how frequently within the past week they recollected racial and gender diversity initiatives or programming in higher education.

Strength of attitude was assessed during Phases 1 and 3, using four 7-interval scales: unimportant/important, uncertain/certain, irrelevant/relevant, and of no interest/of great interest. Attitude strength is a compilation construct. It is related to attitude importance (Krosnick, Boninger, Chuang, Berent, & Carnot, 1993), attitude certainty (Davidson, Yantis, Norwwod, & Montano, 1985; Pelham, 1991), personal relevance (Howard-Pitney, Borgida, & Omoto, 1986; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), and

other things. The alpha reliability for the attitude strength measure in this investigation was α = .92 (*n* = 547) in Phase 1 and α = .92 (*n* = 547) in Phase 3.

Certainty of attitude was assessed during Phases 1 and 3, using a 0-100 point probability continuum (Pfau et al., 2004) asking respondents to estimate the strength of their attitude about the issue in question, where 0 indicates "no certainty" and 100 indicates "absolute certainty." The measure has been used successfully in recent inoculation research (e.g., Pfau et al., 2005).

Attitude toward the issue was assessed in Phase 1 after inoculation, in Phase 2, and in Phase 3. Attitude toward the preferential treatment of racial minorities, toward the preferential treatment of women, and toward the perceived legitimacy of the value-in-diversity campaign were assessed in Phase 2. Attitude toward the counterattitudinal attack was assessed in Phase 3. All attitudes were assessed using the Burgoon et al. (1978) attitude scale. The scale items were: negative/positive, bad/good, unacceptable/acceptable, foolish/wise, wrong/right, and unfavorable/favorable. The alpha reliability for the various attitude toward the issue measures were: α = .97 (*n* = 548) for attitude toward the issue at Phase 1 after inoculation, α = .97 (*n* = 544) for attitude toward the issue at Phase 2, and α = .98 (*n* = 547) for attitude toward the issue at Phase 3. For the remaining attitude measures the alpha reliabilities were: α = .98 (*n* = 544) for attitude toward the preferential treatment of minorities at Phase 2, α = .99 (*n* = 543) for attitude toward the preferential treatment of women at Phase 2, α = .98 (*n* = 542) for attitude toward the perceived legitimacy of the value-in-diversity campaign at Phase 2, and α = .98 (*n* = 547) for attitude toward the counterattitudinal attack at Phase 3.

Threat to freedom was assessed in Phases 2 and 3 using Dillard and Shen's (2005) four-item measure which measures perceptions regarding how threatening the message was to participants' sense of autonomy and self-determination. The scale items were: "The message threatened my freedom to choose," "The message tried to manipulate me," "The message tried to make a decision for me," and "The message tried to pressure me." The alpha reliability score for this measure was $\alpha = .91$ ($n = 546$) at Phase 2 and $\alpha = .90$ ($n = 547$) at Phase 3.

Source credibility, operationalized as participant perceptions about the message source, was assessed in Phases 2 and 3 using McCroskey's (1966) scales for the competence, character, and sociability dimensions. Each of the dimensions was assessed using three bipolar adjective pairs with a 7-point differential as follows: for competence, unintelligent/intelligent, unqualified/qualified, and incompetent/competent; for character, selfish/unselfish, bad/good, and dishonest/honest; and for sociability, unsociable/sociable, gloomy/cheerful, and irritable/good natured. Alpha reliability ratings in this investigation were $\alpha = .95$ ($n = 546$) at Phase 2 and $\alpha = .95$ ($n = 547$) at Phase 3.

Anger-related negative affect was assessed in Phases 2 and 3 using four items that have been validated in previous reactance studies (Dillard & Shen, 2005). The four-item anger scale consisted of the following items: "I feel angry toward the message," "I feel irritated toward the message," "I feel annoyed toward the message," and "I feel aggravated toward the message." Participants were asked how angry they felt toward the message rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale and anchored by none of

this feeling/a great deal of this feeling. The alpha reliability score for this measure was α = .96 (*n* = 546) at Phase 2 and α = .96 (*n* = 546) at Phase 3.

The measure for attraction of restricted freedoms as supported in reactance research (e.g., Lessne & Notarantonio, 1988; Mazis et al., 1973) was created for this investigation. Though attraction of restricted freedoms has been explored in the contextual areas of advertising and marketing, the use of specific items were not provided in previous research and thus, were not easily transferable with a proven track record for use in this investigation. The four items used incorporated the opportunities for minorities and women referenced in the value-in-diversity campaign messages and included the following: "I am attracted to the idea of participating in a mentoring program (Rfment)," "The idea of securing an internship in my field is not appealing to me (Rfintern)," " I am not attracted to the idea of participating in scholarship opportunities (Rfscholar)," and "The idea of participating in professional networking to enhance my future career is appealing to me (Rfnetwork)." Two of the items (Rfintern and Rfscholar) were reverse-coded to reduce the risk of a testing effect. To test the validity of the measure, a principle component analysis was completed using the steps outlined by Norusis (2004). See Table 3 for a summary of the analytic results for attraction of restricted freedoms. Factors were extracted using the principal component analysis method which revealed one component (Eigenvalue = 1.81) that accounted for 45.18% of the variance. However, the loadings for two of the factors (Rfment and Rfnetwork) were noticeably lower than the other two at .53 and .65 respectfully. A second principle component analysis, in which these factors (Rfment and Rfnetwork) were removed resulted in a single component (Eigenvalue = 1.43) that accounted for

71.48% of the variance with each loading at .845. Thus, the scale items used to create the measure for this investigation were Rfintern and Rfschol, and the two items were measured on a 7-point strongly agree/strongly disagree Likert scale. The alpha reliability score for attraction of restricted freedoms which was assessed in Phases 2 and 3 was $\alpha = .60$ ($n = 544$; $r = .43$) at Phase 2 and $\alpha = .71$ ($n = 547$; $r = .55$) at Phase 3.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the various statistical analyses computed to assess the predictions and research questions associated with this investigation. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) was used to assess all hypotheses and research questions except for Hypotheses 10a and 11a which featured Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) and Hypotheses 10b and 11b which required multiple regression. Consistent with the extant inoculation and psychological reactance research, trait reactance was treated as a covariate when assessing psychological reactance-related predictions and initial attitude was treated as a covariate when assessing inoculation-related predictions. Rather than discuss each hypothesis and research question in sequential order, the structure of this chapter reflects the most parsimonious approach for testing and reporting the results. Thus, information is grouped based on the statistical analyses required for assessing specific predictions and research questions.

H1 & H5: Reactance, Campaign Messages, and Majority Members

Hypotheses 1 and 5 focused exclusively on participants whose diversity status condition in the investigation was the majority. For majority members, these predictions compared value-in-diversity (VID) campaign messages versus controls. To assess these predictions, a one-way (VID campaign and control) MANCOVA was computed on the Phase 2 dependent variables of reactance (threat to freedom, attitude toward the issue, anger-related negative affect, and credibility) and attraction of restricted freedoms. Trait reactance was treated as a covariate.

The omnibus results revealed no significant effect for the covariate of trait reactance, F (5, 162) = 1.46, p = .21, but the results did indicate a significant main omnibus effect for VID campaign, F (5, 162) = 4.52, p < .01, η_p^2 = .12. Subsequent analyses on the pattern of means are discussed next.

H1: Overall Reactance

Hypothesis 1 posited that, for majority member participants who receive value-in-diversity campaign messages, as compared to those who do not, value-in-diversity campaign messages generate psychological reactance. To assess this prediction, univariate tests were computed on VID campaign versus control means as a follow-up to the significant omnibus result. Univariate tests indicated significant main effects for VID campaign messages on the Phase 2 dependent variables of threat to freedom, F (1, 166) = 19.76, p < .01, η^2 = .10 (VID Campaign: M = 3.35; Controls: M = 2.08) and anger-related negative affect, F (1, 166) = 8.97, p < .01, η^2 = .05 (VID Campaign: M = 2.92; Controls: M = 1.91). However, there was no evidence for a significant effect on the Phase 2 dependent variables of credibility, F (1, 166) = .88, p = .35, or attitude toward the issue, F (1, 166) = .25, p = .62. The pattern of means, shown in Table 4, revealed that majority participants who received value-in-diversity campaign messages experienced greater threat to freedom and more anger-related negative affect. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. VID campaign messages triggered threat to freedom and anger-related negative affect, but effects did not extend to credibility or attitude toward the issue.

H5: Attraction of Restricted Freedoms

Hypothesis 5 posited that, for majority members who receive value-in-diversity

campaign messages, the messages generate greater attraction of restricted freedoms, such as the opportunities espoused in the campaign message. To assess this prediction, a univariate test was computed on VID campaign versus control means as a follow-up to the significant omnibus result. The univariate test indicated a nearly significant main effect for VID campaign messages on the Phase 2 dependent variable of attraction of restricted freedoms, F (1, 166) = 2.67, p = .10, η^2 = .02 (VID Campaign: M = 5.26; Controls: M = 5.56). However, the pattern of means was in the opposite of the predicted direction, thus suggesting that majority VID campaign message recipients manifest less, not more, attraction of restricted freedoms when compared to controls. Thus, Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

Thus, for majority members of an organization, VID campaign messages generate some symptoms of psychological reactance, but messages do not increase attraction of restricted freedoms, do not affect source credibility, and did not elicit a boomerang effect.

H2-H4: Campaign Messages, Reactance and Diversity Status Condition

Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4 addressed campaign message recipients only; so, control participants, who did not receive a value-in-diversity campaign message, were excluded from this set of analyses. For organizational members who received VID campaign messages, these predictions compared majority members versus minority members. To assess these predictions, a one-way (majority versus minority) MANCOVA was computed on seven Phase 2 dependent variables of reactance (threat to freedom, attitude toward the issue, anger-related negative affect, and credibility), attitude toward racial minorities, attitude toward women, and attitude toward the

legitimacy of the campaign. Trait reactance and network heterogeneity were treated as covariates. The results for the covariates are examined first.

For the covariate of trait reactance, the omnibus results revealed a significant effect, F (7, 425) = 2.81, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. Subsequent univariate analyses indicated significant effects for the covariate of trait reactance on the Phase 2 dependent variables of: threat to freedom, F (1, 431) = 11.33, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$; credibility, F (1, 431) = 6.30, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$; anger-related negative affect, F (1, 431) = 15.65, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$; attitude toward the issue, F (1, 431) = 4.76, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$; and attitude toward the legitimacy of the campaign, F (1, 431) = 4.95, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$. There was a nearly significant univariate effect for the covariate of trait reactance on the dependent variable of attitude toward racial minorities, F (1, 431) = 3.20, $p < .08$, $\eta^2 = .01$, but no significant univariate effect on the dependent variable of attitude toward the preferential treatment of women, F (1, 431) = 1.26, $p = .26$. An examination of the valences indicates trait reactance is positively associated with threat to freedom and anger-related negative affect, but negatively associated with credibility and attitudes toward the issue and toward the legitimacy of the campaign.

For the covariate of network heterogeneity, the omnibus MANCOVA also revealed a significant effect, F (7, 425) = 3.37, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$. Subsequent univariate analyses indicated significant effects for the covariate of network heterogeneity on the Phase 2 dependent variables of: credibility, F (1, 431) = 8.53, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$; attitude toward the issue, F (1, 431) = 10.95, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$; attitude toward racial minorities, F (1, 431) = 11.71, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$; attitude toward the preferential treatment of women, F (1, 431) = 8.03, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$; and attitude toward the legitimacy of the

campaign, F (1, 431) = 17.74, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$. There were no significant univariate effects for the covariate of network heterogeneity on the dependent variables of threat to freedom, F (1, 431) = .39, $p = .53$, or anger-related negative affect, F (1, 431) = 2.45, $p = .12$. These results will be discussed in greater specificity within the context of assessing Hypothesis 3.

For diversity status condition, the omnibus results revealed a significant main effect, F (7, 425) = 4.72, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$. The pattern of means will be assessed in the context of specific predictions.

H2-H3: Magnitude of Reactance

Hypothesis 2 posited that value-in-diversity campaign messages generate a greater magnitude of reactance among majority members, as opposed to minority members in organizations. To assess this prediction, univariate tests were computed on majority versus minority means as a follow-up to the significant omnibus result. Univariate tests indicated significant main effects for diversity status condition on the four Phase 2 reactance-based, dependent variables of threat to freedom, F (1, 431) = 15.90, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$ (Majority: $M = 3.35$; Minority: $M = 2.63$); credibility, F (1, 431) = 10.61, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$ (Majority: $M = 5.09$; Minority: $M = 5.54$); anger-related negative affect, F (1, 431) = 15.44, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$ (Majority: $M = 2.94$; Minority: $M = 2.18$); and attitude toward the issue, F (1, 431) = 19.81, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$ (Majority: $M = 5.53$; Minority: $M = 6.12$). The pattern of means, as shown in Table 5, suggests that among organizational members receiving a VID campaign message, majority members, as compared to minority members, experience greater threat to freedom, hold more negative attitudes toward the issue, experience more anger-related negative

affect, and view the source of the message with lesser credibility. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Hypothesis 3 posited that value-in-diversity campaign messages generate a lesser magnitude of psychological reactance among organizational members who interact in more heterogeneous networks. Following the significant omnibus and significant univariate tests, reported above, this prediction required examination of the valences of the covariate and significant Phase 2 dependent variables (credibility, attitude toward the issue, attitude toward the preferential treatment of women, attitude toward the preferential treatment of racial minorities, and attitude toward the legitimacy of the campaign). The results suggested that greater network heterogeneity is positively associated with credibility and with attitudes. This indicates that, for organizational members receiving a VID campaign message, greater network heterogeneity is positively associated with more favorable attitudes and more favorable perceptions of the message source, which are indicators of less psychological reactance. However, greater network homogeneity is associated with less favorable attitudes and less favorable perceptions of the message source, which are indicators of greater psychological reactance. Thus, there is partial support for Hypothesis 3. Network homogeneity, as compared to network heterogeneity, is associated with some manifestations of greater reactance, but has no effect on threat to freedom or anger-related negative affect.

H4: Attitudinal Impact of Reactance

Hypothesis 4 posited that value-in-diversity campaign messages generate more negative attitudes toward the preferential treatment of minorities and the perceived

legitimacy of the value-in-diversity campaign among majority members, as compared to minority members. To assess this prediction, univariate tests were computed on majority versus minority organizational members as a follow-up to the significant omnibus result. The univariate tests revealed significant main effects on the three Phase 2 dependent measures of: attitude toward racial minorities, F (1, 431) = 13.61, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$ (Majority: $M = 4.07$; Minority: $M = 4.82$); attitude toward the preferential treatment of women, F (1, 431) = 14.12, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$ (Majority: $M = 4.24$; Minority: $M = 4.98$); and attitude toward the legitimacy of the campaign, F (1, 431) = 21.41, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$ (Majority: $M = 5.07$; Minority: $M = 5.75$). The pattern of means, as shown in Table 5, suggests that majority participants, who receive VID campaign messages hold less favorable attitudes toward racial minorities, hold less favorable attitudes toward the preferential treatment of women, and hold less favorable attitudes toward the legitimacy of the value-in-diversity campaign. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported.

Thus, among those who receive campaign messages, majority members of an organization, as compared to minority members, experience all of the symptoms of psychological reactance. Network heterogeneity affects the reactance manifestations of credibility and attitudes toward the issue, toward the preferential treatment of women, toward the preferential treatment of minorities, and toward the legitimacy of the campaign, but network heterogeneity does not elicit greater threat to freedom or increase anger-related negative affect.

H6-H7: Campaign Message Strategies and Restoration of Freedom

Hypotheses 6 and 7 were only associated with the effectiveness of campaign message strategies among participants whose diversity status condition in the investigation was majority. For majority members, these predictions compared explicit messages versus implicit messages and restoration postscripts versus filler postscripts. To assess these predictions, a 2 (Message Type: explicit versus implicit) x 2 (Postscript: restoration versus filler) MANCOVA was computed on the four Phase 2 dependent variables of: threat to freedom, attitude toward racial minorities, attitude toward women, and attitude toward the legitimacy of the campaign. Trait reactance was treated as a covariate. The results for the covariate will be examined first, and then the omnibus results will be discussed for message type, use of postscripts, and possible interaction of message type and use of postscripts.

For the covariate of trait reactance, the omnibus results revealed a nearly significant effect, F (4, 124) = 2.04, $p < .10$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$. Subsequent univariate analyses indicated significant effects for the covariate of trait reactance on the Phase 2 dependent variables of: attitude toward racial minorities, F (1, 127) = 6.41, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$; and attitude toward women, F (1, 127) = 4.51, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$. There were no significant omnibus effects for the covariate of trait reactance on the Phase 2 dependent variables of: threat to freedom, F (1, 127) = 1.95, $p = .17$; or attitude toward the legitimacy of the campaign, F (1, 127) = .59, $p = .44$. An examination of the valences indicates trait reactance is negatively associated with attitudes.

For the message type condition, the omnibus results revealed a significant main effect, F (4, 124) = 4.72, $p < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$. The pattern of means will be assessed in the

context of Hypothesis 6. For the postscript condition, the omnibus results showed no evidence for a significant main effect, F (4, 124) = 1.41, p = .23. Though omnibus results failed to indicate significance for the postscript condition, because theory warranted the prediction, planned comparisons were computed to further assess the pattern of means (Huberty & Morris, 1989). The planned comparison results will be discussed in the context of Hypothesis 7. Also, the MANCOVA revealed no significant omnibus interaction effect between the message type and postscript conditions, F (4, 124) = .18, p = .95.

H6: Message Strategies and Reactance

Hypothesis 6 posited that majority members who receive campaign messages using explicit language, as opposed to implicit language, (a) experience a greater threat to freedom, (b) hold more negative attitudes toward the preferential treatment of minorities, and (c) hold more negative attitudes toward the perceived legitimacy of the value-in-diversity campaign. To assess this prediction, univariate tests were computed on explicit versus implicit message means as a follow-up to the omnibus effect. The univariate tests revealed a significant main effect on the Phase 2 dependent measure of threat to freedom, F (1, 127) = 8.90, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$ (Explict: M = 3.74; Implicit: M = 2.93). However, no significant univariate main effects were found on the Phase 2 dependent variables of: attitude toward racial minorities, F (1, 127) = .59, p = .44; attitude toward women, F (1, 127) = .34, p = .56; or attitude toward the legitimacy of the campaign, F (1, 127) = .05, p = .83. The pattern of means, as shown in Table 6, suggests that, among majority members, explicit messages generate a greater threat to freedom. Thus Hypothesis 6(a), concerning threat to freedom was supported; however,

Hypotheses 6(b) and 6(c), concerning attitudinal measures, was not supported.

Overall, Hypothesis 6 was partially supported with message strategies functioning as predicted in terms of explicit messages eliciting more threat to freedom than implicit messages; however, message strategies failed to have negative attitudinal impact for the preferential treatment of minorities and the perceived legitimacy of the campaign.

H7: Restoration of Freedom

Hypothesis 7 posited that among majority members, a restoration postscript will reduce the perceived threat to freedom posed by VID campaign messages. To assess this prediction, a subsequent planned comparison test, as advocated by Huberty and Morris (1989) when theory warrants it, was computed on restoration postscript versus filler postscript messages. The test revealed a significant main effect for the Phase 2 dependent measure of threat to freedom, F (1, 127) = 4.38, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$ (Restoration: $M = 3.06$; Filler: $M = 3.62$). The pattern of means, as shown in Table 6, suggests that among majority members, campaign messages with a restoration postscript, as compared to a filler postscript, reduce threat to freedom. Thus, Hypothesis 7 was supported.

Thus, for majority members of an organization, the use of explicit language in VID campaign messages increases threat to freedom, but has no effect on attitudes toward the preferential treatment of minorities and toward the legitimacy of the campaign. The use of a restoration postscript in VID campaign messages reduces threat to freedom.

H8, H9b & RQ3: Overall Influence of Inoculation

Hypotheses 8 and 9b as well as Research Question 3 were associated with the overall efficacy of inoculation among all participants in the investigation. These predictions compared participants in the inoculation experimental condition versus those in the control condition. To assess these predictions, a one-way (inoculation versus control) MANCOVA was computed on the seven dependent variables of: Phase 1 involvement-post inoculation; Phase 3 involvement-post attack and attitude toward the issue; and Phase 2 reactance-related variables (threat to freedom, attitude toward the issue, anger-related negative affect, and credibility). Initial attitude and trait reactance served as covariates. The results for the covariates are examined first.

For the covariate of initial attitude, the omnibus results revealed a significant effect, F (7, 530) = 33.43, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .31$. Subsequent univariate analyses indicated significant effects for the covariate of initial attitude on the dependent variables of: post-attack attitude toward the issue, F (1, 536) = 53.34, $p < .08$, $\eta^2 = .09$; involvement-post inoculation, F (1, 536) = 170.58, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .19$; involvement-post attack, F (1, 536) = 73.54, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .11$; and the Phase 2 variables of threat to freedom, F (1, 536) = 14.68, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$; attitude toward the issue, F (1, 536) = 152.98, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .18$; anger-related negative affect, F (1, 536) = 15.71, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$; and credibility, F (1, 536) = 19.23, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$. An examination of the valences indicates initial attitude is positively associated with post-attack attitude toward the issue, post-inoculation involvement, post-attack involvement, and on Phase 2 attitude toward the issue and credibility, but it is negatively associated with threat to freedom and anger-related negative affect.

For the covariate of trait reactance, the MANCOVA also revealed a significant omnibus effect, F (7, 530) = 3.68, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$. Subsequent univariate analyses indicated significant effects for the covariate of trait reactance on the Phase 2 dependent variables of: threat to freedom, F (1, 536) = 14.76, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$; attitude toward the issue, F (1, 536) = 6.04, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .18$; anger-related negative affect, F (1, 536) = 21.72, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$; and credibility, F (1, 536) = 5.86, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$. There was a near significant omnibus effect for the covariate of trait reactance on the dependent variable of post-attack attitude toward the issue, F (1, 536) = 3.22, $p < .10$, $\eta^2 = .01$. However, there was no evidence of a significant omnibus effect for the covariate of trait reactance on the dependent variables of involvement-post inoculation, F (1, 536) = .81, $p = .37$; or involvement-post attack, F (1, 536) = 1.53, $p = .22$. An examination of the valences indicates trait reactance is positively associated with Phase 2 threat to freedom and anger-related negative affect, but negatively associated with post-attack attitude toward the issue, and Phase 2 attitude toward the issue and credibility.

For inoculation treatment condition, the omnibus results showed no evidence for a significant main effect, F (7, 530) = .15, $p = .99$. Though omnibus results failed to indicate significance for the inoculation treatment condition, because theory warranted the predictions, planned comparisons were computed to further assess the pattern of means (Huberty & Morris, 1989). The planned comparison results will be discussed next in the context of specific predictions.

H8 & H9b: Overall Inoculation

Hypothesis 8 posited that inoculation messages, as compared to controls, confer attitudinal resistance following exposure to messages attacking the value-in-diversity concept. To assess this prediction, a planned comparison was computed assessing inoculation and control means. The results of planned comparisons failed to reveal significant effects on post-attack attitude toward the issue, F (1, 536) = .11, $p > .10$. The results suggest inoculation fails to confer attitudinal resistance to the anti-diversity persuasive attack. Thus, Hypothesis 8 was not supported.

Hypothesis 9b posited that for those who receive inoculation messages, as compared to those who do not, inoculation messages enhance base involvement levels. To assess this prediction, planned comparisons were computed on inoculation versus control means. The planned comparison tests failed to reveal significant main effects on post-inoculation involvement, F (1, 536) = .09, $p > .10$; or post-attack involvement, F (1, 536) = .13, $p > .10$. The results suggest inoculation messages fail to enhance base involvement levels. Thus, Hypothesis 9b was not supported.

RQ3: Inoculation and Reactance

Research Question 3 asks, in comparison to individuals who receive no inoculation, does inoculation reduce the level of reactance to value-in-diversity campaign messages? The non-significant omnibus results reveal that inoculation had no overall effect on the Phase 2 reactance-related dependent variables. Thus, for Research Question 3, the results suggest no significant differences between inoculation and control participants' reactance levels to campaign messages.

Thus, inoculation has no overall effect on post-attack attitudes within a value-in-diversity content. The inoculation messages do not impact base involvement levels, nor do they affect manifestations of psychological reactance.

H9a & RQ1-RQ2: Inoculation, Involvement, Threat and Diversity Status Condition

Hypothesis 9a and Research Questions 1 and 2 addressed only the participants who were inoculated; so, control participants, who received no inoculation message, were excluded from this set of analyses. For organizational members who were inoculated, these analyses compared majority members versus minority members. To assess these research questions, a one-way (majority versus minority) MANCOVA was computed on the three dependent variables of: Phase 2 threat, Phase 3 attitude toward the issue, and Phase 2 post-inoculation involvement. Initial attitude and initial involvement were treated as covariates. The results for the covariates are examined first.

For the covariate of initial attitude, the omnibus results revealed a significant effect, F (3, 271) = 2.77, $p < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. Subsequent univariate analyses indicated significant effects for the covariate of initial attitude on the dependent variable of post-inoculation involvement, F (1, 273) = 5.14, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .01$; and a nearly significant effect on the dependent variable of post-attack attitude toward the issue, F (1, 273) = 3.03, $p < .10$, $\eta^2 = .01$. No significant univariate effect was found on the dependent variable of threat, F (1, 273) = .62, $p = .43$. An examination of the valences indicates initial attitude is positively associated with post-inoculation involvement and post-attack attitude toward the issue.

For the covariate of initial involvement, the MANCOVA omnibus results revealed a significant effect, F (3, 271) = 91.09, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .50$. Subsequent univariate analyses indicated significant effects for the covariate of initial involvement on the dependent variables of: post-attack attitude toward the issue, F (1, 273) = 20.19, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$; and post-inoculation involvement, F (1, 273) = 267.86, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .28$. There was a nearly significant effect for the covariate of initial involvement on the dependent variable of threat, F (1, 273) = 2.57, $p = .11$, $\eta^2 = .01$. These results will be discussed in greater specificity within the context of assessing Hypothesis 9a.

For diversity status condition, the omnibus results revealed a significant main effect, F (3, 271) = 3.39, $p < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. The pattern of means will be assessed in the context of specific research questions.

H9a: Inoculation as an Antidote

Hypothesis 9a posited that among individuals who receive value-in-diversity campaign messages, the tendency of inoculation to confer attitudinal resistance to persuasive attacks is most pronounced among individuals who report higher levels of involvement. Following the significant omnibus and significant univariate tests, reported above, this prediction required examination of the valence of the covariate of initial involvement and the significant dependent variable of post-attack attitude toward the issue. The results indicated that initial involvement is positively associated with attitude toward the issue. This suggests that for organizational members receiving an inoculation message, greater levels of involvement are positively associated with more favorable and more resistant attitudes after persuasive attacks. Thus, Hypothesis 9a was supported.

RQ1: Threat and Diversity Status

Research Question 1 asks whether minority or majority members experience greater threat after exposure to value-in-diversity inoculation messages? To assess this research question, univariate analyses were computed on majority versus minority means as a follow-up to the significant omnibus result. Univariate tests indicated a significant main effect for diversity status condition on the dependent variable of threat, F (1, 273) = 7.57, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$ (Minority: $M = 3.21$; Majority: $M = 2.58$). The pattern of means, as shown in Table 7, suggests that among organizational members who receive inoculation messages, minority members as compared to majority members, experience greater threat of perceived susceptibility of their pro-diversity attitudes. Thus, the results for Research Question 1 suggest inoculation messages pose less threat of decreased attitude susceptibility among majority members in an organization as compared to minority members.

RQ2: Involvement and Diversity Status

Research Question 2 asks whether minority or majority members of an organization experience greater involvement levels after exposure to value-in-diversity inoculation messages? To assess this research question, univariate analyses were computed on majority versus minority means as a follow-up to the significant omnibus result. Univariate tests indicated no significant main effect for diversity status condition on the dependent variable of post-inoculation involvement, F (1, 273) = 1.71, $p = .19$. Thus, Research Question 2 suggests that for organizational members who receive inoculation messages, there is no significant difference between majority and minority members' involvement levels when controlling for initial involvement.

Thus, among those who receive inoculation messages, inoculation confers attitudinal resistance when higher levels of involvement are reported, but no significant differences exist between majority and minority members' post-inoculation involvement levels. Minority members, who receive inoculation messages, experience greater susceptibility of their pro-diversity attitudes.

H10a & H11a: Inoculation's Impact on Schemas

Hypotheses 10a and 11a were only associated with participants whose diversity status condition in the investigation was majority. For majority members, these predictions compared inoculation versus controls. To assess these predictions, a one-way (inoculation versus controls) MANOVA was computed on the Phase 3 schema-related dependent variables of: schema word count, schema relevance, schema detail, schema weight (an average of participant schema relevance and schema detail ratings), and schema accessibility.

The omnibus results revealed no significant main effect for inoculation treatment, F (4, 140) = .58, p = .68. Though omnibus results failed to indicate significance for the inoculation treatment condition, because theory warranted the predictions, planned comparisons were computed to further assess the pattern of means (Huberty & Morris, 1989). The planned comparison results will be discussed next in the context of specific predictions.

H10a: Inoculation's Influence on Schema Representations

Hypothesis 10a posits that for majority members, inoculation messages alter schema representations making them (a) more expansive, (b) more relevant, and (c) more specific. To assess this prediction, planned comparisons were computed on

inoculation and control means. Although the pattern of means for all variables was in the predicted direction, planned comparisons failed to reveal a significant main effect for inoculation treatment condition on schema word count, F (1, 143) = 1.00, $p > .10$; schema relevance, F (1, 143) = .10, $p > .10$; schema detail, F (1, 143) = 1.03, $p > .10$; or schema weight, F (1, 143) = 1.07, $p > .10$. The results suggest inoculation, when compared to controls, has no significant impact on the (a) expansion, (b) relevance, or (c) specificity, as well as the overall weight of schema representations. Thus, Hypothesis 10a was not supported.

H11a: Inoculation's Influence on Schema Accessibility

Hypothesis 11a posits that for majority members, inoculation messages increase a diversity schema's level of accessibility. To assess this prediction, planned comparisons were computed on inoculation and control means. The planned comparison test failed to reveal a significant main effect on schema accessibility, F (1, 143) = 1.00, $p > .10$. The results suggest inoculation, when compared to controls, has no significant impact on rendering schemas more accessible. Thus, Hypothesis 11a was not supported.

Thus, for majority members of an organization, inoculation messages do not alter schema representations by making them more expansive, more relevant, or more specific. Also, inoculation messages do not increase the level of schema accessibility.

H10b & H11b: Inoculation, Schemas, and Attitudinal Resistance

Hypotheses 10b and 11b were only associated with participants whose diversity status condition in the investigation was majority and who had received inoculation messages. For majority members receiving an inoculation message, these predictions

concerned the ability of schema representations and schema accessibility to confer attitudinal resistance following a persuasive attack. To assess these predictions, a regression analysis was computed in which Phase 3 post-attack attitude toward the issue was regressed on the Phase 3 schema-related dependent variables of: schema weight (an average of participant schema relevance and schema detail ratings) and schema accessibility. The results of the regression analysis revealed no significant associations between the independent and dependent variables, $R^2 = .01$; $F\ (2, 85) = .61$; $p = .55$.

Hypothesis 10b posited that for majority members who receive value-in-diversity inoculation messages the tendency of inoculation to confer attitudinal resistance to persuasive attacks is most pronounced among individuals who report increased diversity initiative schema representations. The regression analysis results indicated there is no significant association between schema weight and post-attack attitude toward the issue ($\beta = .04$; $t = .36$; $p = .72$). This suggests for majority members receiving inoculation messages, increased schema representations has no association with post-attack attitudes. Thus, Hypothesis 10b was not supported.

Hypothesis 11b posited that for majority members who receive inoculation messages, the tendency of inoculation to confer attitudinal resistance to persuasive attacks is most pronounced among individuals who report an increased accessibility of their diversity initiative schema. The regression analysis results indicated there is no significant association between schema accessibility and post-attack attitude toward the issue ($\beta = .11$; $t = 1.04$; $p = .30$). This suggests for majority members receiving

inoculation messages, increased schema accessibility has no association with post-attack attitudes. Thus, Hypothesis 11b was not supported.

Thus, for majority organizational members who receive inoculation messages, schema representations are not predictors of more resistant post-attack attitudes. Also, schema accessibility is not a predictor of more resistant post-attack attitudes.

CHAPTER VII

DISCUSSION

The current study examined the complexities associated with communicating value-in-diversity campaigns, in which organizations, amid an environment of mixed motives, mixed tensions, and mixed dialectics, seek success in their diversity intervention efforts. The investigation began with the recognition that a greater illumination of various communication strategies within the context of organizational diversity was needed given the lack of attention devoted to the topic in interdisciplinary diversity literature and given the need for organizations to have messages that are more persuasive, more influential, less likely to generate reactance, and more capable of protecting pro-diversity attitudes. In addition, consistent with the extant literature (e.g., Carter, 2001; Chen & Hooijberg, 2000; Ely, 1995; Sims, 2005) emphasis in this investigation was placed on majority organizational members rather than minority organizational members as the primary targets of value-in-diversity campaigns.

First, the current study examined the efficacy of psychological reactance in explaining the likely response of organizational members to campaign messages and in informing message strategy selection and message design. Finally, the experiment examined the potential of inoculation to protect value-in-diversity attitudes from slippage once organizational diversity campaigns were underway and once an organization's diversity initiative came under attack. The pattern of results of the experiment offered unequivocal support for the ability of psychological reactance to inform an organization's efforts as expected; however, the pattern of results offered

little support for the ability of inoculation to serve as an antidote of protection among majority organizational members as anticipated.

The Role of Psychological Reactance in Accomplishing Organizational Aims

Despite the fact that organizations are committed to engaging in organizational diversity interventions (Carter, 2000), which they must somehow *communicate* to their relevant stakeholders, there has been no research about the effectiveness of various communication strategies, along with their influence and outcomes, associated with value-in-diversity campaigns. Similar to the utility of psychological reactance in other contextual areas (e.g., Buller et al., 2000; Dowd & Wallbrown, 1993; Hockenberry & Billingham, 1993; Mazis et al., 1973; Miller, 1976; Vrugt, 1992), the current investigation offered numerous arguments for the usefulness of psychological reactance in assisting organizations in understanding the impact of their campaign efforts.

First, campaign messages should generate reactance because of the fact that the campaigns infringe upon the freedoms (Brehm, 1966; Brehm & Brehm, 1981) of majority organizational members, and a greater magnitude of reactance should be experienced by those likely to view their freedoms as the most threatened – majority organizational members and members who interact in more homogeneous networks. In those circumstances where reactance is experienced, campaign managers should expect negative attitudinal implications as well as altered attraction of the freedoms being threatened in the campaign messages. Furthermore, campaigns messages using explicit language should result in more reactance (Grandpre et al., 2003) and campaign messages with a restoration postscript should result in decreased reactance (Miller et

al., 2007). The above rationale is consistent with both Brehm's (1966) seminal psychological reactance work as well as more recent psychological reactance investigations (e.g., Burgoon et al., 2002; Miller et al., 2007).

Psychological Reactance and Value-in-Diversity Campaigns

The results of Hypothesis 1 indicated that value-in-diversity campaign messages among majority organizational members do generate reactance. The campaign messages heighten both the intensity of threatened freedoms and of anger-related negative affect, but the effects, when compared to majority organizational members who receive no campaign message, do not extend to perceptions of the message source or to attitudes toward racial and gender diversity initiatives.

The results of Hypotheses 2 and 3 concerning the magnitude of reactance both indicated that the magnitude of reactance is indeed greatest among majority (as opposed to minority) organizational members and among organizational members who interact in more homogenous (as opposed to heterogeneous) networks, although the manifestations of reactance slightly differ between the two groups. Among majority members campaign managers can anticipate symptoms of reactance in all areas including increased threat to freedom and anger-related negative affect as well as more negative source credibility evaluations and more negative attitudes toward the issue. However, among organizational members who interact in more homogenous networks, campaign managers can expect less favorable source evaluations and less favorable attitudes toward racial minorities, toward women, and toward the legitimacy of the campaign.

In short, campaign managers can anticipate a less reactant response to campaign messages from minorities and from individuals who interact in more heterogenous friendship-, family-, and job-related circles. These two groups will have more favorable attitudes about the diversity intervention and more favorable perceptions of the message source. In addition, minorities will have less perceived threat to freedom and less anger-related negative affect. The rationale of this expected outcome for campaign managers is consistent with Wright et al. (1992) and Brehm (1966), who maintain that resistance, as a result of reactance occurring in influence attempts, has to be properly managed by campaign planners so that persuasion can take place.

Impact of Reactance from Value-in-Diversity Campaigns

Along with generating reactance among individuals with a majority diversity status in the organization, the results of Hypothesis 4 indicated that campaign messages have negative attitudinal impact as expected. The value-in-diversity campaign messages for majority members result in more negative attitudes toward the preferential treatment of women, toward racial minorities, and toward the legitimacy of the value-in-diversity campaign being carried out by the organization. Grandpre et al. (2003) and Brehm (1966) maintain that threats to behavioral freedoms as a result of influence attempts result in a boomerang effect where individuals attempt to reestablish their freedoms by moving away from the advocated position. This study provides further evidence for this expected outcome.

However, this investigation argued that reactance should result in an increased attraction for the eliminated freedoms among majority members in an organization. Yet the results of Hypothesis 5 indicated this was not the case. Rather than having an

increased attraction toward the opportunities espoused in campaign messages as was the case in previous reactance research (e.g., Clark, 1994; Lessne & Notarntonio, 1988; Mazis et al., 1973), majority members were less attracted to the opportunities referenced in campaign messages. Research supports a variety of responses to reactance arousal in an effort to restore a threatened freedom including personally engaging in the forbidden behavior (direct) or vicariously reveling in the fact that another is engaging in the forbidden behavior (indirect) (Brehm, 1966). Both responses are examples of reestablishing or reasserting the infringed upon freedom. In the case of majority members, it appears efforts were made to reestablish their freedoms by minimizing the importance of the opportunities and thereby decreasing, rather than increasing, the attractiveness of the opportunities.

Message Strategies and Value-in-Diversity Campaign Messages

Related to message strategies this investigation argued for the superiority of implicit language use in message design and for the effectiveness of restoration postscripts as reestablishments of freedom once reactance occurs. The results of Hypothesis 6 indicated that value-in-diversity campaign messages using explicit language were less effective than messages using implicit language, at least in the area of reducing organizational member threat to freedom. Research in adolescent health campaigns (Grandpre et al., 2003) reveals that explicit message strategies are problematic because of their forcefulness which in essence undermines the message recipient's independence and sense of autonomy. However, the negative attitudinal implications associated with explicit messages as argued in this investigation were not manifest.

Perhaps, the most plausible explanation that can account for the lack of negative attitudes generated by explicit messages is the notion that there was not a substantial discrepancy between members' attitudinal positions and the position advocated in the message. A criterion for participation in the study was that organizational members have favorable attitudes toward racial and gender diversity initiatives; so, majority member attitudes were for the most part aligned with the heart of the explicitly-worded campaign message. Relatively little discrepancy (between the advocated position in the message and members' own position) would make it possible for majority members to experience the threat of eliminated freedoms posed by the campaign messages without experiencing a threat to their freedom to hold a certain position, which is connected to the attitudinal impact of reactance. Brehm (1966) suggests, "the consequent tendency not to change in the direction advocated, would increase with increasing discrepancy between the subject's position and the advocated one" (p. 96). Thus, in cases where no extreme discrepancy exists between the advocated position and an individual's initial position, less negative attitudes (as found in this investigation) would be the likely outcome. Assuming majority members, despite the explicit campaign messages threatening majority member freedoms, still felt comfortable with their position relative to the advocated position, no negative source evaluations would manifest as well (which may explain the lack of support for negative source evaluations in the results of Hypothesis 1).

Still the lesson for campaign planners is that employing explicit campaign messages results in the exact outcome that they are seeking to prevent – increases in reactance via heightened threats to freedom. In addition, it would be useful to keep in

mind that among anti-diversity supporters within the organization (where there is likely to be a greater discrepancy between the organization's advocated position and the organizational member's initial position), more negative attitudinal implications may exist. The best tactic, as supported in previous research and argued in this investigation, is to design value-in-diversity campaign messages that use more implicit language in an effort to persuade with greater subtlety and less force.

A final area of insight supported by the results of Hypothesis 7 is the ability of restoration postscripts to combat perceived threats to freedom by restoring a majority member's eliminated or threatened choice. The results suggest that restoration postscripts can diminish reactance by reducing organizational members' perceived threat to freedom and in essence by serving as a remedy for the inescapable impact of value-in-diversity campaigns among majority organizational members. This finding is consistent with Miller et al. (2007) who maintain the effectiveness of a short postscript because of its ability to "disguise the overt nature of a persuasive message" (p. 225). In addition, this result is important, because absent a restoration postscript, the motivational arousal associated with reactance from the campaign messages goes unchecked and unsubdued.

Overall, the results of the current investigation provide strong evidence for psychological reactance as a key explanatory vehicle for understanding the impact of value-in-diversity campaign messages in the areas of overall reactance, magnitude of reactance, and attitudinal impact. The theory is useful in explaining both the impact of the receipt of campaign messages and the further nuances associated with the influence of campaign messages based on diversity status and network heterogeneity.

The Role of Inoculation Theory in Accomplishing Organizational Aims

While the utility of psychological reactance in enhancing an organization's efforts and in assisting campaign planners is clear, the role played by inoculation theory as a protector of organizational members' pro-diversity attitudes was more ambiguous. Given the success of inoculation in protecting political candidates (e.g., An & Pfau, 2004; Pfau, Kenski, et al., 1990), country of origin image (Ivanov, 2006), corporate brand and reputation (e.g., Wan & Pfau, 2004; Wigley, 2007), and anti-plagiarism attitudes (Compton & Pfau, 2008), along with a host of other applications related to the resistance domain, this investigation argued for inoculation's ability to protect favorable racial and gender diversity initiative attitudes once they were attacked.

Inoculation should work because the inoculation messages were reasoned to threaten the susceptibility of organizational member attitudes causing them to begin the counterarguing process capable of defending their positions prior to the attack. Inoculation should be most effective among organizational members with the greatest involvement levels, and it was argued that inoculation would enhance the base involvement levels of organizational members. Finally, the experiment examined schemas and schema accessibility as alternative, but complementary mechanisms for inoculation's route to resistance. The pattern of results, though, failed to offer support for inoculation's ability to meet all of these expectations.

Inoculation as an Antidote for Anti-Diversity Attacks

The results provide minimal rather than widespread evidence for inoculation's efficacy in an organizational diversity context, particularly in conferring attitudinal

resistance as predicted in Hypothesis 8. Overall, inoculation failed to protect organizational member attitudes after the anti-diversity attack.

Despite the lack of an overall inoculation effect, the results do suggest a more nuanced path travelled by inoculation to confer attitudinal resistance within the organizational diversity context. When compared to majority organization members, the results indicated that minorities experienced greater threat or susceptibility of their pro-diversity attitudes (Research Question 1). This suggests that minority organizational members, rather than majority members, are most in need of having their attitudes protected from erosion after anti-diversity attacks. Just as minority members experienced the least arousal from fear of having their freedoms eliminated and the more favorable attitudes in support of the organization's efforts, their pro-diversity positions are the most susceptible to arguments attacking an organization's racial and gender diversity intervention efforts.

For campaign managers, the tendency might perhaps be to re-assert and bolster the company's intentions and efforts among minority organizational members as already pro-diversity advocates. However, given the dangers referenced in inoculation research concerning the role of unchallenged reassurance or the "paper-tiger" effect (McGuire, 1970), the decision to omit minority organizational members as intended targets for inoculation messages would suggest the campaign manager is placing this group, the most supportive members in the organizational system, in a more volatile, weak, and extremely vulnerable position. Reassurance only helps resistance when it is preceded by first threatening organizational members' beliefs. After the threat or after posing the challenge to the belief, it is safe to reassure that the belief is correct after all.

So, while the primary focus of this investigation was on protecting majority organizational member attitudes from slippage, the more unintended discovery of this study is the value that should be placed on protecting the more susceptible attitudes of minority organizational members.

An additional nuance associated with the inoculation effects in this investigation is the connection between higher involvement levels and inoculation's ability to confer resistance. The only instance in which inoculation posed a viable strategy for protection is among those who reported higher involvement levels. For both majority and minority organizational members, inoculation succeeded at conferring attitudinal resistance when those members indicated high involvement levels (Hypothesis 9a); however, inoculation failed to enhance involvement levels or bolster original involvement (Hypothesis 9b) and there was no significant difference between majority and minority members in their post-inoculation involvement levels (Research Question 2). In addition, the Phase 1 inoculation message had no impact on Phase 2 reactance levels.

The connection between involvement and inoculation has been clearly delineated in past research (e.g., Chen et al., 1992; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979; Pfau, 1992; Pfau, Tusing, et al., 1997a). The more nuanced and intricate role of involvement in this study parallels in many areas the findings offered in the investigation by Pfau, Tusing, and colleagues (1997a) who examined the critical elements (threat, counterarguing, and involvement) of the resistance process. Their work revealed that greater involvement produces stronger attitudes that are more resistant and "provides further support for the instrumental role of involvement in inoculation" (p. 209).

Inoculation's success among the highly involved provides further evidence of the relationship between involvement and resistance. As Petty and Cacioppo (1979) argued, "To the extent that increased involvement is associated with more thinking, increased counterargumentation and resistance to influence would be a likely result" (p. 1916). The connection between involvement and resistance is so inextricably linked that Pfau, Tusing et al. (1997a) argued that "involvement more than any other variable holds the key to inoculation's terrain" (p. 210), and they suggested that involvement is likely the boundary condition associated with inoculation.

The results of this study then seem to provide further evidence for involvement as a boundary condition of inoculation within the organizational diversity context. It is likely that in many organizational environments, diversity is regarded as a necessary topic heard and tolerated by most organizational members without much contention and with low- to moderate-levels of organizational member involvement. The organizational terrain then offered for a path to resistance would afford weak, if any, overall inoculation effects as found in this investigation. However, the more ripe and prime area for inoculation's influence would be in the most combative, highly contested organizational environments where organizational members contended for diversity interventions and regarded them as more important and of greater consequence. In this type of environment, where the most highly involved organizational members are likely to exist, inoculation is likely to function as originally expected.

So, within the organizational diversity context, overall inoculation effects do not exist among all (high-, moderate-, and low-involved) organizational members;

however, for organizational members who are highly involved, a greater likelihood exists for them to perceive their attitudes as vulnerable and for them to invest the cognitive effort needed to protect their attitudes. The impetus of involvement, then within the organizational diversity context, appears to be more responsible for the nuanced and more intricate effectiveness of inoculation as an antidote rather than inoculation's overall success alone.

Inoculation and the Role of Schemas

The pattern of results provided little support for the role of schemas as a viable candidate for offering new insights into the way inoculation confers resistance. Inoculation's effect on schema representations was approaching the significant level, but the means were in the predicted direction, which suggests inoculation messages among majority members could be capable of altering schema representations by expanding them, making them more relevant, and making them more specific as expected. The results, though, did not support inoculation's expected impact on schema accessibility nor did results indicate associations between schema representations or schema accessibility and post-attack attitudes. The overall lack of this investigation to find support for the role of schemas in the inoculation process defies the rationale associated with schemas as general knowledge structures (Fiske & Dyer, 1985; Smith, 1998). The results suggest schemas go unchanged and unimpacted by inoculation messages, or perhaps the lack of a change in schemas is attributable to the failing impact of inoculation in the study.

Overall, inoculation had no real bearing on preempting the influence of an anti-diversity attack. Its potential is greatest and most pronounced among highly involved

members of the organization, and the threat mechanism is elicited most among minority organizational members for whom the diversity intervention is of greatest personal consequence. Perhaps, the greatest lesson derived from this investigation for campaign managers as it relates to inoculation's role in accomplishing organizational diversity aims is to re-consider the value of protecting minority member attitudes. Campaign managers should regard minority organizational members as a worthwhile key constituency that is likely to be on board with organizational diversity intervention aims, but who are particularly more susceptible to anti-diversity attacks.

In conclusion, the current investigation calls for reconsidering the strategic use of communication in organizational diversity interventions and suggests two theoretical lenses for doing so. The results of the study indicate that psychological reactance offers unique insights into the resulting impact of value-in-diversity campaign messages, particularly among majority organizational members. The messages exert significant influence on reactance levels by increasing threat to freedom and eliciting negative attitudes and negative source perceptions, all of which may operate under the radar of unsuspecting campaign managers with good intentions for their organizational efforts. Organizational effectiveness and reduced reactance levels, however, can be achieved through the use of implicit language and restoration postscripts in messages. While it is crucial for organizations to somehow protect the already present support for their diversity interventions, inoculation as an overall strategy failed to be the answer in this investigation, unless organizational members are highly involved.

CHAPTER VII

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The primary and most significant limitation of this study is centered on the lack of overall evidence for inoculation's ability to confer attitudinal resistance after the anti-diversity attack. While message pretests confirmed that the inoculation messages elicited threat, a manipulation check using an independent samples t-test revealed an overall threat finding with a nearly significant effect, $t(545) = 1.69$, $p = .09$, and the means were in the predicted direction showing that inoculated participants experienced greater threat than controls (Inoculation: $M = 3.01$; Controls: $M = 2.79$). Because the ultimate test for a successful manipulation of inoculation requires the measurement of both threat and counterarguing (McGuire, 1962; Pfau, 1997), the fact that conterarguing was not assessed in this investigation is problematic for rightfully interpreting the inoculation-related results. Inoculation's failure to confer overall attitudinal resistance could be due to the need for stronger message manipulation to elicit threat or to increase counterargumentation.

A second limitation of this study is related to the scenario for tapping schemas. Though narratives for assessing schemas have been used repeatedly in research (e.g., Hajek & Giles, 2005; Harwood, 1998, Kean & Albada, 2003), the instructions, which directed participants to provide a story rather than offer a description, appeared to be confusing to participants. Despite the written and verbal instructions, the idea of *having to tell a story* may have impeded participant efforts to just write descriptions based on their knowledge of the particular situation.

Future research should seek to further clarify the role of strategic communication and specific message strategies in the context of organizational diversity. This means investigating the effectiveness of various communication strategies based on varying diversity dimensions (e.g., organizational tenure, religion, sexual orientation, etc.) as well as in various organizational contexts (e.g., committees, employee relations, accelerated management programs, etc.). In addition, future research should seek to understand the external impact associated with an organization's diversity efforts. What benefits, for example, do organizational diversity intervention efforts have on perceptions of corporate brand, image, reputation, and credibility? Understanding the economic and perceptual impact of diversity campaigns would also be of interest for organizations.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adler, N. J. (2002). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (4th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.

Alderfer, C. P. (1977). Group and intergroup relations. In J. R. Hackman & J. L. Suttle (Eds.), *Improving life at work* (pp. 227-296). Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.

Alderfer, C. P. (1987). An intergroup perspective on group dynamics. In. J. W. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 190-222). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Alderfer, C. P., Alderfer, C. J., Tucker, L., & Tucker, R. C. (1980). Diagnosing race relations in management. *Journal of Applied Behavorial Science, 16*, 135-166.

Alderfer, C. P., & Smith, K. K. (1982). Studying intergroup relations embedded in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 27*, 35-65.

Allen, B. J. (1995). Diversity and organizational communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 23*, 143-155.

Allen, B. J. (2004). *Difference matters: Communicating social identity.* Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

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

An, C., & Pfau, M. (2004). Efficacy of inoculation in televised political debates. *Journal of Communication, 54*, 421-436.

Arnett, J. J. (2004). *Adolescence and emerging adulthood: A cultural approach* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bailyn, L. (2000). *Gender and diversity in organizations*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Academy of Management.

Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Becker, S. W., Bavelas, A., & Braden, M. (1961). An index to measure contingency of English sentences. *Language and Speech, 4*, 138-145.

Beehr, T. A., Tabor, T. D., & Walsh, J. T. (1980). Perceived mobility channels: Criteria for intraorganizational job mobility. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 26*, 250-264.

Benoit, W. L. (1991). Two tests of the mechanism of inoculation theory. *The Southern Communication Journal, 56,* 219-229.

Bowen, F., & Blackmon, K. (2003). Spirals of silence: The dynamic effects of diversity on organizational voice. *Journal of Management Studies, 40*, 1393-1417.

Bower, G. H., & Mayer, J. D. (1985). Failure to replicate mood-dependent retrieval. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 23*, 39-42.

Brehm, J. W. (1966). *A theory of psychological reactance.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

Brehm, S., & Brehm, J. W. (1981). *Psychological reactance: A theory of freedom and control.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

Brewer, M. B. (1995). Managing diversity: The role of social identities. In S. E. Jackson & M. N. Ruderman (Eds.), *Diversity in work teams: Research paradigms for a changing workplace* (pp. 47-68). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Brewer, M. B., von Hippel, W, & Gooden, M. P. (1999). Diversity and organizational identity: The problem of entree after entry. In D. A. Prentice & D. T. Miller

(Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 337-363). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Buboltz, W. C., Johnson, P., & Woller, K. M. P. (2003). Psychological reactance in college students: Family-of-origin predictors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 81,* 311-317.

Buller, D. B., Burgoon, M., Hall, J. R., Levine, N., Taylor, A. M., Beach, B., Buller, M.K., & Melcher, C. (2000). Long-term effects of language intensity in preventive messages on planned family solar protection. *Health Communication, 12(3),* 261-275.

Burgoon, M., Alvaro, E., Grandpre J., & Voulodakis, M. (2002). Revisiting the theory of psychological reactance: communicating threats to attitudinal freedom. In J. P. Dillard & M. Pfau (Eds.), *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice* (pp. 213-232). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, M., Cohen, M., Miller, M. D., & Montgomery, C. L. (1978). An empirical test of a model of resistance to persuasion. *Human Communication Research, 5,* 27-39.

Burgoon, M., Pfau, M., & Birk, T. S. (1995). An inoculation theory explanation for the effects of corporate issue/advocacy advertising campaigns. *Communication Research, 22,* 485-505.

Burnkrant, R. E., & Sawyer, A. G. (1983). Effects of involvement and message content on information-processing intensity. In R.J. Harris (Ed.), *Information processing research in advertising* (pp. 43-64). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Carlston, D. E., & Smith, E. R. (1996). Principles of mental representation. In E. T. Higgins & A. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 184-210). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Carter, R. T. (2000). Perspectives on addressing cultural issues in organizations. In R.T. Carter (Ed.), *Addressing cultural issues in organizations: Beyond the corporate context* (pp. 3-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39,* 752-766.

Chen, C. C., & Hooijberg, R. (2000). Ambiguity intolerance and support for valuing-diversity interventions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30(11),* 2392-2408.

Chen, H. C., Reardon, R., Rea, C., & Moore, D. (1992). Forewarning of content and involvement: Consequences for persuasion and resistance to persuasion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 28,* 523-541.

Chinese Culture Connection. (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18,* 143-164.

Clark, R. D. (1994). The role of censorship in minority influence. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 24,* 331-338.

Cohen, C. E. (1981). Person categories and social perception: Testing some boundaries of the processing effects of prior knowledge. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40,* 441-452.

Collins, A., & Loftus, E. (1975). A spreading activation theory of semantic memory.

Psychological Review, 82, 407-428.

Compton, J. A. (2004). *Late night political comedy, candidate image, and inoculation: A unique test of inoculation theory.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

Compton, J. A., & Pfau, M. (2004a). Inoculation theory of resistance to influence at maturity: Recent progress in theory development and application and suggestions for future research. *Communication yearbook 29,* 97-145.

Compton, J. A., & Pfau, M. (2004b). Use of inoculation to foster resistance to predatory credit card marketing targeting college students. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 32,* 343-364.

Compton, J. A., & Pfau, M. (2008). Inoculating against pro-plagiarism justifications: Rational and affective strategies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36,* 98-119.

Copeland, L. (1988, June). Valuing workplace diversity. *Personnel,* 52-60.

Cox, T. (1991). The multicultural organization. *Academy of Management Executive, 5,* 34-47.

Cox, T. Jr. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research & practice.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Cox, T. Jr. (2001). *Creating the multicultural organization: A strategy of capturing the power of diversity.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cox, T. H., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive, 5,* 45-56.

Cox, T. H., Lobel, S., & McLeod P. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural difference

on cooperative versus competitive behavior in a group task. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*, 827-847.

Cox, T. Jr. & Nkomo, S. M. (1990). Invisible men and women: A status report on race as a variable in organization behavior research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 419-431.

Crane, E. (1962). Immunization-with and without the use of counterarguments. *Journalism Quarterly, 39*, 445-450.

Cross, E. Y., Katz, J. H., Miller, F. and Seashore, E. W. (1994). *The promise of delivery*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.

Davidson, A. R., Yantis, S., Norwood, M., & Montano, D. E. (1985). Amount of information about the attitude object and attitude-behavior consistency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49,* 1184-1198.

Davis, K. (1963). The corporate image in social context - the problem of demographic change. In J. W. Riley, Jr. (Ed.). *The corporation and its publics: Essays on the corporate image* (pp. 107-136). New York: Wiley.

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 5-18.

Dillard, J. P., & Shen, L. (2005). On the nature of reactance and its role in persuasive health communication. *Communication Monographs, 72,* 144-168.

Dowd, E. T., & Wallbrown, F. (1993). Motivational components of client reactance. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 71*, 533-538.

Ely, R. J. (1995). The role of dominant identity and experience in organizational work on diversity. In S. E. Jackson & M. N. Ruderman (Eds.), *Diversity in work*

teams: Research paradigms for a changing workplace (pp. 161-186). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Esty, K. (1988). Diversity is good for business. *Executive Excellence, 5*, 5-6.

Farkas, A. J., & Anderson, N. H. (1976). Integration theory and inoculation theory as explanations of the "paper tiger" effect. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 98,* 253-268.

Fazio, R. H. (1990). A practical guide to the use of response latency in social psychological research. In C. Hendrick & M. S. Clark (Eds.) *Research methods in personality and social psychology* (Vol. 11, pp. 74-97). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fernandez, J. P. (1981). *Racism and sexism in corporate life: Changing values in American business*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books

Fiske, S. T., & Dyer, L. M. (1985). Structure and development of social schemata: Evidence from positive and negative transfer effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48,* 839-852.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Fogarty, J. S., & Youngs, G. A., (2000). Psychological reactance as a factor in patient noncompliance with medication taking: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30,* 2365-2391.

Fry, S. L. (1992). Public relations must pave the way for developing diversified work force. *Public Relations Journal, 48,* 12-14.

Gaertner, S. L., McLaughlin, J. P. (1983). Racial stereotypes: Associations and

ascriptions of positive and negative characteristics. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 46,* 23-40.

Gibson, D. P. (1969). *The $30 billion Negro.* New York: Macmillon Publishing Company.

Gibson, D. P. (1978). *$70 billion in the Black: America's Black consumers.* New York: Macmillon Publishing Company.

Godbold, L. C., & Pfau, M. (2000). Conferring resistance to peer pressure among adolescents: Using inoculation theory to discourage alcohol use. C*ommunication Research, 27,* 411-437.

Grandpre, J., Alvaro, E. M., Burgoon, M., Miller, C. H., & Hall, J. R. (2003). Adolescent reactance and anti-smoking campaigns: A theoretical approach. *Health Communication, 15(3),* 349-366.

Haigh, M. M. (2006). *Organizational culture, identity, commitment, and citizenship behaviors: Antecedents, change over time, interrelationships, and potential of inoculation to bolster identity, commitment, and citizenship behaviors.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

Hajek, C., & Giles, H. (2005). Intergroup communication schemas: Cognitive representations of talk with gay men, *Language & Communication, 25,* 161-181.

Hale, F. W. (Ed.). (2004). *What makes racial diversity work in higher education: Academic leaders present successful policies and strategies.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Hall, E.T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York: Doubleday.

Harris, P. R., & Moran, R. T. (1991). Managing cultural differences: High-performance strategies for a new world of business (3rd ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

Harwood, J. (1998). Young adults' cognitive representations of intergenerational conversations. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 26,* 13-31.

Hellman, C. M., & McMillan, W. L. (1997). The relationship between psychological reactance and self-esteem. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 137(1),* 135-138.

Hockenberry, S. L., & Billingham, R. E. (1993). Psychological reactance and violence within dating relationships. *Psychological Reports, 73,* 1203-1208.

Hoecklin, L. (1995). *Managing cultural differences: Strategies for competitive advantage*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Value systems in forty countries. In L. Eckensberger, W. Loomer, & Y. Poortinga (Eds.), *Cross-cultural contributions to psychology*. Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Hofstede, G. (1983). Dimensions of national cultures in fifty countries and three regions. In J. Deregowski, S. Dziurawiec, & R. Annis (Eds.), *Expiscations in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 335-355). Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Hong, S-M. (1990). Effects of sex and church attendance on psychological reactance. *Psychological Reports, 66,* 494.

Hong, S-M. (1992). Hong's psychological reactance scale: A further factor analytic validation. *Psychological Reports, 70*, 512-514.

Hong, S-M., Giannakopoulos, E., Laing, D., & Williams, N.A. (1994). Psychological

reactance: Effects of age and gender. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 134(2),* 223-228.

Hong, S. M., & Faedda, S. (1996). Refinement of the Hong psychological reactance scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56,* 173-182.

Howard-Pitney, B., Borgida, E., & Omoto, A. M. (1986). Personal involvement: An examination of processing differences. *Social Cognition, 7,* 51-66.

Huberty, C. J., & Morris, J. D. (1989). Multivariate analysis versus multiple univariate analyses, *Psychological Bulletin, 105,* 302-308.

Ivanov, B. (2006). *The process of inoculation and its potential in promoting resistance to the effectiveness of multiple competitive attacks on the country of origin concept.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

Jackson, R. L. (Ed.). (2003). *African American communication and identities: Essential readings.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Jackson, S. E., & Ruderman, M. N. (1995). Introduction: Perspectives for understanding diverse work teams. In S. E. Jackson & M. N. Ruderman (Eds.), *Diversity in work teams: Research paradigms for a changing workplace* (pp. 1-13). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Jackson, S. E., Stone, V., & Alvarez, E. B. (1993). Socialization amidst diversity: the impact of demographics on work team oldtimers and newcomers. In. L. L. Cummings and B. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior, 15,* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Johnston, W. (1991). Global workforce 2000: The new world labor market. *Harvard Business Review, 69,* 115-127.

Johnston, W. B. & Packer, A. H. (1987). *Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the 21st century*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Jones, E. (1986). Black managers: The dream deferred. *Harvard Business Review, 64*, 84-93.

Kagan, J. (2002). *Surprise, uncertainty, and mental structures*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kanter, R. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and reaction to token women. *American Journal of Sociology, 82,* 965-990.

Kean, L. G, & Albada, K. F. (2003). The relationship between college students' schema regarding alcohol use, their television viewing patterns, and their previous experience with alcohol. *Health Communication, 15(3),* 277-298.

Kern-Foxworth, M. (1991, Spring). Black, brown, red and yellow markets equal green power. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 27-30.

Kiesler, C. A., Collins, B. E., & Miller, N. (1969). *Attitude change.* New York: John Wiley.

Kim, Y. (2002). Unum vs. Pluribus: Ideology and differing academic conceptions of ethnic identity. In W. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 26* (pp. 298-325). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kirchler, E. (1999). Reactance to taxation: Employers' attitudes towards taxes. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 28(2),* 131-139.

Klapper, J. (1957). What do we know about the effects of mass communication: The brink of hope. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 21,* 453-474

Kluckhohn, F., & Strodtbeck, F. (1960). *Variations in value orientations*. New York:

Row, Peterson.

Kossek, E. E., Markel, K. S., & McHugh, P. P. (2003). Increasing diversity as an HRM change strategy. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 16,* 328-352.

Kossek, E. E., & Zonia, S. C. (1993). Assessing diversity climate: A field study of reactions to employer efforts to promote diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14,* 61-81.

Kotcher, R. L. (1995, Spring). Diversity in today's workplace and marketplace. *Public Relations Quarterly,* 6-8.

Kramer, R. M., & Brewer, M. B. (1984). Effects of group identity on resource use in a simulated commons dilemma. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 1044-1057.

Krosnick, J. A., Boninger, D. S., Chuang, Y. C., Berent, M. K., & Carnot, C. G. (1993). Attitude strength: One construct or many related constructs? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65,* 1132-1151.

Lanceley, A. (1985). Use of controlling language in the rehabilitation of the elderly. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 10,* 125-135.

Lee, W., & Pfau, M. (1997). *The effectiveness of cognitive and affective inoculation appeals in conferring resistance against cognitive and affective attacks.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Jerusalem, Israel. Top three paper: Information Systems.

Lessne, G. J., & Notarantonio, E. M. (1988). The effects of limits in retail advertisements: A reactance theory perspective. *Psychology & Marketing, 5(1),* 33-44.

Lumsdaine, A. A., & Janis, I. L. (1953). Resistance to "counterpropaganda" produced by one-sided and two-sided "propaganda" presentations. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 17,* 311-318.

Mandell, B. & Kohler-Gray, S. (1990). Management of development that values diversity. *Personnel, 67,* 41-47.

Markus, H., & Zajonc, R. B. (1985). The cognitive perspective in social psychology. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.) *Handbook of social psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 137-230). New York, NY: Random House.

Marmer-Solomon, C. (1989, August). The corporate response to workforce diversity. *Personnel Journal,* 43-53.

Marshall, S.P. (1995). *Schemas in problem solving*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Martins, L. L., Milliken, F. J., Wisenfeld, B. M., & Salgado, S. R. (2003). Racioethnic diversity and group members' experiences: The role of the racioethnic diversity of the organizational context. *Group & Organizational Management, 28,* 75-106.

Mather, M., & Johnson, M. K. (2000). Choice-supportive source monitoring: Do our decisions seem better to us as we age? *Psychology and Aging, 15,* 596-606.

Mather, M., & Johnson, M. K. (2003). Affective review and schema reliance in memory in older and younger adults. *American Journal of Psychology, 116(2),* 169-189.

Mazis, M. B., Settle, R. B., & Leslie, D. C. (1973). Elimination of phosphate detergents and psychological reactance. *Journal of Marketing Research, 10,*

390-395.

McCroskey, J. C. (1966). Special reports: Scales for the measurement of ethos, *Speech Monographs, 33,* 65-72.

McGuire, W.J. (1961). The effectiveness of supportive and refutational defenses in immunizing and restoring beliefs against persuasion. *Sociometry, 24*, 194-197.

McGuire, W.J. (1962). Persistence of the resistance to persuasion induced by various types of prior belief defenses. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 64*, 241-248.

McGuire, W.J. (1964). Inducing resistance to persuasion: Some contemporary approaches. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 191-229). New York: Academic Press.

McGuire, W. J. (1970, February). A vaccine for brainwash. *Psychology Today*, pp. 36-39, 63-64.

McGuire, W. J., & Papageorgis, D. (1961). The relative efficacy of various types of prior belief-defense in producing immunity against persuasion. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62,* 327-337.

McGuire, W. J., & Papageorgis, D. (1962). Effectiveness of forewarning in developing resistance to persuasion. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 26,* 24-34.

McLaughlin, B., Shutz, C., & White, D. (1980). Parental speech to five-year-old children in a game-playing situation. *Child Development, 51,* 580-582.

Miller, C. H., Lane, L. T., Deatrick, L. M., Young, A. M., & Potts, K. A. (2007). Psychological reactance and promotional health messages: The effects of controlling language, lexical concreteness, and the restoration of freedom.

Human Communication Research, 33, 219-240.

Miller, G. R. (1967). [Review of the book *The theory of psychological reactance*]. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 53(3),* p. 293.

Miller, R. L. (1976). Mere exposure, psychological reactance, and attitude change. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 40*, 229-233.

Mollica, K. (2003). The influence of diversity context on white men's and racial minorities' reactions to disproportionate group harm. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 143*, 415-431.

Nail, P. R., & Van Leeuwen, M. D. (1996). The effectance versus the self-presentational view of reactance: Are importance ratings influenced by anticipated surveillance? *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 11(3),* 573-585.

Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. C. (2006). *Organizational behavior: Foundations, realities, and challenges* (5th ed.). Mason, OH: South-western.

Nkomo, S. M., & Cox, T. Jr. (1996). Diverse identities in organizations. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nords (Eds.). *Handbook of organizations* (pp. 338-356). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Northcraft, G. B., Polzer, J. T., Neale, M. A., & Kramer, R. M. (1995). Diversity, social identity, and performance: Emergent social dynamics in cross-functional teams. In S. E. Jackson & M. N. Ruderman (Eds.), *Diversity in work teams: Research paradigms for a changing workplace* (pp. 69-96). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Norusis, M. J. (2004). *SPSS 13.0 statistical procedures companion.* Upper Saddle

River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Papageorgis, D., & McGuire, W. J. (1961). The generality of immunity to persuasion produced by pre-exposure to weakened counterarguments. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62*, 475-481.

Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Pelham, B. W. (1991). On confidence and consequence: The certainty and importance of self-knowledge. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 518-530.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1979). Issue involvement can increase or decrease persuasion by enhancing message-relevant cognitive responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 1915-1926.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Pfau, M. (1992). The potential of inoculation in promoting resistance to the effectiveness of comparative advertising messages. *Communication Quarterly, 40*, 26-44.

Pfau, M. (1997). Inoculation model of resistance to influence. In G.A. Barnett & F.J. Boster (Eds.), *Progress in communication sciences: Advances in persuasion* (Vol. 13, pp. 133-171). Greenwich, CT: Ablex.

Pfau, M., & Burgoon, M. (1988). Inoculation in political campaign communication. *Human Communication Research, 15*, 91-111.

Pfau, M., Compton, J., Parker, K. A., Wittenberg, E. M., An, C., Ferguson, M., et al. (2004). The traditional explanation for resistance versus attitude accessibility: Do they trigger distinct or overlapping processes of resistance? *Human*

Communication Research, 30, 329-360.

Pfau, M., Haigh, M., Sims, J., & Wigley, S. (2007). The influence of corporate front-group stealth campaigns. *Communication Research, 34,* 73-99.

Pfau, M., Ivanov, B., Houston, B., Haigh, M., Sims, J., Gilchrist, E., et al. (2005). Inoculation and mental processing: The instrumental role of associative networks in the process of resistance to counterattitudinal influence. *Communication Monographs, 72*, 414-441.

Pfau, M., & Kenski, H. C. (1990). *Attack politics: Strategy and defense*. New York: Praeger.

Pfau, M., Kenski, H. C., Nitz, M., & Sorenson, J. (1990). Efficacy of inoculation strategies in promoting resistance to political attack messages: Application to direct mail. *Communication Monographs, 57*, 25-43.

Pfau, M., Park, D., Holbert, R. L., & Cho, J. (2001). The effects of party- and PAC-sponsored issue advertising and the potential of inoculation to combat its impact on the democratic process. *American Behavioral Scientist, 44*, 2379-2397.

Pfau, M., & Parrott, R. (1993). *Persuasive communication campaigns.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Pfau, M., Roskos-Ewoldsen, D., Wood., M., Yin, S., Cho, J., Kerr-Hasin, L., & Shen, L. (2003). Attitude accessibility as an alternative explanation for how inoculation confers resistance. *Communication Monographs, 70*, 39-51.

Pfau, M., Semmler, S. M., Deatrick, L., Mason, A., Nisbett, G., Lane, L., Craig, E., Underhill, J., & Banas, J. (2008). Nuances about the role and impact of affect in

inoculation. *Communication Monographs,* in press.

Pfau, M., Szabo, E. A., Anderson, J., Morril, J. Zubric, J., & Wan, H.-H. (2001). The role and impact of affect in the process of resistance to persuasion. *Human Communication Research, 27,* 216-252.

Pfau, M., Tusing, K. J., Koerner, A. F., Lee, W. P., Goldbold, L. C., Penaloza, L. J., et al. (1997a). Enriching the inoculation construct: The role of critical components in the process of resistance. *Human Communication Research, 24,* 187-215.

Pfau, M., Tusing, K. J., Lee, W., Godbold, L. C., Koerner, A., Penaloza, L. J., et al. (1997b). Nuances in inoculation: The role of inoculation approach, ego-involvement, and message processing disposition in resistance. *Communication Quarterly, 45*, 461-481.

Pfau, M., Van Bockern, S., & Kang, J. G. (1992). Use of inoculation to promote resistance to smoking initiation among adolescents. *Communication Monographs, 57,* 25-43.

Pichert, J. W., & Anderson, R. C. (1977). Taking different perspectives on a story. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 69,* 309-315.

Ravazzani, S. (2006, November). *Communicating for diversity, with diversity, in diversity: Main implications and summary of the contents.* Paper presented at the 2nd World Public Relations Festival, Milan, Italy.

Resnick, L. B. (1994). Situated rationalism: Biological and social preparation for learning. In L. Hirschfeld & S.A. Gelman (Eds.), *Mapping the mind* (pp. 474-493). New York: Cambridge University Press: New York.

Rose, P. (2002, Sping). The times they are a changing. . .and so should pr training.

Public Relations Quarterly, 14-17.

Rosenthal, R. (1984). *Meta-analytic procedures for social research.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R. (1997). Attitude accessibility and persuasion: Review and transactive model. In B. Burleson (Ed.), *Communication yearbook, 20* (pp. 185-225). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R., Apran-Ralstin, L., & St. Pierre, J. (2002). Attitude Accessibility and persuasion: The quick and the strong. In J. P. Dillard & M. Pfau (Eds.) *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice* (pp. 39-61). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R., & Fazio, R. H. (1997). The role of belief accessibility in attitude formation. *Southern Communication Journal, 62,* 107-116.

Sachau, D. A., Houlihan, D., & Gilbertson, T. (1999). Predictors of employee resistance to supervisors' requests. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 139(5),* 611-621.

Schank, R., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Scott, W. A. (1955). Reliability of content analysis: The case of nominal scale coding. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 19,* 321-325.

Seemann, E. A., Buboltz, W. C., Jenkins, S. M., Soper, B., & Woller, K. (2004). Ethnic and gender differences in psychological reactance: the importance of reactance in multicultural counseling. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 17(2),* 167-176.

Seibel, C. A., & Dowd, E. T. (2001). Personality characteristics associated with psychological reactance. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 57(7),* 963-969.

Shephard, C. R. (1964). *Small groups*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing.

Sims, J. (2005, May). *Dialogue on organizational diversity: Academic conceptions and approaches to different identities.* Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Organizational Communication Division, New York, NY.

Singer, J. A., & Salovey, P. (1988). Mood and memory: Evaluating the network theory of affect. *Clinical Psychology Review, 8,* 211-251.

Smith, E. R. (1998). Mental representation and memory. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.). *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 391-446). New York: McGraw Hill.

Smith, M. J. (1979). Extreme disagreement and the expression of attitudinal freedom. *Communication Monographs, 46,* 112-118.

Smith, M. J. (1982). *Persuasion and human action: A review and critique of social influence theories*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Stangor, C., & McMillan, D. (1992). Memory for expectancy-congruent and expectancy-incongruent information: A review of the social and social developmental literatures. *Psychological Bulletin, 111,* 42-61.

Steensma, H., & Erkel, D. (1999). Reactance to perceived external pressure to introduce quality assurance standards in organizations. *Psychological Reports, 85,* 1077-1080.

Szabo, E. A., & Pfau, M. (2002). Nuances in inoculation. In J. P. Dillard & M. Pfau

(Eds.) *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice* (pp. 233-258). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American, 223*, 96-102.

Tajfel, H. (1978). The psychological structure of intergroup relations. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 27-60). London: Academic Press.

Tannenbaum, P. H. (1966). Mediated generalization of attitude change via the principle of congruity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3*, 493-499.

Tannenbaum, P. H., Macaulay, J. R., & Norris, E. L. (1966). Principle of congruity and reduction of persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3*, 233-238.

Tannenbaum, P. H. & Norris, E. L. (1965). Effects of combining congruity principle strategies for the reduction of persuasion. *Sociometry, 289*, 145-157.

Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review, 68*, 107-117.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., & Deci, E. (2006). Intrinsic versus extrinsic goal contents in self-determination theory: Another look at the quality of academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 4*, 19-31.

von Hippel, W., Jonides, J., Hilton, J. L., & Narayan, S. (1993). Inhibitory effect of schematic processing on perceptual encoding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 921-935.

Vrugt, A. (1992). Preferential treatment of women and psychological reactance theory: An experiment. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 22,* 303-307.

Wan, H. H., & Pfau, M. (2004). The relative effectiveness of inoculation, bolstering, and combined approaches in crisis communication. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 16,* 301-328.

Weary, G., & Edwards, J. A. (1994). Social cognition and clinical psychology: Anxiety, depression, and the processing of social information. In R. S. Wyer & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition: Volume 2: Applications* (pp. 289-338). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wigley, S. L. (2007). *Relative effectiveness of bolstering and inoculation approaches in crisis communication.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

Wilson, C. C., Gutierrez, F., & Chao, L. M. (2003). *Racism, sexism, and the media: The rise of communication in multicultural America* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wright, R. A., Wadley, V. G., Danner, M., & Phillips, P. N. (1992). Persuasion, reactance, and judgments of interpersonal appeal. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 22,* 85-91.

Wyer, R. S., & Carlston, D. E. (1994). The cognitive representation of persons and events. In R. S. Wyer & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition: Volume 1: Basic processes* (pp. 41-98). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zaichkowsky, J. L. (1985). Measuring the involvement construct. *Journal of Consumer*

Research, 12, 341-352.

Ziller, R. C. (1973). Homogeneity and heterogeneity of group membership. In C. H. McClintock (Ed.), *Experimental social psychology* (pp. 385-411). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Table 1

*3 Most Prevalent Approaches to Different Identities in Interdisciplinary Diversity Literature**

	Social Identity Theory	Embedded Intergroup Relations Theory	Racioethnicity & Gender
Exemplars	Brewer (1995); Tajfel (1970, 1978)	Alderfer (1987; Alderfer & Smith (1982)	Allen (1995, 2004); Kossek & Zonia (1993); Martins et al. (2003)
Identity Is	Based on social group categor- izations	Based on a function of identity-group and org- anizational-group memberships	Based on physical attributes of race, ethnicity, & gender
Level of Analysis**	Ind/Group/Org	Group/Org	Ind/Group
Principal Activity	Understanding the categorization processes of groups primarily at the subgroup level	Understanding inter- group (identity & organizational groups) relations embedded within the subsystem and suprasystem	Integration of minor- ity racioethnic groups & White women into the organization

* See Sims (2005) for an expanded table with more approaches and table attributes.

** Table attribute reflects the attributes offered by Nkomo and Cox (1996).

Table 2

Principle Component Analytic Results for the Network Heterogeneity Measure

Initial Factor Analysis Loadings	Final Factor Analysis Loadings*
Nhfriend (.80)	Nhfriend (.83)
Nhfamily (.61)	Nhfamily (.65)
Nhjob (.68)	Nhjob (.70)
Nhclass (.60)	Nhgroups (.75)
Nhgroups (.75)	

* - excludes the Nhclass Factor which loaded poorly using the principal component analysis extraction method.

Table 3

Principle Component Analytic Results for the Attraction of Restricted Freedoms Measure

Initial Factor Analysis Loadings	Final Factor Analysis Loadings*
Rfment (.53)	Rfintern (.85)
Rfintern (.74)	Rfschol (.85)
Rfschol (.74)	
Rfnetwork (.65)	

* - excludes the Rfment and Rfnetwork Factors which loaded much lower using the principal component analysis extraction method.

Table 4

Phase 2 Means for Majority Participants as a Function of Campaign Message Condition

	Campaign message condition	
Dependent measure	Control	VID Campaign
	n = 36	*n* = 133
threat to freedom	2.08 (1.11)	3.35 [a] (1.59)
attitude toward the issue	5.64 (1.19)	5.51 (1.31)
anger-related negative affect	1.91 (1.56)	2.92 [a] (1.79)
credibility	5.29 (1.31)	5.08 (1.05)
attraction of restricted freedoms	5.56 (.87)	5.26 [b] (.96)

Note. Means and standard deviations are displayed (latter in parentheses). Phase 2 measures were assessed using a 7-point scale with higher scores indicating a greater threat to freedom, more favorable attitude toward the issue, more anger-related negative affect, higher credibility ratings, and greater attraction toward restricted freedoms.

[a] Statistically significant compared to control at $p < .05$

[b] Nearly significant compared to control at $p < .10$

Table 5

Phase 2 Means for Campaign Message Recipients as a Function of Diversity Status Condition

	Diversity status condition	
Dependent measure	Majority *n* = 132	Minority *n* = 303
threat to freedom	3.35_a (1.60)	2.63 (1.61)
attitude toward the issue	5.53_a (1.28)	6.12 (1.03)
anger-related negative affect	2.94_a (1.79)	2.18 (1.59)
credibility	5.09_a (1.05)	5.54 (1.15)
attitude toward racial minorities	4.07_a (1.79)	4.82 (1.62)
attitude toward women	4.24_a (1.74)	4.98 (1.63)
attitude toward legitimacy of the campaign	5.07_a (1.39)	5.75 (1.14)

Note. Means and standard deviations are displayed (latter in parentheses). Phase 2 measures were assessed using a 7-point scale with higher scores indicating a greater threat to freedom, more favorable attitude toward the issue, more anger-related negative affect, higher credibility ratings, more favorable attitude toward racial minorities, more favorable attitude toward women, and more favorable attitude toward legitimacy of the campaign.

$_a$ Statistically significant difference at $p < .01$

Table 6

Phase 2 Means for Majority Participants as a Function of Campaign Message Type and Postscript Type

	Value-in-diversity campaign message condition			
	Message Type		Postscript Type	
Dependent measure	Explicit	Implicit	Restoration	Filler
	n = 68	*n* = 64	*n* = 64	*n* = 68
threat to freedom	3.74[a] (1.68)	2.93 (1.40)	3.06[b] (1.52)	3.62 (1.63)
attitude toward racial minorities	4.22 (1.72)	3.91 (1.85)	3.99 (1.87)	4.13 (1.71)
attitude toward women	4.36 (1.69)	4.12 (1.80)	4.17 (1.81)	4.31 (1.69)
attitude toward legitimacy of the campaign	5.05 (1.45)	5.09 (1.34)	5.04 (1.39)	5.11 (1.41)

Note. Means and standard deviations are displayed (latter in parentheses). Phase 2 measures were assessed using a 7-point scale with higher scores indicating a greater threat to freedom, more favorable attitude toward racial minorities, more favorable attitude toward women, and more favorable attitude toward legitimacy of the campaign.

[a] Statistically significant difference within type at $p < .01$

[b] Statistically significant difference within type at $p < .05$

Table 7

Means for Inoculated Participants as a Function of Diversity Status Condition

	Diversity status condition	
Dependent measure	Majority	Minority
	n = 88	*n* = 189
threat	2.58[a] (1.45)	3.21 (1.60)
post-attack attitude toward the issue	4.98 (1.51)	5.49 (1.42)
post-inoculation issue involvement	4.97 (1.47)	5.71 (1.33)

Note. Means and standard deviations are displayed (latter in parentheses). Measures were assessed using a 7-point scale with higher scores indicating a greater threat or perceived susceptibility of one's pro-diversity attitude, a more favorable attitude toward the issue, and a greater involvement level. A higher, more favorable attitude toward the issue also indicates a more resistant attitude.

[a] Statistically significant difference at $p < .01$

APPENDIX A: INOCULATION & CONTROL MESSAGES

On the following pages, the entire versions of the two inoculation messages (VID-I-1 & VID-I-2) and one dummy message (I-DU, given to participants in the control condition) used in Phase 1 of this investigation can be found. The messages used were presented on a single page, but have been adjusted below to fit the margin requirements of the Graduate College outlined for dissertations.

IT'S TIME TO VALUE DIVERSITY INITIATIVES IN AMERICA'S COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES (VID-I-1)

Racial and gender diversity initiatives in America's colleges and universities are a critical component of a solid educational experience. Despite this fact, there are those who seek to de-value the role of diversity and minimize the importance of the presence of racial and ethnic minorities and women in higher education. Some of their appeals are so persuasive that they may cause you to question your support of diversity.

Advocates for the dismissal of diversity initiatives claim that too much diversity can be troublesome and dysfunctional because of the differences brought about in student communication styles, cultural backgrounds, and points of view. However, many studies suggest that diversity offers students increased creativity, innovation, and novelty rather than a decrease. Instead of being exposed to a "mono-cultural" experience or single cultural path, having different types of students present in the educational environment enhances student willingness to problem-solve and thus results in developing a more well-rounded student, graduate, and eventually, employee.

Those who support the dismissal of diversity initiatives claim it reduces student cohesiveness. Yet, the presence of different types of students in the classroom provides a controlled, "safe," environment for engaging dialogue about cultural differences which can promote understanding in the future. One Stanford university professor found that 94% of all students, despite race or gender differences, pull together while working on projects, extracurricular activities, or group assignments that require interaction. He argues, "A diverse classroom creates a more dynamic intellectual

environment with a plurality of perspectives which moves students to respect differences."

Proponents to dismiss diversity efforts claim the politically correct movement has swept our nation's colleges and universities, probably because a few minorities and women complained loud enough for others to listen. But, the seriousness of diversity in higher education is more than just being politically correct. By 2050, more than half of the U.S. population is estimated to be people of color. From a financial perspective, adapting to the habits and tastes of these multi-ethnic consumer markets will require organizations to attract and retain the best employees who are capable of enhancing marketing efforts, improving service quality, and working alongside coworkers who are different. If diversity efforts are dismissed, university students will be ill-prepared to adapt to the shifting U.S. population demographics and to assist future employers at tapping multi-ethnic markets.

Remember that there is value to racial and gender diversity initiatives in America's colleges and universities. Oppose efforts to curtail diversity and limit its importance in higher education.

IT'S TIME TO SUPPORT DIVERSITY INITIATIVES IN AMERICA'S COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES (VID-I-2)

Racial and gender diversity initiatives matter in higher education today and are a critical element of a solid educational experience. Despite this fact, there are those who seek to de-value the role of diversity and minimize the importance of the presence of racial and ethnic minorities and women in higher education. Some of their appeals are so persuasive that they may cause you to question your support of diversity.

Advocates for the dismissal of diversity initiatives in higher education claim that race and gender are irrelevant in higher education decision-making, because society has reached a point where they should not matter. However, statistics and national studies suggest that inequities still exist that are disproportionately harmful to women and minorities. When compared to their white male counterparts, for women and minorities, salaries are lower, home-loan interest rates are higher, and financial circumstances and credit ratings are poorer. What else explains this reality other than bias and prejudice? And, how can we believe that recruitment and admission processes in universities are somehow exempt from these same prejudices?

Those who support the dismissal of diversity initiatives claim we can develop globally competitive students without supporting diversity. Yet, in a world where our economy is becoming increasingly international, how can we be prepared for the global nature of policy issues and international markets if higher education is producing students who are ill-equipped for the challenge? Repeatedly, university studies find that a more diverse classroom exposes students to a greater variety of cultures,

backgrounds and experiences. One Stanford University economics professor said, “A key to global relations is acknowledging differences and understanding the world doesn’t operate like you do. This is how diversity prepares students for a global economy.”

Proponents to dismiss diversity efforts claim the U.S. demographic changes will have little impact. But, the shifting demographics in the U.S. population are monumental. By 2020, the number of Hispanic or non-White residents will have more than doubled, while the non-Hispanic White population will not be increasing at all. At the same time, half of all jobs will require at least some college education. Unless universities increase the participation rates of minorities, society will lack the technically trained and culturally adaptable people to work in a diverse workforce or an internationally competitive economy.

Remember that there is value to racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education. Oppose efforts to curtail diversity and limit its importance in America’s universities.

VID-I-2

IT'S TIME TO VISIT OKLAHOMA'S STATE PARKS (I-DU)

Visiting one of Oklahoma's state parks is a fantastic way to have a fun and relaxing vacation experience. The state boasts several lodges and state parks that have cabins and recreational park areas that are big enough to accommodate large parties and small enough for an intimate outing for two. Many of the facilities have been recently renovated with updated interiors that reflect the beauty of the natural landscape.

Oklahoma's 50 State Parks give visitors the opportunity to enjoy a beautiful outdoors. From the pine forests of southeastern Oklahoma to the spectacular mesas of the Panhandle, visitors can escape the busy, hectic pace of routine life. Several activities, including camping, hiking, swimming, fishing, water skiing, and even cave exploring, will keep guests wondering where their vacation time has gone.

"My favorite park is the Alabaster Caverns State Park," said Samantha Mills, who has visited 20 of Oklahoma's state parks. "The lighting in the cavern was recently overhauled and so the views inside are simply amazing."

Located in northwestern Oklahoma, the Alabaster Caverns is a 200-acre park with the largest natural gypsum cave in the world that is open to the public. Visitors can take a guided tour of the cave or simply spend time at the horseshoe pit, volleyball court, hiking trails, or other camping areas. Wild caving is also a unique adventure that many guests choose to enjoy at the park as well.

If Alabaster Caverns doesn't sound quite as appealing, why not try one of Oklahoma's 15 state parks that have cabins and lodges. These rank among the nation's

best. Choose from Beavers Bend, Fort Cobb, Lake Murray, Lake Keystone, Roman Nose, and Lake Tenkiller just to name a few. At Beavers Bend, which is located in the southeastern part of the state off the shore of Broken Bow Lake, guests can view the crystal clear waters and mountainous terrain that form what many call “Oklahoma’s Little Smokies.” All rooms have a lake view with a balcony or patio plus visitors can enjoy a complimentary continental breakfast in a great room with a fireplace. Choose to golf, trout fish, paddleboat, canoe, horseback ride, or hayride along with friends and family members. Or, play sports (e.g., volleyball, softball, horseshoes) by checking out equipment at no additional charge.

Remember that there is value to having a relaxing and enjoyable vacation in the state of Oklahoma. Plan a trip to visit one of Oklahoma’s state parks.

APPENDIX B: CAMPAIGN & CONTROL MESSAGES

On the following pages, the entire versions of the four value-in-diversity campaign messages (VID-EX-RPS, VID-EX-FPS, VID-IM-RPS, VID-IM-FPS) and one dummy message (VID-DU, given to participants in the control condition) used in Phase 2 of this investigation can be found. The four value-in-diversity campaign messages have explicit (EX) or implicit (IM) language use as well as a restoration postscript (RPS) or filler postscript (FPS) as detailed in the Methods section. The messages used were presented on a single page, but have been adjusted below to fit the margin requirements of the Graduate College outlined for dissertations.

UCO ANNOUNCES NEW RACIAL AND GENDER DIVERSITY PROGRAMMING (VID-EX-RPS)

In an email to the University of Central Oklahoma student body this week, university administration outlined a new diversity initiative aimed at doubling the presence of minority and female students at the university. The new plan offers mentoring programs, internships, scholarship opportunities, and professional networking to UCO minorities and females designed to enhance their overall student learning experience.

"Here's why every student should support diversity at UCO," a senior-ranking university official said. "Greater intellectual contributions come from inclusive educational environments, and greater dialogue is achieved when every student engages in oftentimes difficult, but enriching idea exchanges. All students must be advocates for improving our campus climate to reach this goal, and all students ought to be supportive of this strategic program. So, every student really must support this new diversity initiative."

Set to begin immediately, the program seeks to recruit and admit females as well as students of color in larger proportions including Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and African Americans beginning with increased scholarships that enable them to afford the escalating costs of higher education. In addition, the program offers students of color and females the opportunity to partner with both a professional mentor and an upper class UCO student in their respective fields who are capable of coaching and guiding them. Finally, the UCO Apprenticeship Program will offer a 12-week internship to select minorities and females to work in

Oklahoma City area organizations where they earn student wages, grow in their career knowledge, and develop professional networking skills.

Here's how UCO students are required to help:

- Students should recommend minorities and females who are current or prospective UCO students to take part in the program
- Upper class students must volunteer their time to serve as UCO student mentors
- Students should enroll in a newly-created elective course, "Contemporary Racism and Gender Inequalities," which uses the classroom environment to explore personal feelings and prejudices along with each student's attitudes, customs, and values
- Students need to be willing participants and ought to encourage a bias-free and non-threatening learning environment that supports the well-being and success of all campus members

"You've probably heard a lot of messages telling you to support diversity in higher education. Some of these messages reflect diversity initiatives similar to this one telling you how important diversity is. Of course, you don't have to listen to any of these messages," a senior-ranking university official said to a group of students earlier this week. "Ultimately, it is up to the student to make a decision about whether to support diversity. Some students will support the program, while other students will make a decision not to support the program. Being an advocate for diversity is your own individual decision. It's a personal choice that each student will make on his or her own. You're free to decide for yourself."

UCO ANNOUNCES NEW RACIAL AND GENDER DIVERSITY PROGRAMMING (VID-EX-FPS)

In an email to the University of Central Oklahoma student body this week, university administration outlined a new diversity initiative aimed at doubling the presence of minority and female students at the university. The new plan offers mentoring programs, internships, scholarship opportunities, and professional networking to UCO minorities and females designed to enhance their overall student learning experience.

"Here's why every student should support diversity at UCO," a senior-ranking university official said. "Greater intellectual contributions come from inclusive educational environments, and greater dialogue is achieved when every student engages in oftentimes difficult, but enriching idea exchanges. All students must be advocates for improving our campus climate to reach this goal, and all students ought to be supportive of this strategic program. So, every student really must support this new diversity initiative."

Set to begin immediately, the program seeks to recruit and admit females as well as students of color in larger proportions including Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and African Americans beginning with increased scholarships that enable them to afford the escalating costs of higher education. In addition, the program offers students of color and females the opportunity to partner with both a professional mentor and an upper class UCO student in their respective fields who are capable of coaching and guiding them. Finally, the UCO Apprenticeship Program will offer a 12-week internship to select minorities and females to work in

Oklahoma City area organizations where they earn student wages, grow in their career knowledge, and develop professional networking skills.

Here's how UCO students are required to help:

- Students should recommend minorities and females who are current or prospective UCO students to take part in the program
- Upper class students must volunteer their time to serve as UCO student mentors
- Students should enroll in a newly-created elective course, "Contemporary Racism and Gender Inequalities," which uses the classroom environment to explore personal feelings and prejudices along with each student's attitudes, customs, and values
- Students need to be willing participants and ought to encourage a bias-free and non-threatening learning environment that supports the well-being and success of all campus members

"You've probably heard a lot of messages telling you to support diversity in higher education. Some of these messages reflect diversity initiatives similar to this one telling you how important diversity is. Of course, these messages are just ways of communicating university aims," a senior-ranking university official said to a group of students earlier this week. "Basically, this type of communication in higher education is shared with students daily. These messages are designed to be able to communicate with different types of students along with other individuals, like faculty, staff and administrators, who make up the campus community. All members of the university constituency will be exposed to the same information about the UCO diversity programming that you are hearing today."

UCO ANNOUNCES NEW RACIAL AND GENDER DIVERSITY PROGRAMMING (VID-IM-RPS)

In an email to the University of Central Oklahoma student body this week, university administration outlined a new diversity initiative aimed at doubling the presence of minority and female students at the university. The new plan offers mentoring programs, internships, scholarship opportunities, and professional networking to UCO minorities and females designed to enhance their overall student learning experience.

"Here's why every student might want to support diversity at UCO," a senior-ranking university official said. "Greater intellectual contributions come from inclusive educational environments, and greater dialogue is achieved when every student engages in oftentimes difficult, but enriching idea exchanges. All students could be advocates for improving our campus climate to reach this goal, and all students can be supportive of this strategic program. So, every student really may want to support this new diversity initiative."

Set to begin immediately, the program seeks to recruit and admit females as well as students of color in larger proportions including Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and African Americans beginning with increased scholarships that enable them to afford the escalating costs of higher education. In addition, the program offers students of color and females the opportunity to partner with both a professional mentor and an upper class UCO student in their respective fields who are capable of coaching and guiding them. Finally, the UCO Apprenticeship

Program will offer a 12-week internship to select minorities and females to work in Oklahoma City area organizations where they earn student wages, grow in their career knowledge, and develop professional networking skills.

Here's how UCO students can help:

- Students could recommend minorities and females who are current or prospective UCO students to take part in the program
- Upper class students may volunteer their time to serve as UCO student mentors
- Students might want to enroll in a newly-created elective course, "Contemporary Racism and Gender Inequalities," which uses the classroom environment to explore personal feelings and prejudices along with each student's attitudes, customs, and values
- Students can be willing participants and might want to encourage a bias-free and non-threatening learning environment that supports the well-being and success of all campus members

"You've probably heard a lot of messages telling you to support diversity in higher education. Some of these messages reflect diversity initiatives similar to this one telling you how important diversity is. Of course, you don't have to listen to any of these messages," a senior-ranking university official said to a group of students earlier this week. "Ultimately, it is up to the student to make a decision about whether to support diversity. Some students will support the program, while other students will make a decision not to support the program. Being an advocate for diversity is your own individual decision. It's a personal choice that each student will make on his or her own. You're free to decide for yourself."

UCO ANNOUNCES NEW RACIAL AND GENDER DIVERSITY PROGRAMMING (VID-IM-FPS)

In an email to the University of Central Oklahoma student body this week, university administration outlined a new diversity initiative aimed at doubling the presence of minority and female students at the university. The new plan offers mentoring programs, internships, scholarship opportunities, and professional networking to UCO minorities and females designed to enhance their overall student learning experience.

"Here's why every student might want to support diversity at UCO," a senior-ranking university official said. "Greater intellectual contributions come from inclusive educational environments, and greater dialogue is achieved when every student engages in oftentimes difficult, but enriching idea exchanges. All students could be advocates for improving our campus climate to reach this goal, and all students can be supportive of this strategic program. So, every student really may want to support this new diversity initiative."

Set to begin immediately, the program seeks to recruit and admit females as well as students of color in larger proportions including Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and African Americans beginning with increased scholarships that enable them to afford the escalating costs of higher education. In addition, the program offers students of color and females the opportunity to partner with both a professional mentor and an upper class UCO student in their respective fields who are capable of coaching and guiding them. Finally, the UCO Apprenticeship Program will offer a 12-week internship to select minorities and females to work in

Oklahoma City area organizations where they earn student wages, grow in their career knowledge, and develop professional networking skills.

Here's how UCO students can help:

- Students could recommend minorities and females who are current or prospective UCO students to take part in the program
- Upper class students may volunteer their time to serve as UCO student mentors
- Students might want to enroll in a newly-created elective course, "Contemporary Racism and Gender Inequalities," which uses the classroom environment to explore personal feelings and prejudices along with each student's attitudes, customs, and values
- Students can be willing participants and might want to encourage a bias-free and non-threatening learning environment that supports the well-being and success of all campus members

"You've probably heard a lot of messages telling you to support diversity in higher education. Some of these messages reflect diversity initiatives similar to this one telling you how important diversity is. Of course, these messages are just ways of communicating university aims," a senior-ranking university official said to a group of students earlier this week. "Basically, this type of communication in higher education is shared with students daily. These messages are designed to be able to communicate with different types of students along with other individuals, like faculty, staff and administrators, who make up the campus community. All members of the university constituency will be exposed to the same information about the UCO diversity programming that you are hearing today."

IT'S TIME TO FLY KITES IN OKLAHOMA (VID-DU)

Kite flying in Oklahoma is a growing leisurely activity that brings families together in a fun, outdoor environment. Because Oklahoma weather always includes an abundance of wind, kite flying is becoming a growing favorite pastime within the state, and kite fliers are popping up in official Oklahoma State Parks as well as city parks throughout Oklahoma's towns.

Kite flying offers a fantastic way to enjoy time with friends, family, and children. This activity allows for exercise while viewing the beauty of a natural landscape and evoking sweet memories of childhood. What better way to make use of Oklahoma's good winds and flat open expanses than designing, building, and testing your own home-made kite? Testing out your skills at kite building can often be just as fun as the kite flying experience itself. However, store-bought kites are fairly inexpensive and work just fine as well.

Several Oklahoma areas, like Lake Hefner and Earlywine Park in Oklahoma City, make ideal kite flying locations. Plus, inexperienced and novice kite flyers can enjoy learning more about building and flying kites at several kite festivals located in Edmond, Lahoma, or the Greenleaf State Park. The Greenleaf State Park festival provides guests with free kite-making supplies including sticks, string, crayons, and paper in a guided instructional session.

"A special part is when you see mom and dad helping the kids put the kites together and coloring them and stapling the paper on the string," Sam Warnom,

Greenleaf State Park employee, said. “It’s special to watch that happen, and you see a lot of that at Greenleaf State Park. It’s a lot of fun.”

Interested kite fliers can also join the American Kitefliers Association which is a nonprofit organization dedicated to educating the public in the art, history, technology, and practice of building and flying kites. The association has more than 4,000 members in 35 countries and is the largest association of kitefliers in the world.

“Our association was founded in 1964 by Robert Ingraham of New Mexico and has grown steadily since that time. Advancing the joys and values of kiting in all nations is the primary purpose of our organization,” said Joseph Barnett, who has been an American Kitefliers Association member since 1989. “We’re from all walks of life, and we just enjoy kiting.”

Remember that there is value to having a relaxing and enjoyable time flying kites. Make a special effort to go kite flying in Oklahoma sometime soon.

APPENDIX C: ATTACK MESSAGES

On the following pages, the entire versions of the two attack messages (ATT-1 & ATT-2) used in Phase 3 of the investigation can be found. The messages used were presented on a single page, but have been adjusted below to fit the margin requirements of the Graduate College outlined for dissertations.

DIVERSITY INITIATIVES IN AMERICA'S COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES ARE OVERRATED (VID-A-1)

The importance of diversity programs in America's colleges and universities is overrated and just proves educators pay too much attention to the small number of minorities and women who are claiming they don't have equal access and opportunity to the same advantages provided to others. Given such extensive use of politically correct diversity programs, the time has finally come to officially end diversity initiatives in higher education. Although minorities and women manipulate demographic statistics to prove their point, the truth is that all students in today's time have an equal opportunity to obtain scholarships, to secure admittance to school, and to succeed in their respective degree programs.

University diversity efforts do not produce more prepared or better educated students. The notion that diversity initiatives increase student preparation for future careers is simply not true. Rather than forcing students to compete, as they will have to do in the future, the programs de-motivate minorities and women by offering them a free pass to the same educational opportunities that others work hard to attain and are more qualified to receive. Even, a prominent Ivy League educator argues that integrating colleges for the sake of "improving America's future workforce" is in fact reverse discrimination. He argued, "The notion that having more minorities and women in universities somehow miraculously improves the working population is misguided. If 90% of college applicants are white males and they make up less than half of college students admitted to college, how can anyone claim this is not reverse discrimination?"

Expecting *some* students to take a backseat to educational opportunities, while allowing easy access to the same opportunities for others lowers the competitive quality of education for everyone.

In addition to reverse discrimination, diversity programs create tension and produce unnecessary backlash among students. Numerous studies have documented the dysfunctional outcomes associated with forcing different types of students to be present in a single educational environment. Miscommunication occurs, cohesiveness decreases, and the lack of commonality among students makes group decision-making virtually impossible, especially when students are required to interact in extracurricular activities, fraternities, and sororities. According to a prominent education journal, each of these factors contributes to an overall lower level of student academic performance. Jim Eizen, a university distinguished professor and noted educational consultant, articulates this point: “For students, perceived dissimilarity decreases attraction and results in a lack of cohesion and increased conflict. Rather than reducing tension, an institution’s diversity efforts actually increase the likelihood of student disagreements and create more stress than what was present prior to diversity initiatives.”

The wave of negative backlash from diversity programs is real and for good reason. Allocating funds to support special mentoring, networking, and internship programs exclusively for minority and female students reduces access to those same opportunities for other students who are just as deserving. In fact, 90% of the students who participate in this special programming never go on to earn graduate degrees or PhDs in their fields. This renders the developmental aims of those programs unsuccessful. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education, less than 4% of all

earned doctorates are minorities, and minorities and females make up less than 10% of all faculty positions. These percentages are not dramatic increases from the same statistics in the 1970s; so, the funds being allocated to this special programming are not being put to good use.

Since students now have equal access to the same opportunities, oppose efforts to justify diversity programs and initiatives.

DON'T SUPPORT DIVERSITY INITIATIVES IN AMERICA'S COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES (VID-A-2)

The notion that diversity programs in America's colleges and universities somehow enhances the learning environment is simply overrated and wrongly suggests students in higher education are handicapped from interacting with others who are different unless diversity programs are carried out. Given the weak arguments and failed statistics used to support diversity programs, the time has finally come to officially end diversity initiatives in higher education. Although educators use the internationalization of our economy to prove their point, the truth is that universities are no better off from diversity initiatives than they were before and student learning is not being enhanced any more than prior to the initiatives.

Diversity initiatives in higher education do not make America's students better prepared for the competitiveness associated with a global economy. Rather than creating environments where students are forced to compete for scholarships, admission to college, and career-enriching internships, diversity programs reserve spots for minorities and women allowing them a "free pass." Students should prove their merit by being at the peak of their professional abilities in order to rigorously contend on an international level. How does this happen when diversity programs allow *some* students to escape competing, while more qualified others miss out on the opportunity to sufficiently compete? Even a prominent Ivy League economics expert argues that diversity for the sake of "improving America's global competitiveness" is in fact misguided. He argued, "Real preparation for a global economy stems from increased

expertise in math, science, accounting, computer science, medicine, and other fields. We need greater competition among the best students to compete globally, not pseudo struggles over race and gender."

In addition to inhibiting our ability to be globally competitive, diversity programs fail to generate cohesion as "contact" proponents suggest. Repeatedly research has proven that increased contact and social interaction with others who are different simply reinforces the negative prejudices that students had prior to the exposure and interaction, creating more tension and producing unnecessary backlash among students. Numerous studies have documented the dysfunctional outcomes associated with forcing different types of students to be present in a single educational environment. Increased miscommunication, decreased cohesion, and poorer decision-making occur when students are required to interact in extracurricular activities, fraternities, and sororities.

According to a prominent education journal, each of these factors hampers the overall academic performance of students. So, an institution's diversity efforts actually increase the likelihood of student disagreements and create more stress than what existed prior to diversity initiatives.

Finally, diversity initiatives are overrated because they simply don't work. Despite the wave of diversity initiatives and programming that have taken place in the 90s and 2000s, the number of minority faculty and minority students present in America's colleges and universities still lags significantly behind their white counterparts. Faculty percentages for minorities and women have not doubled and the percentage of minorities still remains less than 20% in the majority of universities.

What has the allocation of funds toward diversity programming accomplished? Should millions of dollars be spent just for the retention of 20% of minorities and females in higher education? Such dismal statistics in America's corporations would be deemed unacceptable. So, why should we settle for lower standards in America's colleges and universities than we do in the corporate sector?

Since diversity initiatives do not create a more globally competitive workforce, fail to create cohesion at the collegiate level, and simply do not work, don't support diversity initiatives in higher education.

APPENDIX D: QUESTIONNAIRES

On the following pages, the entire versions of the questionnaires for Phases 1, 2, and 3 used throughout the investigation can be found. All questionnaires have been slightly modified and adjusted (e.g., spacing or response lines decreased) to fit the margin requirements of the Graduate College outlined for dissertations; however, the content of the questionnaires in this Appendix remains identical to the questionnaires used in this investigation.

SURVEY QUALIFIER

For each statement below, please CIRCLE the position that best describes your attitude.

STATEMENT 1:

Diverse student populations in America's colleges and universities are valuable.

Attitude toward the Statement

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

STATEMENT 2:

Scholarly research in America's colleges and universities is valuable.

Attitude toward the Statement

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

Phase I: **INITIAL MEASURE**

PLEASE PRINT YOUR FIRST & LAST NAME:

_____

Please print name of course instructor and course number:

_____ _____

1. **Please circle one:** Male (1) Female (2)

2. **Ethnicity/Race (Please circle one):**
   (1) African American (2) American Indian/Alaskan Native (3) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (4) Caucasian/White (5) Hispanic American (6) Other

3. **Age on last birthday:_____**

4. **Year in school (Please circle one):** (1) Freshmen (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior

For each statement, please circle the number that best expresses your position about each statement, where "1" is "strongly disagree" and "7" is "strongly agree."

5. **The idea of exercising to reduce stress associated with my studies is appealing to me.**
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
6. **I am attracted to the idea of participating in a mentoring program.**
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
7. **The idea of securing an internship in my field is *not* appealing to me.**
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
8. **I am attracted to the idea of studying a foreign language.**
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
9. **I am *not* attracted to the idea of participating in scholarship opportunities.**
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
10. **The idea of participating in scholarly research is appealing to me.**
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
11. **The idea of participating in professional networking to enhance my future career is appealing to me.**
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
12. **I become frustrated when I am unable to make free and independent decisions**
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
13. **It irritates me when someone points out things which are obvious to me.**
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
14. **I become angry when my freedom of choice is restricted.**
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
15. **Regulations trigger a sense of resistance in me**
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
16. **I find contradicting others stimulating.**
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
17. **When something is prohibited, I usually think, "That's exactly what I am going to do."**
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
18. **I resist the attempts of others to influence me.**
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
19. **It makes me angry when another person is held up as a role model for me to follow.**
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
20. **When someone forces me to do something, I feel like doing the opposite.**
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
21. **I consider advice from others to be an intrusion.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

22. **Advice and recommendations usually induce me to do just the opposite.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

We would like for you to create a story based on the following information.

You are on your way to attend a meeting on your campus about the value of your school's efforts to promote a more diverse campus: to increase racial and gender diversity, especially among faculty and students. What kinds of things do you expect to be discussed at the meeting? What types of people will attend and speak at the meeting, and what will these people say about your university's efforts?
Add any details that you would like about the individuals involved in the meeting, the setting, or the activities.

P l e a s e p r i n t l e g i b l y s o w e c a n r e a d y o u r w r i t i n g !

23. WC=_____

24. REL=_____

25. DET=_____

26. **Estimate how frequently within the past week you recollected diverse student populations in higher education on a scale from 0 to 100, where "0" indicates "no recollection" and "100" indicates "constant recollection." _____**

27. **Estimate how frequently within the past week you recollected racial and gender diversity initiatives or programming in higher education on a scale from 0 to 100, where "0" indicates "no recollection" and "100" indicates "constant recollection." _____**

For each statement, please circle the number that best expresses your position about each statement, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

28. **The friends I interact with on a regular basis represent a mixture of various races and ethnic groups.**

    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

29. **The family members I interact with on a regular basis represent a mixture of various races and ethnic groups.**

    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

30. **On my job, the people I interact with on a regular basis represent a mixture of various races and ethnic groups.**

    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

31. **In my classes, the students I interact with on a regular basis represent a mixture of various races and ethnic groups.**

    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

32. **In volunteer groups, religious groups, or social organizations, the people that I interact with on a regular basis represent a mixture of various races and ethnic groups.**

    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

The next items concern the specific statement referenced below. After reading the statement, complete the items that follow. The first block of items is designed to determine your overall attitude toward the specific statement. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response to the statement.

STATEMENT:

Racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education are valuable.

My attitude toward the statement above is:

33.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
		[Where 1 is the most negative and 7 is the most positive]							
34.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
35.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
36.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
37.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
38.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

How important is the above statement to you?

39.	Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Important
40.	Of no concern concern	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Of much
41.	Means nothing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean a lot
42.	Doesn't matter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Matters to me
43.	Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Significant
44.	Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relevant

Please return the survey booklet to the researcher and await further instructions.

Thanks for your participation!

Phase I: **INOC-NO-1**

We appreciate your continued participation in this study of how people process messages. Please read the instructions at the start of each section of this booklet, do what is asked, and complete the survey items in each section as accurately as possible. After you complete the questionnaire, please bring it up to the researcher.

PLEASE PRINT YOUR FIRST & LAST NAME:
_____

Please print name of course instructor and course number:

_____ _____

1. **Please circle one:** Male (1) Female (2)

2. **Ethnicity/Race (Please circle one):**
   (1) African American (2) American Indian/Alaskan Native (3) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (4) Caucasian/White (5) Hispanic American (6) Other

3. **Age on last birthday:_____**

4. **Year in school (Please circle one):** (1) Freshmen (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior

Please disregard numbering of items in this questionnaire. Groups of items are arranged differently across questionnaires.

This part of the research contains a message about an issue, which is followed by exercises and scales concerning the message. Please read the message on the next page carefully and then complete the following scales.

IT'S TIME TO VALUE DIVERSITY INITIATIVES IN AMERICA'S COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES

Racial and gender diversity initiatives in America's colleges and universities are a critical component of a solid educational experience. Despite this fact, there are those who seek to de-value the role of diversity and minimize the importance of the presence of racial and ethnic minorities and women in higher education. Some of their appeals are so persuasive that they may cause you to question your support of diversity.

Advocates for the dismissal of diversity initiatives claim that too much diversity can be troublesome and dysfunctional because of the differences brought about in student communication styles, cultural backgrounds, and points of view. However, many studies suggest that diversity offers students increased creativity, innovation, and novelty rather than a decrease. Instead of being exposed to a "mono-cultural" experience or single cultural path, having different types of students present in the educational environment enhances student willingness to problem-solve and thus results in developing a more well-rounded student, graduate, and eventually, employee.

Those who support the dismissal of diversity initiatives claim it reduces student cohesiveness. Yet, the presence of different types of students in the classroom provides a controlled, "safe," environment for engaging dialogue about cultural differences which can promote understanding in the future. One Stanford university professor found that 94% of all students, despite race or gender differences, pull together while working on projects, extracurricular activities, or group assignments that require interaction. He argues, "A diverse classroom creates a more dynamic intellectual environment with a plurality of perspectives which moves students to respect differences."

Proponents to dismiss diversity efforts claim the politically correct movement has swept our nation's colleges and universities, probably because a few minorities and women complained loud enough for others to listen. But, the seriousness of diversity in higher education is more than just being politically correct. By 2050, more than half of the U.S. population is estimated to be people of color. From a financial perspective, adapting to the habits and tastes of these multi-ethnic consumer markets will require

organizations to attract and retain the best employees who are capable of enhancing marketing efforts, improving service quality, and working alongside coworkers who are different. If diversity efforts are dismissed, university students will be ill-prepared to adapt to the shifting U.S. population demographics and to assist future employers at tapping multi-ethnic markets.

Remember that there is value to racial and gender diversity initiatives in America's colleges and universities. Oppose efforts to curtail diversity and limit its importance in higher education.

VID-I-1

For each set of adjective pairs, circle a number on each row that best describes your position. This initial set of items is designed to <u>measure your sense of the overall importance of the issue of racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education</u>. How important is this issue to you?

45.	Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Important
		[Where 1 is the most unimportant and 7 is the most important]							
46.	Of no concern concern	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Of much
47.	Means nothing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean a lot
48.	Doesn't matter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Matters to me
49.	Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Significant
50.	Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relevant

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the idea expressed at the beginning of the message you just read that, <u>despite your opinion on this issue, there is the possibility you may come in to contact with arguments contrary to your position that are so persuasive that they may cause you to rethink your position.</u> I find this possibility:

51.	Not Dangerous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dangerous
52.	Nonthreatening	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Threatening
53.	Calm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Anxious
54.	Not Scary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Scary
55.	Not Harmful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Harmful
56.	Not Risky	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Risky

The next set of items concerns the specific statement referenced below. After reading the statement, complete the items that follow. The first block of items is designed to determine your overall attitude toward the specific statement. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response to the statement.

STATEMENT:

Racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education are valuable.

My attitude toward the statement above is:

57.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
58.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
59.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
60.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
61.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
62.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

---

63. Estimate how certain you are of your attitude on the above statement on a scale from 0 to 100, where "0" indicates no certainty and "100" indicates absolute certainty: _____.

The strength of my attitude toward the above statement is:

64.	Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Important
65.	Uncertain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Certain
66.	Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relevant
67.	Of No Interest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Of Great Interest

Please return the survey booklet to the researcher and await further instructions.

Thanks for your participation!

Phase I: **INOC-NO-2**

We appreciate your continued participation in this study of how people process messages. Please read the instructions at the start of each section of this booklet, do what is asked, and complete the survey items in each section as accurately as possible. After you complete the questionnaire, please bring it up to the researcher.

PLEASE PRINT YOUR FIRST & LAST NAME:
_____

Please print name of course instructor and course number:

_____ _____

1. **Please circle one:** Male (1) Female (2)

2. **Ethnicity/Race (Please circle one):**
   (1) African American (2) American Indian/Alaskan Native (3) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (4) Caucasian/White (5) Hispanic American (6) Other

3. **Age on last birthday:_____**

4. **Year in school (Please circle one):** (1) Freshmen (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior

Please disregard numbering of items in this questionnaire. Groups of items are arranged differently across questionnaires.

This part of the research contains a message about an issue, which is followed by exercises and scales concerning the message. Please read the message on the next page carefully and then complete the following scales.

IT'S TIME TO SUPPORT DIVERSITY INITIATIVES IN AMERICA'S COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES

Racial and gender diversity initiatives matter in higher education today and are a critical element of a solid educational experience. Despite this fact, there are those who seek to de-value the role of diversity and minimize the importance of the presence of racial and ethnic minorities and women in higher education. Some of their appeals are so persuasive that they may cause you to question your support of diversity.

Advocates for the dismissal of diversity initiatives in higher education claim that race and gender are irrelevant in higher education decision-making, because society has reached a point where they should not matter. However, statistics and national studies suggest that inequities still exist that are disproportionately harmful to women and minorities. When compared to their white male counterparts, for women and minorities, salaries are lower, home-loan interest rates are higher, and financial circumstances and credit ratings are poorer. What else explains this reality other than bias and prejudice? And, how can we believe that recruitment and admission processes in universities are somehow exempt from these same prejudices?

Those who support the dismissal of diversity initiatives claim we can develop globally competitive students without supporting diversity. Yet, in a world where our economy is becoming increasingly international, how can we be prepared for the global nature of policy issues and international markets if higher education is producing students who are ill-equipped for the challenge? Repeatedly, university studies find that a more diverse classroom exposes students to a greater variety of cultures, backgrounds and experiences. One Stanford University economics professor said, "A key to global relations is acknowledging differences and understanding the world doesn't operate like you do. This is how diversity prepares students for a global economy."

Proponents to dismiss diversity efforts claim the U.S. demographic changes will have little impact. But, the shifting demographics in the U.S. population are monumental. By 2020, the number of Hispanic or non-White residents will have more than doubled, while the non-Hispanic White population will not be increasing at all. At

the same time, half of all jobs will require at least some college education. Unless universities increase the participation rates of minorities, society will lack the technically trained and culturally adaptable people to work in a diverse workforce or an internationally competitive economy.

Remember that there is value to racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education. Oppose efforts to curtail diversity and limit its importance in America's universities.

VID-I-2

For each set of adjective pairs, circle a number on each row that best describes your position. This initial set of items is designed to <u>measure your sense of the overall importance of the issue of racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education</u>. How important is this issue to you?

45.	Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Important
		[Where 1 is the most unimportant and 7 is the most important]							
46.	Of no concern concern	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Of much
47.	Means nothing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean a lot
48.	Doesn't matter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Matters to me
49.	Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Significant
50.	Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relevant

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the idea expressed at the beginning of the message you just read that, <u>despite your opinion on this issue, there is the possibility you may come in to contact with arguments contrary to your position that are so persuasive that they may cause you to rethink your position.</u> I find this possibility:

51.	Not Dangerous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dangerous
52.	Nonthreatening	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Threatening
53.	Calm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Anxious
54.	Not Scary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Scary
55.	Not Harmful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Harmful
56.	Not Risky	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Risky

The next set of items concerns the specific statement referenced below. After reading the statement, complete the items that follow. The first block of items is designed to determine your overall attitude toward the specific statement. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response to the statement.

STATEMENT:

Racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education are valuable.

My attitude toward the statement above is:

57.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
58.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
59.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
60.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
61.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
62.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

---

63. Estimate how certain you are of your attitude on the above statement on a scale from 0 to 100, where "0" indicates no certainty and "100" indicates absolute certainty: _____.

The strength of my attitude toward the above statement is:

64.	Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Important
65.	Uncertain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Certain
66.	Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relevant
67.	Of No Interest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Of Great Interest

Please return the survey booklet to the researcher and await further instructions.

Thanks for your participation!

Phase I: **INOC-CON**

We appreciate your continued participation in this study of how people process messages. Please read the instructions at the start of each section of this booklet, do what is asked, and complete the survey items in each section as accurately as possible. After you complete the questionnaire, please bring it up to the researcher.

PLEASE PRINT YOUR FIRST & LAST NAME:
_____

Please print name of course instructor and course number:

_____ _____

1. **Please circle one:** Male (1) Female (2)

2. **Ethnicity/Race (Please circle one):**
   (1) African American (2) American Indian/Alaskan Native (3) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (4) Caucasian/White (5) Hispanic American (6) Other

3. **Age on last birthday:_____**

4. **Year in school (Please circle one):** (1) Freshmen (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior

Please disregard numbering of items in this questionnaire. Groups of items are arranged differently across questionnaires.

This part of the research contains a message about an issue, which is followed by exercises and scales concerning the message. Please read the message on the next page carefully and then complete the following scales.

IT'S TIME TO VISIT OKLAHOMA'S STATE PARKS

Visiting one of Oklahoma's state parks is a fantastic way to have a fun and relaxing vacation experience. The state boasts several lodges and state parks that have cabins and recreational park areas that are big enough to accommodate large parties and small enough for an intimate outing for two. Many of the facilities have been recently renovated with updated interiors that reflect the beauty of the natural landscape.

Oklahoma's 50 State Parks give visitors the opportunity to enjoy a beautiful outdoors. From the pine forests of southeastern Oklahoma to the spectacular mesas of the Panhandle, visitors can escape the busy, hectic pace of routine life. Several activities, including camping, hiking, swimming, fishing, water skiing, and even cave exploring, will keep guests wondering where their vacation time has gone.

"My favorite park is the Alabaster Caverns State Park," said Samantha Mills, who has visited 20 of Oklahoma's state parks. "The lighting in the cavern was recently overhauled and so the views inside are simply amazing."

Located in northwestern Oklahoma, the Alabaster Caverns is a 200-acre park with the largest natural gypsum cave in the world that is open to the public. Visitors can take a guided tour of the cave or simply spend time at the horseshoe pit, volleyball court, hiking trails, or other camping areas. Wild caving is also a unique adventure that many guests choose to enjoy at the park as well.

If Alabaster Caverns doesn't sound quite as appealing, why not try one of Oklahoma's 15 state parks that have cabins and lodges. These rank among the nation's best. Choose from Beavers Bend, Fort Cobb, Lake Murray, Lake Keystone, Roman Nose, and Lake Tenkiller just to name a few. At Beavers Bend, which is located in the southeastern part of the state off the shore of Broken Bow Lake, guests can view the crystal clear waters and mountainous terrain that form what many call "Oklahoma's Little Smokies." All rooms have a lake view with a balcony or patio plus visitors can enjoy a complimentary continental breakfast in a great room with a fireplace. Choose to golf, trout fish, paddleboat, canoe, horseback ride, or hayride along with friends and

family members. Or, play sports (e.g., volleyball, softball, horseshoes) by checking out equipment at no additional charge.

Remember that there is value to having a relaxing and enjoyable vacation in the state of Oklahoma. Plan a trip to visit one of Oklahoma's state parks.

I-DU

We are interested in your thoughts about the importance of racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education.

For each set of adjective pairs, circle a number on each row that best describes your position. This initial set of items is designed to <u>measure your sense of the overall importance of the issue of racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education</u>. How important is this issue to you?

45.	Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Important
	[Where 1 is the most unimportant and 7 is the most important]								
46.	Of no concern	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Of much concern
47.	Means nothing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean a lot
48.	Doesn't matter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Matters to me
49.	Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Significant
50.	Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relevant

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the idea that, <u>despite your opinion on this issue, there is the possibility you may come in to contact with arguments contrary to your position that are so persuasive that they may cause you to rethink your position.</u> I find this possibility:

51.	Not Dangerous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dangerous
52.	Nonthreatening	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Threatening
53.	Calm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Anxious
54.	Not Scary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Scary
55.	Not Harmful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Harmful
56.	Not Risky	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Risky

The next set of items concerns the specific statement referenced below. After reading the statement, complete the items that follow. The first block of items is designed to determine your overall attitude toward the specific statement. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response to the statement.

STATEMENT:

Racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education are valuable.

My attitude toward the statement above is:

57.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
58.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
59.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
60.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
61.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
62.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

---

63. Estimate how certain you are of your attitude on the above statement on a scale from 0 to 100, where "0" indicates no certainty and "100" indicates absolute certainty: _____.

The strength of my attitude toward the above statement is:

64.	Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Important
65.	Uncertain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Certain
66.	Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relevant
67.	Of No Interest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Of Great Interest

Please return the survey booklet to the researcher and await further instructions.

Thanks for your participation!

Phase II: **VID-EX-RPS**

We appreciate your continued participation in this study of how people process messages. Please read the instructions at the start of each section of this booklet, do what is asked, and complete the survey items in each section as accurately as possible. After you complete the questionnaire, please bring it up to the researcher.

PLEASE PRINT YOUR FIRST & LAST NAME:
_____

Please print name of course instructor and course number:

_____ _____

1. **Please circle one:** Male (1) Female (2)

2. **Ethnicity/Race (Please circle one):**
   (1) African American (2) American Indian/Alaskan Native (3) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (4) Caucasian/White (5) Hispanic American (6) Other

3. **Age on last birthday:_____**

4. **Year in school (Please circle one):** (1) Freshmen (2) Sophomore (3) Junior 4) Senior

Please disregard numbering of items in this questionnaire. Groups of items are arranged differently across questionnaires.

This part of the research contains a message about a campaign, which is followed by exercises and scales concerning the message. Please read the message on the next page carefully and then complete the following scales.

UCO ANNOUNCES NEW RACIAL AND GENDER DIVERSITY PROGRAMMING

In an email to the University of Central Oklahoma student body this week, university administration outlined a new diversity initiative aimed at doubling the presence of minority and female students at the university. The new plan offers mentoring programs, internships, scholarship opportunities, and professional networking to UCO minorities and females designed to enhance their overall student learning experience.

"Here's why every student should support diversity at UCO," a senior-ranking university official said. "Greater intellectual contributions come from inclusive educational environments, and greater dialogue is achieved when every student engages in oftentimes difficult, but enriching idea exchanges. All students must be advocates for improving our campus climate to reach this goal, and all students ought to be supportive of this strategic program. So, every student really must support this new diversity initiative."

Set to begin immediately, the program seeks to recruit and admit females as well as students of color in larger proportions including Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and African Americans beginning with increased scholarships that enable them to afford the escalating costs of higher education. In addition, the program offers students of color and females the opportunity to partner with both a professional mentor and an upper class UCO student in their respective fields who are capable of coaching and guiding them. Finally, the UCO Apprenticeship Program will offer a 12-week internship to select minorities and females to work in Oklahoma City area organizations where they earn student wages, grow in their career knowledge, and develop professional networking skills.

Here's how UCO students are required to help:

- Students should recommend minorities and females who are current or prospective UCO students to take part in the program
- Upper class students must volunteer their time to serve as UCO student mentors
- Students should enroll in a newly-created elective course, "Contemporary Racism and Gender Inequalities," which uses the classroom environment to explore personal feelings and prejudices along with each student's attitudes, customs, and values
- Students need to be willing participants and ought to encourage a bias-free and non-threatening learning environment that supports the well-being and success of all campus members

"You've probably heard a lot of messages telling you to support diversity in higher education. Some of these messages reflect diversity initiatives similar to this one telling you how important diversity is. Of course, you don't have to listen to any of these messages," a senior-ranking university official said to a group of students earlier this week. "Ultimately, it is up to the student to make a decision about whether to support diversity. Some students will support the program, while other students will make a decision not to support the program. Being an advocate for diversity is your own individual decision. It's a personal choice that each student will make on his or her own. You're free to decide for yourself."

VID-EX-RPS

Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your position about each statement, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

68. **The message threatened my freedom to choose.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

69. **The message tried to manipulate me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

70. **The message tried to make a decision for me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

71. **The message tried to pressure me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the people who wrote the message you just read. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response.

The people who wrote this message are:

72. Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intelligent
[Where 1 is the most unintelligent and 7 is the most intelligent]								
73. Unqualified	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Qualified
74. Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competent
75. Selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unselfish
76. Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
77. Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Honest
78. Unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sociable
79. Gloomy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cheerful
80. Irritable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good-natured

The next section is designed to understand how the message made you feel. Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your feeling, where 1 is none of this feeling and 7 is a great deal of this feeling.

81. **I feel angry toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

82. **I feel irritated toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

83. **I feel annoyed toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

84. **I feel aggravated toward the message**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

---

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the opportunities mentioned in the message. Please circle the number that best expresses your attraction toward the opportunities mentioned, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

85. **I am attracted to the idea of participating in a mentoring program.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

86. **The idea of securing an internship in my field is *not* appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

87. **I am *not* attracted to the idea of participating in scholarship opportunities.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

88. **The idea of participating in professional networking to enhance my future career is appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

The next set of items concerns your attitude about each of the specific statements referenced below. For each statement, read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your attitude toward the statement.

My attitude toward the statement, "Racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education are valuable" is:

89.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
90.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
91.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
92.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
93.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
94.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the preferential treatment of racial minorities is:

95.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
96.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
97.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
98.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
99.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
100.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the preferential treatment of women is:

101.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
102.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
103.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
104.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
105.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
106.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the legitimacy of a value-in-diversity campaign is:

107.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
108.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
109.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
110.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise

111.Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
112.Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

Please return the survey booklet to the researcher and await further instructions.

Thanks for your participation!

Phase II: **VID-EX-FPS**

We appreciate your continued participation in this study of how people process messages. Please read the instructions at the start of each section of this booklet, do what is asked, and complete the survey items in each section as accurately as possible. After you complete the questionnaire, please bring it up to the researcher.

PLEASE PRINT YOUR FIRST & LAST NAME:
_____

Please print name of course instructor and course number:

_____ _____

1. **Please circle one:** Male (1) Female (2)

2. **Ethnicity/Race (Please circle one):**
   (1) African American (2) American Indian/Alaskan Native (3) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (4) Caucasian/White (5) Hispanic American (6) Other

3. **Age on last birthday:_____**

4. **Year in school (Please circle one):** (1) Freshmen (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior

Please disregard numbering of items in this questionnaire. Groups of items are arranged differently across questionnaires.

This part of the research contains a message about a campaign, which is followed by exercises and scales concerning the message. Please read the message on the next page carefully and then complete the following scales.

UCO ANNOUNCES NEW RACIAL AND GENDER DIVERSITY PROGRAMMING

In an email to the University of Central Oklahoma student body this week, university administration outlined a new diversity initiative aimed at doubling the presence of minority and female students at the university. The new plan offers mentoring programs, internships, scholarship opportunities, and professional networking to UCO minorities and females designed to enhance their overall student learning experience.

"Here's why every student should support diversity at UCO," a senior-ranking university official said. "Greater intellectual contributions come from inclusive educational environments, and greater dialogue is achieved when every student engages in oftentimes difficult, but enriching idea exchanges. All students must be advocates for improving our campus climate to reach this goal, and all students ought to be supportive of this strategic program. So, every student really must support this new diversity initiative."

Set to begin immediately, the program seeks to recruit and admit females as well as students of color in larger proportions including Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and African Americans beginning with increased scholarships that enable them to afford the escalating costs of higher education. In addition, the program offers students of color and females the opportunity to partner with both a professional mentor and an upper class UCO student in their respective fields who are capable of coaching and guiding them. Finally, the UCO Apprenticeship Program will offer a 12-week internship to select minorities and females to work in Oklahoma City area organizations where they earn student wages, grow in their career knowledge, and develop professional networking skills.

Here's how UCO students are required to help:

- Students should recommend minorities and females who are current or prospective UCO students to take part in the program
- Upper class students must volunteer their time to serve as UCO student mentors
- Students should enroll in a newly-created elective course, "Contemporary Racism and Gender Inequalities," which uses the classroom environment to explore personal feelings and prejudices along with each student's attitudes, customs, and values
- Students need to be willing participants and ought to encourage a bias-free and non-threatening learning environment that supports the well-being and success of all campus members

"You've probably heard a lot of messages telling you to support diversity in higher education. Some of these messages reflect diversity initiatives similar to this one telling you how important diversity is. Of course, these messages are just ways of communicating university aims," a senior-ranking university official said to a group of students earlier this week. "Basically, this type of communication in higher education is shared with students daily. These messages are designed to be able to communicate with different types of students along with other individuals, like faculty, staff and administrators, who make up the campus community. All members of the university constituency will be exposed to the same information about the UCO diversity programming that you are hearing today."

VID-EX-FPS

Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your position about each statement, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

68. **The message threatened my freedom to choose.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

69. **The message tried to manipulate me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

70. **The message tried to make a decision for me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

71. **The message tried to pressure me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the people who wrote the message you just read. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response.

The people who wrote this message are:

72. Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intelligent
[Where 1 is the most unintelligent and 7 is the most intelligent]								
73. Unqualified	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Qualified
74. Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competent
75. Selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unselfish
76. Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
77. Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Honest
78. Unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sociable
79. Gloomy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cheerful
80. Irritable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good-natured

The next section is designed to understand how the message made you feel. Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your feeling, where 1 is none of this feeling and 7 is a great deal of this feeling.

81. **I feel angry toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

82. **I feel irritated toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

83. **I feel annoyed toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

84. **I feel aggravated toward the message**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

---

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the opportunities mentioned in the message. Please circle the number that best expresses your attraction toward the opportunities mentioned, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

85. **I am attracted to the idea of participating in a mentoring program.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

86. **The idea of securing an internship in my field is *not* appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

87. **I am *not* attracted to the idea of participating in scholarship opportunities.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

88. **The idea of participating in professional networking to enhance my future career is appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

The next set of items concerns your attitude about each of the specific statements referenced below. For each statement, read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your attitude toward the statement.

My attitude toward the statement, "Racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education are valuable" is:

89.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
90.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
91.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
92.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
93.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
94.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the preferential treatment of racial minorities is:

95.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
96.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
97.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
98.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
99.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
100.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the preferential treatment of women is:

101.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
102.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
103.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
104.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
105.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
106.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the legitimacy of a value-in-diversity campaign is:

107.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
108.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
109.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
110.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise

111.Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
112.Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

Please return the survey booklet to the researcher and await further instructions.

Thanks for your participation!

Phase II: **VID-IM-RPS**

We appreciate your continued participation in this study of how people process messages. Please read the instructions at the start of each section of this booklet, do what is asked, and complete the survey items in each section as accurately as possible. After you complete the questionnaire, please bring it up to the researcher.

PLEASE PRINT YOUR FIRST & LAST NAME:
_____

Please print name of course instructor and course number:

_____ _____

1. **Please circle one:** Male (1) Female (2)

2. **Ethnicity/Race (Please circle one):**
   (1) African American (2) American Indian/Alaskan Native (3) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (4) Caucasian/White (5) Hispanic American (6) Other

3. **Age on last birthday:_____**

4. **Year in school (Please circle one):** (1) Freshmen (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior

Please disregard numbering of items in this questionnaire. Groups of items are arranged differently across questionnaires.

This part of the research contains a message about a campaign, which is followed by exercises and scales concerning the message. Please read the message on the next page carefully and then complete the following scales.

UCO ANNOUNCES NEW RACIAL AND GENDER DIVERSITY PROGRAMMING

In an email to the University of Central Oklahoma student body this week, university administration outlined a new diversity initiative aimed at doubling the presence of minority and female students at the university. The new plan offers mentoring programs, internships, scholarship opportunities, and professional networking to UCO minorities and females designed to enhance their overall student learning experience.

"Here's why every student might want to support diversity at UCO," a senior-ranking university official said. "Greater intellectual contributions come from inclusive educational environments, and greater dialogue is achieved when every student engages in oftentimes difficult, but enriching idea exchanges. All students could be advocates for improving our campus climate to reach this goal, and all students can be supportive of this strategic program. So, every student really may want to support this new diversity initiative."

Set to begin immediately, the program seeks to recruit and admit females as well as students of color in larger proportions including Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and African Americans beginning with increased scholarships that enable them to afford the escalating costs of higher education. In addition, the program offers students of color and females the opportunity to partner with both a professional mentor and an upper class UCO student in their respective fields who are capable of coaching and guiding them. Finally, the UCO Apprenticeship Program will offer a 12-week internship to select minorities and females to work in Oklahoma City area organizations where they earn student wages, grow in their career knowledge, and develop professional networking skills.

Here's how UCO students can help:

- Students could recommend minorities and females who are current or prospective UCO students to take part in the program
- Upper class students may volunteer their time to serve as UCO student mentors
- Students might want to enroll in a newly-created elective course, "Contemporary Racism and Gender Inequalities," which uses the classroom environment to explore personal feelings and prejudices along with each student's attitudes, customs, and values
- Students can be willing participants and might want to encourage a bias-free and non-threatening learning environment that supports the well-being and success of all campus members

"You've probably heard a lot of messages telling you to support diversity in higher education. Some of these messages reflect diversity initiatives similar to this one telling you how important diversity is. Of course, you don't have to listen to any of these messages," a senior-ranking university official said to a group of students earlier this week. "Ultimately, it is up to the student to make a decision about whether to support diversity. Some students will support the program, while other students will make a decision not to support the program. Being an advocate for diversity is your own individual decision. It's a personal choice that each student will make on his or her own. You're free to decide for yourself."

VID-IM-RPS

Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your position about each statement, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

68. **The message threatened my freedom to choose.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

69. **The message tried to manipulate me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

70. **The message tried to make a decision for me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

71. **The message tried to pressure me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the people who wrote the message you just read. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response.

The people who wrote this message are:

72. Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intelligent
[Where 1 is the most unintelligent and 7 is the most intelligent]								
73. Unqualified	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Qualified
74. Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competent
75. Selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unselfish
76. Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
77. Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Honest
78. Unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sociable
79. Gloomy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cheerful
80. Irritable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good-natured

The next section is designed to understand how the message made you feel. Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your feeling, where 1 is none of this feeling and 7 is a great deal of this feeling.

81. **I feel angry toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

82. **I feel irritated toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

83. **I feel annoyed toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

84. **I feel aggravated toward the message**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

---

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the opportunities mentioned in the message. Please circle the number that best expresses your attraction toward the opportunities mentioned, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

85. **I am attracted to the idea of participating in a mentoring program.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

86. **The idea of securing an internship in my field is *not* appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

87. **I am *not* attracted to the idea of participating in scholarship opportunities.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

88. **The idea of participating in professional networking to enhance my future career is appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

The next set of items concerns your attitude about each of the specific statements referenced below. For each statement, read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your attitude toward the statement.

My attitude toward the statement, "Racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education are valuable" is:

89.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
90.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
91.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
92.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
93.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
94.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the preferential treatment of racial minorities is:

95.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
96.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
97.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
98.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
99.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
100.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the preferential treatment of women is:

101.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
102.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
103.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
104.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
105.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
106.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the legitimacy of a value-in-diversity campaign is:

107.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
108.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
109.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
110.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise

111.Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
112.Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

Please return the survey booklet to the researcher and await further instructions.

Thanks for your participation!

Phase II: **VID-IM-FPS**

We appreciate your continued participation in this study of how people process messages. Please read the instructions at the start of each section of this booklet, do what is asked, and complete the survey items in each section as accurately as possible. After you complete the questionnaire, please bring it up to the researcher.

PLEASE PRINT YOUR FIRST & LAST NAME:
_____

Please print name of course instructor and course number:

_____ _____

1. **Please circle one:** Male (1) Female (2)

2. **Ethnicity/Race (Please circle one):**
   (1) African American (2) American Indian/Alaskan Native (3) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (4) Caucasian/White (5) Hispanic American (6) Other

3. **Age on last birthday:_____**

4. **Year in school (Please circle one):** (1) Freshmen (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior

Please disregard numbering of items in this questionnaire. Groups of items are arranged differently across questionnaires.

This part of the research contains a message about a campaign, which is followed by exercises and scales concerning the message. Please read the message on the next page carefully and then complete the following scales.

UCO ANNOUNCES NEW RACIAL AND GENDER DIVERSITY PROGRAMMING

In an email to the University of Central Oklahoma student body this week, university administration outlined a new diversity initiative aimed at doubling the presence of minority and female students at the university. The new plan offers mentoring programs, internships, scholarship opportunities, and professional networking to UCO minorities and females designed to enhance their overall student learning experience.

"Here's why every student might want to support diversity at UCO," a senior-ranking university official said. "Greater intellectual contributions come from inclusive educational environments, and greater dialogue is achieved when every student engages in oftentimes difficult, but enriching idea exchanges. All students could be advocates for improving our campus climate to reach this goal, and all students can be supportive of this strategic program. So, every student really may want to support this new diversity initiative."

Set to begin immediately, the program seeks to recruit and admit females as well as students of color in larger proportions including Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and African Americans beginning with increased scholarships that enable them to afford the escalating costs of higher education. In addition, the program offers students of color and females the opportunity to partner with both a professional mentor and an upper class UCO student in their respective fields who are capable of coaching and guiding them. Finally, the UCO Apprenticeship Program will offer a 12-week internship to select minorities and females to work in Oklahoma City area organizations where they earn student wages, grow in their career knowledge, and develop professional networking skills.

Here's how UCO students can help:

- Students could recommend minorities and females who are current or prospective UCO students to take part in the program
- Upper class students may volunteer their time to serve as UCO student mentors
- Students might want to enroll in a newly-created elective course, "Contemporary Racism and Gender Inequalities," which uses the classroom environment to explore personal feelings and prejudices along with each student's attitudes, customs, and values
- Students can be willing participants and might want to encourage a bias-free and non-threatening learning environment that supports the well-being and success of all campus members

"You've probably heard a lot of messages telling you to support diversity in higher education. Some of these messages reflect diversity initiatives similar to this one telling you how important diversity is. Of course, these messages are just ways of communicating university aims," a senior-ranking university official said to a group of students earlier this week. "Basically, this type of communication in higher education is shared with students daily. These messages are designed to be able to communicate with different types of students along with other individuals, like faculty, staff and administrators, who make up the campus community. All members of the university constituency will be exposed to the same information about the UCO diversity programming that you are hearing today."

VID-IM-FPS

Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your position about each statement, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

68. **The message threatened my freedom to choose.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

69. **The message tried to manipulate me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

70. **The message tried to make a decision for me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

71. **The message tried to pressure me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the people who wrote the message you just read. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response.

The people who wrote this message are:

72. Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intelligent
[Where 1 is the most unintelligent and 7 is the most intelligent]								
73. Unqualified	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Qualified
74. Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competent
75. Selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unselfish
76. Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
77. Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Honest
78. Unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sociable
79. Gloomy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cheerful
80. Irritable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good-natured

The next section is designed to understand how the message made you feel. Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your feeling, where 1 is none of this feeling and 7 is a great deal of this feeling.

81. **I feel angry toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

82. **I feel irritated toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

83. **I feel annoyed toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

84. **I feel aggravated toward the message**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

---

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the opportunities mentioned in the message. Please circle the number that best expresses your attraction toward the opportunities mentioned, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

85. **I am attracted to the idea of participating in a mentoring program.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

86. **The idea of securing an internship in my field is *not* appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

87. **I am *not* attracted to the idea of participating in scholarship opportunities.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

88. **The idea of participating in professional networking to enhance my future career is appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

The next set of items concerns your attitude about each of the specific statements referenced below. For each statement, read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your attitude toward the statement.

My attitude toward the statement, "Racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education are valuable" is:

89.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
90.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
91.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
92.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
93.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
94.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the preferential treatment of racial minorities is:

95.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
96.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
97.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
98.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
99.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
100.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the preferential treatment of women is:

101.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
102.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
103.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
104.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
105.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
106.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the legitimacy of a value-in-diversity campaign is:

107.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
108.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
109.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
110.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise

111.Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
112.Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

Please return the survey booklet to the researcher and await further instructions.

Thanks for your participation!

Phase II: **VID-CON**

We appreciate your continued participation in this study of how people process messages. Please read the instructions at the start of each section of this booklet, do what is asked, and complete the survey items in each section as accurately as possible. After you complete the questionnaire, please bring it up to the researcher.

PLEASE PRINT YOUR FIRST & LAST NAME:
_____

Please print name of course instructor and course number:

_____ _____

1. **Please circle one:** Male (1) Female (2)

2. **Ethnicity/Race (Please circle one):**
   (1) African American (2) American Indian/Alaskan Native (3) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (4) Caucasian/White (5) Hispanic American (6) Other

3. **Age on last birthday:_____**

4. **Year in school (Please circle one):** (1) Freshmen (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior

Please disregard numbering of items in this questionnaire. Groups of items are arranged differently across questionnaires.

This part of the research contains a message about a campaign, which is followed by exercises and scales concerning the message. Please read the message on the next page carefully and then complete the following scales.

IT'S TIME TO FLY KITES IN OKLAHOMA

Kite flying in Oklahoma is a growing leisurely activity that brings families together in a fun, outdoor environment. Because Oklahoma weather always includes an abundance of wind, kite flying is becoming a growing favorite pastime within the state, and kite fliers are popping up in official Oklahoma State Parks as well as city parks throughout Oklahoma's towns.

Kite flying offers a fantastic way to enjoy time with friends, family, and children. This activity allows for exercise while viewing the beauty of a natural landscape and evoking sweet memories of childhood. What better way to make use of Oklahoma's good winds and flat open expanses than designing, building, and testing your own home-made kite? Testing out your skills at kite building can often be just as fun as the kite flying experience itself. However, store-bought kites are fairly inexpensive and work just fine as well.

Several Oklahoma areas, like Lake Hefner and Earlywine Park in Oklahoma City, make ideal kite flying locations. Plus, inexperienced and novice kite flyers can enjoy learning more about building and flying kites at several kite festivals located in Edmond, Lahoma, or the Greenleaf State Park. The Greenleaf State Park festival provides guests with free kite-making supplies including sticks, string, crayons, and paper in a guided instructional session.

"A special part is when you see mom and dad helping the kids put the kites together and coloring them and stapling the paper on the string," Sam Warnom, Greenleaf State Park employee, said. "It's special to watch that happen, and you see a lot of that at Greenleaf State Park. It's a lot of fun."

Interested kite fliers can also join the American Kitefliers Association which is a nonprofit organization dedicated to educating the public in the art, history, technology, and practice of building and flying kites. The association has more than 4,000 members in 35 countries and is the largest association of kitefliers in the world.

"Our association was founded in 1964 by Robert Ingraham of New Mexico and has grown steadily since that time. Advancing the joys and values of kiting in all

nations is the primary purpose of our organization," said Joseph Barnett, who has been an American Kitefliers Association member since 1989. "We're from all walks of life, and we just enjoy kiting."

Remember that there is value to having a relaxing and enjoyable time flying kites. Make a special effort to go kite flying in Oklahoma sometime soon.

VID-DU

Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your position about each statement, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

68. **The message threatened my freedom to choose.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

69. **The message tried to manipulate me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

70. **The message tried to make a decision for me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

71. **The message tried to pressure me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the people who wrote the message you just read. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response.

The people who wrote this message are:

72. Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intelligent
[Where 1 is the most unintelligent and 7 is the most intelligent]								
73. Unqualified	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Qualified
74. Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competent
75. Selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unselfish
76. Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
77. Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Honest
78. Unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sociable
79. Gloomy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cheerful
80. Irritable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good-natured

The next section is designed to understand how the message made you feel. Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your feeling, where 1 is none of this feeling and 7 is a great deal of this feeling.

81. **I feel angry toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

82. **I feel irritated toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

83. **I feel annoyed toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

84. **I feel aggravated toward the message**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

---

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the opportunities mentioned in the message. Please circle the number that best expresses your attraction toward the opportunities mentioned, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

85. **I am attracted to the idea of participating in a mentoring program.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

86. **The idea of securing an internship in my field is *not* appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

87. **I am *not* attracted to the idea of participating in scholarship opportunities.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

88. **The idea of participating in professional networking to enhance my future career is appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

The next set of items concerns your attitude about each of the specific statements referenced below. For each statement, read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your attitude toward the statement.

My attitude toward the statement, "Racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education are valuable" is:

89.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
90.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
91.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
92.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
93.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
94.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the preferential treatment of racial minorities is:

95.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
96.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
97.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
98.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
99.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
100.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the preferential treatment of women is:

101.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
102.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
103.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
104.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
105.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
106.	Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

My attitude toward the legitimacy of a value-in-diversity campaign is:

107.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
108.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
109.	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
110.	Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise

111.Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
112.Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

Please return the survey booklet to the researcher and await further instructions.

Thanks for your participation!

Phase III: **ATT-1**

We appreciate your continued participation in this study of how people process messages. Please read the instructions at the start of each section of this booklet, do what is asked, and complete the survey items in each section as accurately as possible. After you complete the questionnaire, please bring it up to the researcher.

PLEASE PRINT YOUR FIRST & LAST NAME:
_____

Please print name of course instructor and course number:

_____ _____

1. **Please circle one:** Male (1) Female (2)

2. **Ethnicity/Race (Please circle one):**
   (1) African American (2) American Indian/Alaskan Native (3) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (4) Caucasian/White (5) Hispanic American (6) Other

3. **Age on last birthday:_____**

4. **Year in school (Please circle one):** (1) Freshmen (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior

Please disregard numbering of items in this questionnaire. Groups of items are arranged differently across questionnaires.

This part of the research contains a message about an issue, which is followed by exercises and scales concerning the message. Please read the message on the next page carefully and then complete the following scales.

DIVERSITY INITIATIVES IN AMERICA'S COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES ARE OVERRATED

The importance of diversity programs in America's colleges and universities is overrated and just proves educators pay too much attention to the small number of minorities and women who are claiming they don't have equal access and opportunity to the same advantages provided to others. Given such extensive use of politically correct diversity programs, the time has finally come to officially end diversity initiatives in higher education. Although minorities and women manipulate demographic statistics to prove their point, the truth is that all students in today's time have an equal opportunity to obtain scholarships, to secure admittance to school, and to succeed in their respective degree programs.

University diversity efforts do not produce more prepared or better educated students. The notion that diversity initiatives increase student preparation for future careers is simply not true. Rather than forcing students to compete, as they will have to do in the future, the programs de-motivate minorities and women by offering them a free pass to the same educational opportunities that others work hard to attain and are more qualified to receive. Even, a prominent Ivy League educator argues that integrating colleges for the sake of "improving America's future workforce" is in fact reverse discrimination. He argued, "The notion that having more minorities and women in universities somehow miraculously improves the working population is misguided. If 90% of college applicants are white males and they make up less than half of college students admitted to college, how can anyone claim this is not reverse discrimination?" Expecting *some* students to take a backseat to educational opportunities, while allowing easy access to the same opportunities for others lowers the competitive quality of education for everyone.

In addition to reverse discrimination, diversity programs create tension and produce unnecessary backlash among students. Numerous studies have documented the dysfunctional outcomes associated with forcing different types of students to be present in a single educational environment. Miscommunication occurs, cohesiveness decreases, and the lack of commonality among students makes group decision-making

virtually impossible, especially when students are required to interact in extracurricular activities, fraternities, and sororities. According to a prominent education journal, each of these factors contributes to an overall lower level of student academic performance. Jim Eizen, a university distinguished professor and noted educational consultant, articulates this point: “For students, perceived dissimilarity decreases attraction and results in a lack of cohesion and increased conflict. Rather than reducing tension, an institution’s diversity efforts actually increase the likelihood of student disagreements and create more stress than what was present prior to diversity initiatives.”

The wave of negative backlash from diversity programs is real and for good reason. Allocating funds to support special mentoring, networking, and internship programs exclusively for minority and female students reduces access to those same opportunities for other students who are just as deserving. In fact, 90% of the students who participate in this special programming never go on to earn graduate degrees or PhDs in their fields. This renders the developmental aims of those programs unsuccessful. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education, less than 4% of all earned doctorates are minorities, and minorities and females make up less than 10% of all faculty positions. These percentages are not dramatic increases from the same statistics in the 1970s; so, the funds being allocated to this special programming are not being put to good use.

Since students now have equal access to the same opportunities, oppose efforts to justify diversity programs and initiatives.

VID-A-1

The first set of items concerns the specific statement referenced below. After reading the statement, complete the items that follow. The first block of items is designed to determine your overall attitude toward the specific statement. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response to the statement.

STATEMENT:

Racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education are valuable.

My attitude toward the statement above is:

113. Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
[Where 1 is the most negative and 7 is the most positive]								
114. Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
115. Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
116. Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
117. Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
118. Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

---

119. Estimate how certain you are of your attitude on the above statement on a scale from 0 to 100, where "0" indicates no certainty and "100" indicates absolute certainty: _____.

The strength of my attitude toward the above statement is:

120. Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Important
121. Uncertain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Certain
122. Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relevant
123. Of No Interest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Of Great Interest

This next set of items is designed to <u>measure your sense of the overall importance of the issue of racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education</u>. How important is this issue to you?

124. Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Important
125. Of no concern	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Of much concern
126. Means nothing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean a lot
127. Doesn't matter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Matters to me
128. Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Significant
129. Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relevant

Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your position about each statement, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

130. **The message threatened my freedom to choose.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

131. **The message tried to manipulate me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

132. **The message tried to make a decision for me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

133. **The message tried to pressure me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the people who wrote the message you just read. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response.

The people who wrote this message are:

134. Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intelligent
[Where 1 is the most unintelligent and 7 is the most intelligent]								
135. Unqualified	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Qualified
136. Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competent
137. Selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unselfish
138. Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
139. Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Honest
140. Unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sociable
141. Gloomy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cheerful
142. Irritable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good-natured

The next section is designed to help us understand how the message made you feel. Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your feeling, where 1 is none of this feeling and 7 is a great deal of this feeling.

143. **I feel angry toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

144. **I feel irritated toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

145. **I feel annoyed toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

146. **I feel aggravated toward the message**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

---

This next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about several opportunities. Please circle the number that best expresses your attraction toward the opportunities mentioned, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

147. **I am attracted to the idea of participating in a mentoring program.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

148. **The idea of securing an internship in my field is *not* appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

149. **I am *not* attracted to the idea of participating in scholarship opportunities.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

150. **The idea of participating in professional networking to enhance my future career is appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

We would like for you to create a story based on the following information.

You are on your way to attend a meeting on your campus about the value of your school's efforts to promote a more diverse campus: to increase racial and gender diversity, especially among faculty and students. What kinds of things do you expect to be discussed at the meeting? What types of people will attend and speak at the meeting, and what will these people say about your university's efforts? Add any details that you would like about the individuals involved in the meeting, the setting, or the activities.

P l e a s e p r i n t l e g i b l y s o w e c a n r e a d y o u r w r i t i n g !

151.WC=_____

152.REL=_____

153.DET=_____

154. **Estimate how frequently within the past week you recollected diverse student populations in higher education on a scale from 0 to 100, where "0" indicates "no recollection" and "100" indicates "constant recollection." _____**

155. **Estimate how frequently within the past week you recollected racial and gender diversity initiatives or programming in higher education on a scale from 0 to 100, where "0" indicates "no recollection" and "100" indicates "constant recollection." _____**

Please return the survey booklet to the researcher. Thanks for your participation!

Phase III: **ATT-2**

We appreciate your continued participation in this study of how people process messages. Please read the instructions at the start of each section of this booklet, do what is asked, and complete the survey items in each section as accurately as possible. After you complete the questionnaire, please bring it up to the researcher.

PLEASE PRINT YOUR FIRST & LAST NAME:
_____

Please print name of course instructor and course number:

_____ _____

1. **Please circle one:** Male (1) Female (2)

2. **Ethnicity/Race (Please circle one):**
   (1) African American (2) American Indian/Alaskan Native (3) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (4) Caucasian/White (5) Hispanic American (6) Other

3. **Age on last birthday:_____**

4. **Year in school (Please circle one):** (1) Freshmen (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior

Please disregard numbering of items in this questionnaire. Groups of items are arranged differently across questionnaires.

This part of the research contains a message about an issue, which is followed by exercises and scales concerning the message. Please read the message on the next page carefully and then complete the following scales.

DON'T SUPPORT DIVERSITY INITIATIVES IN AMERICA'S COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES

The notion that diversity programs in America's colleges and universities somehow enhances the learning environment is simply overrated and wrongly suggests students in higher education are handicapped from interacting with others who are different unless diversity programs are carried out. Given the weak arguments and failed statistics used to support diversity programs, the time has finally come to officially end diversity initiatives in higher education. Although educators use the internationalization of our economy to prove their point, the truth is that universities are no better off from diversity initiatives than they were before and student learning is not being enhanced any more than prior to the initiatives.

Diversity initiatives in higher education do not make America's students better prepared for the competitiveness associated with a global economy. Rather than creating environments where students are forced to compete for scholarships, admission to college, and career-enriching internships, diversity programs reserve spots for minorities and women allowing them a "free pass." Students should prove their merit by being at the peak of their professional abilities in order to rigorously contend on an international level. How does this happen when diversity programs allow *some* students to escape competing, while more qualified others miss out on the opportunity to sufficiently compete? Even a prominent Ivy League economics expert argues that diversity for the sake of "improving America's global competitiveness" is in fact misguided. He argued, "Real preparation for a global economy stems from increased expertise in math, science, accounting, computer science, medicine, and other fields. We need greater competition among the best students to compete globally, not pseudo struggles over race and gender."

In addition to inhibiting our ability to be globally competitive, diversity programs fail to generate cohesion as "contact" proponents suggest. Repeatedly research has proven that increased contact and social interaction with others who are different simply reinforces the negative prejudices that students had prior to the exposure and interaction, creating more tension and producing unnecessary backlash

among students. Numerous studies have documented the dysfunctional outcomes associated with forcing different types of students to be present in a single educational environment. Increased miscommunication, decreased cohesion, and poorer decision-making occur when students are required to interact in extracurricular activities, fraternities, and sororities. According to a prominent education journal, each of these factors hampers the overall academic performance of students. So, an institution's diversity efforts actually increase the likelihood of student disagreements and create more stress than what existed prior to diversity initiatives.

Finally, diversity initiatives are overrated because they simply don't work. Despite the wave of diversity initiatives and programming that have taken place in the 90s and 2000s, the number of minority faculty and minority students present in America's colleges and universities still lags significantly behind their white counterparts. Faculty percentages for minorities and women have not doubled and the percentage of minorities still remains less than 20% in the majority of universities. What has the allocation of funds toward diversity programming accomplished? Should millions of dollars be spent just for the retention of 20% of minorities and females in higher education? Such dismal statistics in America's corporations would be deemed unacceptable. So, why should we settle for lower standards in America's colleges and universities than we do in the corporate sector?

Since diversity initiatives do not create a more globally competitive workforce, fail to create cohesion at the collegiate level, and simply do not work, don't support diversity initiatives in higher education.

The first set of items concerns the specific statement referenced below. After reading the statement, complete the items that follow. The first block of items is designed to determine your overall attitude toward the specific statement. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response to the statement.

STATEMENT:

Racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education are valuable.

My attitude toward the statement above is:

113. Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
[Where 1 is the most negative and 7 is the most positive]								
114. Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
115. Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Acceptable
116. Foolish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wise
117. Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
118. Unfavorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Favorable

---

119. Estimate how certain you are of your attitude on the above statement on a scale from 0 to 100, where "0" indicates no certainty and "100" indicates absolute certainty: _____.

The strength of my attitude toward the above statement is:

120. Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Important
121. Uncertain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Certain
122. Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relevant
123. Of No Interest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Of Great Interest

This next set of items is designed to <u>measure your sense of the overall importance of the issue of racial and gender diversity initiatives in higher education</u>. How important is this issue to you?

124. Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Important
125. Of no concern	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Of much concern
126. Means nothing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean a lot
127. Doesn't matter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Matters to me
128. Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Significant
129. Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relevant

Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your position about each statement, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

130. **The message threatened my freedom to choose.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

131. **The message tried to manipulate me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

132. **The message tried to make a decision for me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

133. **The message tried to pressure me.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

The next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about the people who wrote the message you just read. Read each of the adjective pairs and then circle a number on each row between the two adjective pairs that best describes your response.

The people who wrote this message are:

134. Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intelligent
[Where 1 is the most unintelligent and 7 is the most intelligent]								
135. Unqualified	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Qualified
136. Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competent
137. Selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unselfish
138. Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
139. Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Honest
140. Unsociable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sociable
141. Gloomy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cheerful
142. Irritable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good-natured

The next section is designed to help us understand how the message made you feel. Based on the message you just read, please circle the number that best expresses your feeling, where 1 is none of this feeling and 7 is a great deal of this feeling.

143. **I feel angry toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

144. **I feel irritated toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

145. **I feel annoyed toward the message.**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

146. **I feel aggravated toward the message**

None of this feeling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A great deal of this feeling

---

This next section is designed to help us understand how you feel about several opportunities. Please circle the number that best expresses your attraction toward the opportunities mentioned, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

147. **I am attracted to the idea of participating in a mentoring program.**

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

148. **The idea of securing an internship in my field is *not* appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

149. **I am *not* attracted to the idea of participating in scholarship opportunities.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

150. **The idea of participating in professional networking to enhance my future career is appealing to me.**

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

We would like for you to create a story based on the following information.

You are on your way to attend a meeting on your campus about the value of your school's efforts to promote a more diverse campus: to increase racial and gender diversity, especially among faculty and students. What kinds of things do you expect to be discussed at the meeting? What types of people will attend and speak at the meeting, and what will these people say about your university's efforts? Add any details that you would like about the individuals involved in the meeting, the setting, or the activities.

P l e a s e p r i n t l e g i b l y s o w e c a n r e a d y o u r w r i t i n g !

151.WC=_____

152.REL=_____

153.DET=_____

154. **Estimate how frequently within the past week you recollected diverse student populations in higher education on a scale from 0 to 100, where "0" indicates "no recollection" and "100" indicates "constant recollection." _____**

155. **Estimate how frequently within the past week you recollected racial and gender diversity initiatives or programming in higher education on a scale from 0 to 100, where "0" indicates "no recollection" and "100" indicates "constant recollection." _____**

Please return the survey booklet to the researcher. Thanks for your participation!