Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

7-18-2022

Chapter 13: Reconceptualizing Diversity Training Predictors of Training Success

Shakoor Ward
Pennsylvania State university

Abeni El-Amin
Fort Hays State University, aelamin@fhsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.fhsu.edu/management_facpubs

Part of the Educational Leadership Commons

Recommended Citation

Chapter 13
Reconceptualizing Diversity Training Predictors of Training Success

Shakoor Ward
The Pennsylvania State University, USA

Abeni El-Amin
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7506-1658
Fort Hays State University, USA & Shenyang Normal University, China

ABSTRACT

The results of in-depth meta-analyses of diversity training outcomes reveal that cognitive learning is the strongest effect from diversity training, while smaller effects were behavioral and attitudinal change. Further results of the analysis suggest that successful diversity training occurs when learning is the goal, not impact from behavior or attitude changes. An adapted version of The Kirkpatrick Training and Evaluation Model is highlighted to demonstrate how to design an evaluation that measures actual learning, rather than perceived learning. In addition, the Plus/Delta feedback tool is introduced as an effective evaluation tool to identify what is going well and what needs to change or improve within a training program covering several topics over multiple sessions with a cohort. The chapter concludes with a recommendation that the success of diversity training is evaluated on the degree of learning that occurs in each session, rather than the impact on university diversity initiatives and post-training attitude changes.

INTRODUCTION

Researchers studying motivation and learning within organizations (e.g., Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009; Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001) have focused on the context and delivery of diversity training. What is central to understanding the harmony between context and delivery of diversity training is the assortment of information to broaden perspectives as suggested by Avery and Thomas (2004), and to offer sessions

of inclusivity that will cater to all attendees (Huber, 2013). The authors suggest the task at hand of a diversity trainer is daunting enough, demanding concentrated efforts in delivering quality programs and designing evaluations that speak to the actual effectiveness rather than perceived effectiveness. Better understanding of what is considered "effective" is needed to ensure that diversity training programs are not misevaluated (Holladay et al., 2003).

BACKGROUND

Consistent with the definition of diversity training in Pendry et al. (2007), Bezrukova et al. (2016) define diversity training as "a distinct set of instructional programs aimed at facilitating positive intergroup interactions, reducing prejudice and discrimination, and enhancing the skills, knowledge, and motivation of participants to interact with diverse others" (p. 6).

Kirkpatrick (2006) is a prominent training model that include levels for measuring results, such as the application of what was learned and impact of training. However, these levels involve multiple collaborators with reliance on administrators and other individuals beyond diversity trainers to collect the data and are far less likely to be implemented. Bezrukova et al. (2012) reviewed and examined one hundred and seventy-eight (178) articles whose authors have investigated numerous aspects of diversity training programs in Higher Education and in other workplace settings. Their review revealed only 11 "results-level" data for diversity training (Bezrukova et al., 2012). Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) labeled "results-level" measures as measures relating to grievances, turnover, promotions, and the re-cruitment of individuals from marginalized populations. Bezrukova et al. (2012) noted that it is rare to see "results-level" data for diversity training (only 11 of 178 in their study).

Kirkpatrick's Training Model seeks to capture increased job performance and maximum results with a four-level approach. Levels one and two are within a trainer's capacity. Level one assesses participants reaction to the training, whether they found it favorable, engaging, and relevant to their jobs. Level two assesses what was learned from the training and whether targeted outcomes were met. This level seeks to gauge the degree to which participants acquired the intended knowledge, skills, and confidence as a result of participating in a training. These two levels can be assessed soon after the training by asking survey questions along with a post-test examination of key points and aims of the training. However, levels three and four are beyond a trainer's "reach" and would involve administrator approval and ad-ministrative support. Level three assesses behavior of participants after they have returned to their roles at work. Specifically, whether they are applying what they learned during the training. Level four is more involved than level three. Level four assesses the long-term results associated with the training, and if the targeted outcomes were met. Moreover, since level four is the finality of the model, support systems and accountability become more transparent. Considering the tasks associated with "results-level" data, it's not surprising that only eleven (11) out of one hundred and seventy-eight (178) articles reviewed by Bezrukova et al. (2012) included data associated with Kirkpatrick's level three and level four. Leadership support is necessary.

The role of leadership is to uphold core values as it pertains to human rights and dignity of humankind. Leaders must ensure absolute integrity of stakeholders within their organization; require consistency in practice of regulatory agencies, institutional policies, and practices through collaboration with other leaders, the administration, and government. Leaders must ensure diversity, equity, inclusion, and belong-ing. They can best do so by possessing and exercising strategic leadership, utilizing strong interpersonal

and collaborative skills at meetings or with diverse stakeholders, hone the ability to effectively build relationships, and work through challenging conversations as needed (Dorociak et al., 2017). Leaders provide a voice by critically thinking through and communicating issues that are important to them and organizational stakeholders. Leaders develop cohesive solutions, advise, coach, mediate, influence and guide communities in change processes. While some do not think of collaboration as serious business…it is. Collaboration permits leaders to communicate implications of decisions related to aspects of strategy. Leaders should apply breadth and depth of experience, personal knowledge, and analytics to implement and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiencies of diversity training programs and processes. Leaders are key stakeholders and should make recommendations for strategic changes that drive societal outcomes regarding human rights, justice, and equality. In summary, leaders are responsible for implementing diversity training and compliance.

Plenty of research has focused on the outcomes of diversity training (e.g., Combs & Luthans, 2007; Sanchez & Medkik, 2004). However, the effects of diversity training at U.S. universities are often linked to employee and student recruitment and selection, employee retention, intercultural conflicts, reports of discrimination and bias, and overall climate regarding diversity related matters. The authors suggest, along with other researchers (e.g., Kulik & Roberson, 2008a), that diversity training is not realistically able to successfully address the scope of diversity matters within university settings. For example, Kalev et al. (2006) report that management ranks within organizations might not see an increase in minority hires following diversity programs on how to increase minority hires. Diversity related outcomes such as increasing cultural competencies and minority staffing goals are long-term and continuous processes, which requires a collaborative approach from key personnel and stakeholders. Diversity training can support long-term goals by influencing more immediate outcomes, for example influencing knowledge and skills that may support "big picture" future diversity goals such as increased minority hiring (Kulik & Roberson, 2008a). The authors suggest that university diversity trainers focus on learning and skill-based outcomes and designing training to enhance those outcomes. Evaluating diversity training based on proximal outcomes provide a more realistic assessment and appropriate accountability on the role of training.

Likewise, Dorociak et al. (2017) indicated that organizing diversity training requires planning, reflection, and execution. Diversity training planning requires more than designing a plan of action; it is about identifying solutions and developing innovative ways to manage diversity training. Utilizing feedback communication with mentors, facilitators, or diversity training exemplars improves diversity training development and implementation, which is value to diversity training excellence. Diversity training planning requires that developers consistently create, edit, and refine diversity training curriculum to align with current realities. Diversity training planning necessitates diligence in both stating the vision clearly and follow up with written documentation for record keeping. Surveying industry standards for diversity topics and training techniques provides program managers evidence-based methods to execute training.

The most common technique used to assess whether a trainee has acquired knowledge is through administering a post-training test. This test should be easy to administer and score, assess key take-aways and objectives from training, have only one correct answer for each item, and administered as a multiple choice or true/false examination. This post-test illustrates level two of Kirkpatrick's model, which recommends an examination of the trainees' knowledge of the training content delivered. Thus, in diversity training, cognitive learning refers to the extent to which attendees acquire knowledge about cultural diversity issues conveyed by the trainer. Stakeholders of diversity training need to see the training as effective and meaningful. Cognitive learning is shown to continue over time, while attitudinal and

behavioral learning is proven to diminish over time (Bezrukova et al., 2016). Bezrukova et al. (2016) assessed a meta-analysis of two hundred and sixty (260) independent samples on the effects of diversity training and found "no compelling evidence that long-term effects of diversity training are sustainable in relation to attitudinal/affective outcomes" (p. 1243). Consider the purpose of education and how learning is facilitated and assessed. Arranged by subjects taught, education serves the purpose of facilitating the acquisition of knowledge, skills, abilities, values, beliefs, and societal customs. The learning acquired is assessed through tests in controlled environments as opposed to "real life" settings. Theoretically, cognitive knowledge learned in the classroom or in controlled learning environments, transfers to other settings such as the workplace when prompted. Prompting can occur through cues in the workplace or other environmental stimuli that reminds individuals of what was learned. Each encounter with environmental stimuli related to content learned, reinforces the knowledge gained over time. For example, when writing a letter of recommendation for a female employee or graduate student, a past participant of a diversity training recalls what was learned in the training three months ago about gender-based stereotypes and gender-associated language used that may not address and speak to characteristics outlined for the position. Having to write a letter of recommendation served as a prompt. Participants who have cognitively learned from diversity training use prompting to self-regulate their behavior and develop what they've learned post training (Winne, 2005), reinforcing their knowledge over time.

The national culture of trainees could also impact cognitive-based outcomes. National culture background of training participants is of importance when assessing diversity training, especially when considering major U.S. universities, which are known to enroll a sizeable number of international students and have a celebrated presence of international faculty and visiting scholars. Social stratifications among non-U.S. countries have cultural attitudinal associations on diversity training outcomes addressing U.S. social issues. Theoretical approaches to understanding higher-order human culture exist for better understanding. The most prominent example is Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 1980, 2011). This model seeks to capture cultural differences by surveying samples of people in different countries, paired by education, experience, and profession (if possible), and publishing country scores from comparing the resulting country averages. In view of Hofstede's reliance on standard attitudinal scales, the model is construable as the attitudinal model of national culture (Voss, Lucas, & Ward, 2014).

Hofstede (1980) introduced the first model of cultural dimensions over 50 years ago. His survey items were in the form of statements reflecting possible beliefs about the expectations that one's society places on one-self (Voss et al., 2014). This first effort produced four cultural dimensions that varied primarily by country, rather than by individual respondent. The four included the well-known power distance, individualism-collectivism (or just individualism), masculinity-femininity (or just masculinity), and uncertainty avoidance. Hofstede's current model has 7-dimensions, but the relevance for this chapter is with two of the four mentioned, power distance and individualism. To illustrate how one might project a cultural expectation based on a definition of each of these dimensions, people in a culture that is high in power distance (e.g., China, France, and the Arab World) expect differences in power to exist, and this expectation guides one's customary patterns of interactions and expectations within society (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). A person who is influenced by a high-power distance culture does not expect any forms of existential egalitarianism. By contrast, a person from a low power distance culture (e.g., Denmark, U.S., U.K.) grows accustomed to making formal requests for needed resources, according to a relatively predictable, egalitarian structure (Voss et al., 2014). Therefore, participants culturally influenced from high power distance societies are often indifferent or ambivalent toward efforts seeking equity and equality for non-dominant social groups and identities (i.e., diversity training), even if they

are members of non-dominant groups in the U.S. context. Instead, such a person is culturally influenced to think in terms of tapping into the power structure, such as by nurturing the right relationships (those in power) or avoiding the power structure according to standing in the social hierarchies.

Moreover, Holladay and Quinones (2005) conducted an awareness-based diversity training program and concluded that participants from more individualistic countries such as the U.S., U.K., Germany, and the Netherlands, had more favorable reactions toward diversity training than participants from collectivist countries like Japan, India, and Brazil. Similar to the cultural influence on training participants from high power distance societies, collectivist influenced training participants may be more indifferent or ambivalent than cultural individualists are toward diversity efforts perceived to be addressing selected group identities rather than the whole society or national identity. The impact of cultural dimensions on cognitive-based outcomes is closely connected to social cognitive theory. Simply explained, social cognitive theory identifies how external forces (e.g., learned cultural norms) and internal forces (e.g., your thoughts) impact your learning. Of course, the content and objective of the diversity training may be influenced by cultural dimensions more, less, or not much of a factor. The key takeaway is recognizing that culture can play a role in diversity training outcomes and should be considered when designing programs to maximize positive outcomes from all participants.

MAIN FOCUS OF THE CHAPTER

In the tradition of diversity training research, theoretical approaches to improving the transfer of learning to a measurable outcome exist with a potential for organizational impact, but there has been little effort to moving the theoretical approaches to practice. Educational settings such as U.S. universities place emphasis on the necessity of diversity training, yet there isn't consistency regarding empirical data identifying the features of diversity training that contribute to its effectiveness (El-Amin, 2022; Holladay, & Quiñones, 2008; Madera et al., 2013; Weaver & Dixon-Kheir, 2002). There has been progress in research that has focused more on attitude change compared to skill-based or knowledge change (Paluck & Green, 2009; Perry et al., 2009). This may be due to researchers prioritizing attitude change or perhaps wanting to understand better why attitude change is a weaker outcome in diversity training compared to other outcomes (e.g., reaction, cognitive learning). An area of critique and criticism associated with measuring attitude change within diversity training is that diversity training subject matter challenges worldviews and deals with issues that are often considered emotional or subjective (Law, 1998). Thus, participants' starting points may vary regarding attitudes and emotional connections to the subject matter.

Issues, Controversies, Problems

Notwithstanding, as the marketplace for goods and services increases, so does the demand for diverse workforces (Aamodt, 2015). As a result, organizations must embody diversity within their operations. Simply having a diverse worker populace is no longer enough for an organization to be successful in today's difficult economy. Organizations must understand diverse cultures, diversity of thought, and various cultural philosophies. Organizational diversity promotes the individuality inside an organization, acknowledging that each person can contribute with different, modern, and novel ideas and solutions. Workers from a variety of backgrounds and experiences can supply a range of views on matters and for that increase productiveness and performance. Diversity incorporates various competencies while

increasing employee retention and productivity (Herring & Henderson, 2015). Affirmative action can be improved by implementing diversity, inclusion, belonging, and equity initiatives. Diversity programs must motivate high quality intergroup collaboration, reduce partiality and division, and promote principles of humanity (Aamodt, 2015). From the organization's viewpoint, diversity training is characterized as elevating inclusion about individuality within the work environment. Further, these distinctions restrict or enhance the way people collaborate while at work. Issues of Affirmative Action (AA), Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO), and sexual harassment are significant concerns, yet provide a massive opportunity to improve diversity, inclusion, equity, and belonging practices via training and appropriate evaluations of training.

University diversity training evaluations often follow a standard evaluation model used by other organizations, which too often tend to focus on participant reactions rather than assessing knowledge gained from a training (Bennett, 2006). Curtis and Dreachslin (2008) reports that affective-based outcome is the most common outcome evaluated within diversity training. Kalinoski, Steele-Johnson, D. Peyton, Leas, Steinke, and Bowling (2012) defined affective-based outcomes as "measures of internal conditions drive perception and behavior." Kraiger et al. (1993) definition includes "measure of attitudes and motivation." However, some research has suggested that training alone is not feasible for changing fundamental attitudes toward others (Bendick et al., 2001). This finding coincides with the idea that attitudes often assessed in diversity topics are usually strong and are commonly resistant to change (Dalege et al., 2016). This limitation seems rational considering a diversity training session in university settings is often one contact (one-offs) of one to three hours in duration. To hold the trainer responsible for changing a lifetime of nurtured attitudes within a highly constrained learning session should not be an expected outcome, although one cannot totally rule out the possibility. Attitudes often vary with encounters and other impressionable stimuli in moments. Further, as individuals advance through phases of self-reflection, they become more knowledgeable about the importance of effective workplace communication (Knapp et al., 2017). At the professional level, regardless of experience of individuals, the task focus is on increasing the individuals' awareness of the positive and negative impacts of diversity and inclusion; therefore, stakeholders must focus on reflection which enables individuals to progress towards greater levels of awareness. Likewise, implicit bias or bias creates a complex dynamic that should diminish with diversity training.

Research examining the effects of diversity training on cognitive-based outcomes is not as common as affective-based assessments, although the effects of cognitive-based outcomes has consistently been observed in past diversity training research as having effects for change (Holladay & Quiñones, 2008). Kalinoski et al. (2012) defines cognitive-based outcomes as "measures of verbal knowledge, knowledge organization, and cognitive strategies" based off Kraiger et al. (1993) definition. Kalinoski et al. (2012) meta-analytic evaluation of diversity training outcomes reported larger effects on cognitive-based outcomes relative to affective-based outcomes. Yet, cognitive-based post-training assessments are not a standard of diversity training evaluations because changing attitudes is a primary goal of diversity training, therefore affective-based outcomes are most frequently evaluated (Curtis & Dreachslin, 2008). Holding attitude change as the standard measurement for evaluating diversity training is analogous to being "in the weeds" (i.e. too problematic or so much work that it is too difficult to capture sustainability) of measuring outcomes and contributes to the overall mixed reviews of the beneficial effects of diversity training. Indeed, Kalinoski et al. (2012) proposed several reasons why measuring attitude change is problematic when assessing the effectiveness of diversity training. One reason is that trainees might already have favorable attitudes toward diversity prior to training, and current research methods

are unable to separate the effects of having a favorable attitude prior to training compared to the attainment level of favorable attitude post-training (correlation vs. causation).

There have been studies reporting evidence of successful diversity training attitudes that transferred to workplace settings (Majumdar et al., 2004; Roberson et al., 2009). However, there is no persuasive evidence, outside of "fuzzy" data, that long-term positive attitudes and affective outcomes from diversity training are sustainable. One reason is that reactions and attitudes are still volatile post-training and can be easily influenced by media and participant encounters. For example, someone who holds negative biases, prejudices, and stereotypes against Arab Muslims before participating in diversity training that address ethnicity, culture, and religion may experience a positive reaction and a positive shift in attitudes immediately post-training. Yet, this positive shift is delicate and may reverse back to pretraining attitudes in response to media accounts of Arab Muslim terrorism, social injustices in the Arab Muslim world, or negative encounters with Arab Muslims or those assumed to be Arab Muslims. Priming studies illustrate how salient positive vs. negative individual exemplars (e.g., Michael Jordan vs. OJ Simpson) have both been shown to curb attitudes toward Black American stereotypes (Dasgupta and Greenwald, 2001). Dasgupta and Greenwald (2001) conducted the experiment by examining whether exposure to pictures of admired and disliked exemplars can reduce automatic preferences for one identity group over another identity group (i.e., reducing preference for White American over Black American). The results revealed that exposure to admired Black Americans significantly weakened automatic pro-White attitudes for 24 hours beyond the treatment but did not affect explicit racial attitudes. The findings suggest that exposure can modulate implicit attitudes over the short-term as a reaction to the exposure. However, unlike a controlled testing environment, the types of exposure (positive vs. negative; good vs. bad; favorable vs. unfavorable) one can experience is beyond control, especially over the long-term.

In addition, Smith et al., (2006) has broadly criticized diversity research for the absence of guiding theory and an absence of agreement about the measurement of training effects. An outcome of "change" is often considered a primary goal of diversity training. What type of change? Who needs change? Why should one change? Change from what to what? How do you measure sincere change? Is change temporary or sustainable? Do all participants of a training receive the same change? Does change have utility for social and political interests? Research results are mixed. Bendick et al. (2001) suggests attitude change toward others is not a practical outcome of diversity training. Other research conducted has found positive effects on attitude change (Bailey et al., 2001; Robb & Doverspike, 2001). Research results evaluating affective-based outcomes are inconsistent (Kulik & Roberson, 2008b). Kalinoski et al. (2012) defines affective-based outcomes as "measures of internal states that drive perception and behavior" (p. 1082). There's evidence to support knowledge, and skill-based change albeit with inconsistent results (Paluck & Green, 2009; Perry et al., 2009). Inconsistent and mixed results from diversity training is directly an outcome of not being a discipline and not functioning under guided theory. Indeed, diversity programs are inclusive of many disciplines, broad conceptual and theoretical underpinnings, as well as varied interests and subject matter that has no borders and may even include competing values and interests. All that considered, Kalinoski et al. (2012) suggests the weaker and mixed research results say more about how researchers have evaluated diversity training than the effectiveness of diversity training. Diversity training often provokes more emotionally stimulated responses than other types of workforce training that is geared toward more decisive and agreeable job practices, thus much of literature treat diversity training as a separate branch of training (Hanover & Cellar, 1998; Law, 1998). The separation is due to content; however, the well-established training evaluation methodologies that are found in such fields as training and development, organizational and workforce development, organizational behavior, and

education are just as applicable to evaluating diversity training as other training. A case for utilizing these established and well reputed practices is presented next.

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Bezrukova et al. (2016) defines diversity training as a "distinct set of instructional programs aimed at facilitating positive intergroup interactions, reducing prejudice and discrimination, and enhancing the skills, knowledge, and motivation of participants to interact with diverse others" (p. 1228). A role of a diversity trainer is to encourage critical thinking in participants. Thus, diversity training may adopt a guided practice consisting of three interwoven stages: 1) exposing participants to innovative ideas, 2) facilitating understanding of the content, and 3) developing well-supported and reasoned arguments that challenge existing thinking.

The first stage is to expose participants to innovative ideas. The exposure can be represented in many different forms and has stronger effects when design and delivery combine different learning styles. According to Kolb and Kolb (2005), effective learning occurs when a learner "touches all the bases," including feeling, thinking, acting, or reflecting through combined and multi-instructional methods. Using the different technological tools and media offers the participant a wider contact zone with the target subject.

The second stage is to ease understanding of content. Combining different training approaches and methods is helpful to achieve this. For example, collaborative learning can be useful during discussion time. It focuses on preparing the learners to solve problems collaboratively in ambiguous situations. Knowledge exploration and application play significant roles in the learning process. Through collaborative learning, each participant can help their group identify or address a problem that reflects a wide range of perspectives and is thus more complete and more comprehensive. In addition, by using a constructive approach, participants are empowered in their own learning, and they lead the way by reflecting on their experiences. This process centers participants as co-constructors of their own learning. Creating an environment where participants feel psychologically safe questioning and reflecting on their own processes, either privately or in-group discussions is essential. It is also important to create diverse activities that lead the participants to reflect on their prior knowledge and experiences. Examples of diverse activities are videos and other eLearning, simulations, hands-on, role-playing, case studies, games, and trainer-led activities. Incorporating a thoughtful variety of activities into the program and training structure can help reach the greatest number of participants. Avery and Thomas (2004) mention the importance of infusing training with variety or providing perspective-broadening information to best reach and connect to all participants (Huber, 2013). Therefore, it is highly recommended to use various techniques and methods to peak participant interest and motivate interest in the material.

The third stage is to inspire participants to think beyond their existing knowledge. Through this stage, the participants can become thoughtful and critical thinkers. They will be able to evaluate what they see and hear, and present solid arguments. To reach this level, a trainer might assign participants to work in small groups and answer questions related to target subjects with supportive evidence based on their experiences. Through group work, every participant can share their own opinions with others and provide feedback to one another. Therefore, having participants work together provides opportunities for them to think critically while interacting with their peers.

Further, Bezrukova et al. (2016) meta-analytical research analyzed results from sixty-five (65) studies (N= 8465) and suggest that "a focus on proximal outcomes and on how we can design training to enhance those outcomes will benefit our understanding of diversity training" (p. 1077). Other researchers (e.g., Kulik & Roberson, 2008b) arrived at the same conclusion. Proximal outcomes include valid and reliable knowledge, and transferable skills gained by participants. In comparison, distal outcomes of diversity training include more diverse hiring rates and staffing goals, and an improved campus climate. Often, diversity training and programs are weighted heavily as a solution to distal outcomes and removes focus from accountability of leadership personnel, faculty, and other key staff personnel within a university structure charged with addressing personnel matters and student affairs. Continuous improvement of proximal training outcomes might eventually lead to improvement on distal outcomes, but it requires a cooperative effort with shared purpose in addition to training.

Again, the Kirkpatrick Model of Training & Evaluation has been a standard method globally for learning and development professionals for over 50 years (Kirkpatrick Partners, 2021). As a reminder to the previous introduction to the model, the evaluation method outlines four levels of outcomes that we might consider following a learning and development session: reaction, learning, behavior, and results. Level 1 (Reaction) and Level 2 (Learning) are straight forward common post-training evaluations. Participant reaction simply gauges how the participant felt about aspects of the training (e.g., the degree to which it was engaging and relevant). Participant learning simply gauges what was learned from the training. Levels 3 (Behavior) and 4 (Results) is undoubtedly more difficult to evaluate in a survey. Behavior gauges the degree to which participants apply what was learned during the training to their work environment. Results are demonstrated targeted outcomes because of the training. Levels 3 and 4 can be gauged in some manner by being deliberate to include questions that gauge participants interests and intentions to apply what they've learned and if they believe they will be successful. Although much of diversity outcomes are not fixed and can fluctuate due to contextual factors and human inconsistencies, by asking participants about their intended behavior and ability to achieve targeted outcomes can provide a much better evaluative judgement of the training outcomes (Ward, 2020). The Appendix is an example of a survey instrument utilizing the Kirkpatrick Model for a diversity training delivered to university graduate students within the broader topic of Workplace Respect (See Appendix). Levels 1 and 2 are required quantitative response sections within the instrument. Levels 3 and 4 assessments are embedded in the first quantitative response section of the instrument (see Level 1 section of Figure 1) and the optional response qualitative section following Level 1 responses.

Conducting a training program consisting of multiple sessions with a cohort presents opportunities to discover how the participants are learning (relative to cognitive outcomes) and what adjustments can be made collaboratively by the trainer and cohort by soliciting feedback from the cohort midway through a training series or periodically. Using a formative feedback tool is a method intended to provide opportunities to discuss the shared responsibility and continuous improvement toward intended results. Established instructional methods, program design, and assessment practices from the fields of education, training and development, and other disciplines dependent on teaching and learning methods are recommended resources for diversity training due to sharing a commonality of addressing psychosocial variables even though the subject matter of these disciplines are not as emotionally charged as diversity topics.

As a result, the Plus/Delta tool created by the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) at Iowa State University covers how to deliver, collect responses, and utilize the findings of the Plus/Delta feedback tool within diversity training (see Figure 2). Additionally, the upper-left column asks participants to identify what is working to enhance learning in the program. The lower-left column asks

Reconceptualizing Diversity Training Predictors of Training Success

Figure 1. Level 1 and optional section of instrument
Source: (Authors, 2022)

LEVEL I: REACTION	Strongly Disagree										Strongly Agree
1. I understood the learning objectives.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. I am confident that I will be able to apply what I learned in this session on the job?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. My learning was enhanced by the knowledge and experiences shared by the facilitator.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. I was comfortable with the pace of the program.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5. I found the room atmosphere to be comfortable.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6. I am committed to try to apply what I have learned.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7. I was engaged with what was going on during the program.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8. The activities and exercises aided in my learning, discovery, and/or reflection.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9. I would recommend this program to my co-workers if asked.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

(Optional) Please provide comments to help us improve this session in the future:

A. From what you learned and reviewed, what will you be able to apply as a graduate student in your department?

B. How committed are you to applying what you learned and reviewed to your work/academic environment?

C. What other feedback would you like to share?

Note. Response number 2 applies to Level 3: Behavior and optional response A. applies to Level 4: Results.

participants to identify what they are doing to enhance their learning in the program. The upper-right column asks participants to identify what needs to change or become better in the program to enhance learning. The hidden benefit of this question is that it does not lead participants to comment on a targeted quality of the program. Participants might identify content, delivery methods, trainer knowledge, or other features of the program. The lower-right column asks participants to identify what they need to do to enhance their learning in the program.

Anonymous feedback is typically collected online to provide "safety" to participants and allow critiques and criticisms without concern. However, anonymity may not be required for a cohort if relatedness, connections, mutual respect, and psychological safety are established prior to using the Plus/Delta feedback tool. The Plus/Delta questions can be offered online (e.g., Survey Monkey, Qualtrics, etc.) or delivered in-person in creative ways. For example, a four-quadrant chart could be drawn on "sticky note" wall pads and placed near the exits of the meeting room. Participants could be provided with "sticky notes" and place their responses in the appropriate quadrant while exiting after the session concluded. If desired, anonymity can be provided by the trainer exiting the meeting room first and then return to gather the feedback after participants have exited. Feedback gathered midway through a multiple session diversity series or program helps the trainer identify what changes can be made for the remaining sessions (e.g., new delivery and learning approaches) from what cannot change prior to the next time the topic is offered (e.g., content).

The Plus/Delta feedback and similar evaluation methods replicate the Continuous Improvement Model used in disciplines promoting organizational development and change. The term "continuous improve-

Figure 2. Plus/Delta tool example

Plus	Delta
What is helping me to learn in this training?	What changes are needed in this program to improve learning?
What am I doing to improve my learning in the diversity training series?	What do I need to do to improve my learning in this program?
Note. Adapted from the Plus/Delta tool created by CELT at Iowa State University	

ment" is used across industries to describe a process representing an ongoing effort to improve results (American Society for Quality, 2022). At the diversity training level, continuous improvement can refer to using timely, accurate data to regularly inform and improve trainer practice. Likewise, Flumerfelt and Green (2013) suggested continuous improvement allows relevant actors (i.e., trainers and participants) to reflect on their efforts, identify areas of improvement, try potential solutions to what needs to improve, observe, and evaluate interventions, and adapt interventions based on data collected (e.g., Plus/Delta). Diversity training evaluation methods improve when diversity trainers and administrators utilize valid and reliable outcome measuring tools, guided practices and methodologies, and research and established practices from disciplines that focus on educational and training deliveries and evaluations.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The implications of this chapter should be very appealing to diversity trainers and HR administrators involved in university-wide diversity initiatives. For instance, trainers and HR professional development administrators can focus on the quality of training and realistic evaluations, specifically as it relates to measuring cognitive-based learning outcomes rather than holding diversity training responsible for "moving the needle" as it relates to diverse hires and increased retention, as well as the accountability of the overall campus climate relating to diversity matters. Diversity trainers should have intense focus on the objective of helping people work effectively with different others. Trainers are accountable for the features of the training and assessing learning that will enable practitioners to continuously improve and enhance the transfer of learning from the training venue to where attendees perform their job. For example, Kulik and Roberson (2008), and Knippenberg and Schippers (2007) report significant effects from a variety of instructional methods, particularly delivery that includes social interaction. Social interaction is like a workshop style of delivery, which includes exercises and other forms of active delivery, rather than a training that is dominated by a passive delivery (e.g., lecture or video) format. Many current video-format diversity training has a testing component to assess what was learned. However, social interaction is missing, and video-format alone is often not the preferred choice when opportunities to

interact with trainers and other participants is an option. Evidence-based research comparing outcomes from different modes of delivery could verify if there are significant differences.

Another important characteristic of diversity training research concerns the lack of theoretical framework incorporated to guide inquiry. Paluck (2006) and Pendry et al. (2007) work on diversity training has been very influential in presenting investigative understandings on diversity training. Yet, Bezrukova et al. (2012) review reveals that diversity training remains fairly atheoretical in the ways they are conducted and evaluated. Evaluating diversity training will benefit and improve from developing theory-based training programs.

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions were presented as an example of theory-based guidance to help better understand dimensions of diversity within U.S. universities and consider non-identifiable diversity characteristics of training participants. Holladay et al. (2003) and Kaplan (2006) tried to better understand how participants' outcomes are influenced by the framing of diversity training. For instance, Holladay et al. (2003) concluded that a training frame using an inclusive and broader focus of the training (e.g., race, gender, and age, etc.), as opposed to a focus on one group (e.g., only gender) reduced participant criticisms and backlash. This outcome provides theoretical guidance toward inclusive characteristics (e.g., cultural dimensions) when attempting to offer training that focuses on a more general and inclusive approach and attempts outcomes that are better received by all participants regardless of individual identities.

Kirkpatrick's four level evaluation model has remained one of the most frequently used frameworks for the evaluation of training programs, yet it may be underutilized among diversity professionals unfamiliar with training and development evaluation methods within the branches of Human Resources and Management fields, including Leadership Studies, Organizational Development, Workforce Education, Organizational Change, and other disciplines focused on learning and performance. However, within standard diversity training, limitations exist with evaluating level three (behavior) and level four (results) of Kirkpatrick's model. Levels three and four are common university outcomes tied to diversity, and may include data on student enrollment, employee and student satisfaction, turnover, employee recruitment and selection, and promotions. Leadership must be supportive and are instrumental in providing necessary access and resources for longitudinal studies to better assess diversity training outcomes.

The Plus/Delta feedback tool was introduced as a continuous improvement evaluation method for diversity training covering multiple sessions (e.g., a series) with the same cohort. This tool asks participants to reflect on their continuous improvement and inform the changes needed for both the trainer and participants to enhance the learning experience. Unlike other conventional diversity training assessments, it helps participants take ownership and accountability of their role and think about what they can contribute to enhance the learning (i.e., PLUS), and what could improve in the training to help enhance their learning (i.e., DELTA) (Helminski & Koberna, 1995). Evidence-based research implementing a continuous improvement model would inform the utility of a continuous improvement approach to advancing diversity training outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Diversity training is the primary response to improving diversity initiatives. Yet, much of these goals are not practical of diversity training outcomes. While they are hopeful outcomes of training, these goals remove the focus of accountability from administrators, faculty, and human resources personnel. Diversity training is among the many "change traps" of higher education's diversity efforts. Change

traps is a term used to describe the same efforts done repeatedly to address diversity problems, yet with very few success stories to model. Reconceptualizing diversity training predictors of training success begins with the evaluation criteria and process. Diversity trainers must distinguish their responsibility from other university personnel when it comes to training outcomes. In other words, what determines a successful training? What outcomes are within the scope of a trainer's impact? Training interventions can be successful although institutional diversity goals are lagging due to the limitations of training and the collaborative effort required from a plethora of higher education personnel also charged with improving campus diversity goals. Institutional support is an important condition affecting longitudinal outcomes of diversity training.

REFERENCES

Aamodt, M. G. (2015). *Industrial/organization psychology: An applied approach* (8th ed.). Wadsworth/ Cengage. https://gcumedia.com/digital-resources/cengage/2015/industrialorganizational-psychology_an-applied-approach_ebook_8e.php

Aguinis, H., & Kraiger, K. (2009). Benefits of training and development for individuals and teams, organizations, and society. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*(1), 451–474. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163505 PMID:18976113

American Society for Quality. (2022). *Continuous improvement*. http://asq.org/learn-about-quality/continuousimprovement/overview/overview.html

Avery, D. R., & Thomas, K. M. (2004). Blending content and contact: The roles of diversity curriculum and campus heterogeneity in fostering diversity management competency. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *3*(4), 380–396. doi:10.5465/amle.2004.15112544

Bailey, A., Barr, O., & Bunting, B. (2001). Police attitudes toward people with intellectual disability: An evaluation of awareness training. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, *45*(4), 344–350. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2788.2001.00339.x PMID:11489056

Bendick, M., Egan, M. L., & Lofhjelm, S. M. (2001). Workforce diversity training: From anti- discrimination compliance to organizational development. *Human Resource Planning*, *24*, 10–25.

Bennett, J. (2006). Achieving race equality through training: A review of approaches in the UK. *The Journal of Mental Health Workforce Development*, *1*(1), 5–11. doi:10.1108/17556228200600002

Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K., & Spell, C. (2012). Reviewing diversity training: Where we have been and where we should go. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *11*(2), 207–227. doi:10.5465/amle.2008.0090

Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *142*(11), 1227–1274. doi:10.1037/bul0000067 PMID:27618543

Combs, G. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Diversity training: Analysis of the impact of self-efficacy. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *18*(1), 91–120. doi:10.1002/hrdq.1193

Curtis, E. F., & Dreachslin, J. L. (2008). Diversity management interventions and organizational performance. A synthesis of current literature. *Human Resource Development Review*, *7*(1), 107–134. doi:10.1177/1534484307311700

Dalege, J., Borsboom, D., van Harreveld, F., van den Berg, H., Conner, M., & van der Maas, H. L. J. (2016). Toward a formalized account of attitudes: The Causal Attitude Network (CAN) model. *Psychological Review*, *123*(1), 2–22. doi:10.1037/a0039802 PMID:26479706

Dasgupta, N., & Greenwald, A. G. (2001). On the malleability of automatic attitudes: Combating automatic prejudice with images of admired and disliked individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*(5), 800–814. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.81.5.800 PMID:11708558

Dorociak, K. E., Rupert, P. A., & Zahniser, E. (2017). Work life, well-being, and self-care across the professional lifespan of psychologists. *Professional Psychology, Research and Practice*, *48*(6), 429–437. doi:10.1037/pro0000160

El-Amin, A. (2022). Improving organizational commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging. In *Social Justice Research Methods for Doctoral Research* (pp. 208–221). IGI Global.

Gulick, L., Jose, I., Peddie, C., King, E., Kravitz, D., & Ferro, G. (2009). *Enhancing diversity training outcomes: How recognizing bias about bias will impact diversity-supportive behaviors and hiring decisions.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA.

Hanover, J., & Cellar, D. (1998). Environmental factors and the effectiveness of workforce diversity training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *9*(2), 105–124. doi:10.1002/hrdq.3920090203

Herring, C., & Henderson, L. (2015). *Diversity in organizations: A critical examination*. Routledge.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. *Sage (Atlanta, Ga.)*.

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, *2*(1), 1–26. doi:10.9707/2307-0919.1014

Holladay, C. L., & Quinones, M. A. (2005). Reactions to diversity training: An international comparison. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *16*(4), 529–545. doi:10.1002/hrdq.1154

Holladay, C. L., & Quiñones, M. A. (2008). The influence of training focus and trainer characteristics on diversity training effectiveness. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *7*(3), 343–354. doi:10.5465/amle.2008.34251672

Holladay, C., Knight, J., Paige, D., & Quiñones, M. (2003). The influence of framing on attitudes toward diversity training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *14*(3), 245–263. doi:10.1002/hrdq.1065

Huber, M. (2014). Treatment evaluation in the presence of sample selection. *Econometric Reviews*, *33*(8), 869–905. doi:10.1080/07474938.2013.806197

Huber, S. G. (2013). Multiple learning approaches in the professional development of school leaders—Theoretical perspectives and empirical findings on self-assessment and feedback. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *41*(4), 527–540. doi:10.1177/1741143213485469

Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, *71*(4), 589–617. doi:10.1177/000312240607100404

Kalinoski, Z. T., Steele-Johnson, D., Peyton, E. J., Leas, K. A., Steinke, J., & Bowling, N. A. (2012). A meta-analytic evaluation of diversity training outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1076–1104.

Kaplan, D. M. (2006). Can diversity training discriminate? Backlash to lesbian, gay, and bisexual diversity initiatives. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *18*(1), 61–72. doi:10.100710672-005-9005-4

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (2006). Seven keys to unlock the four levels of evaluation. *Performance Improvement*, *45*(7), 5–8. doi:10.1002/pfi.2006.4930450702

Kirkpatrick Partners. (2021). *The Kirkpatrick Model.* https://www.kirkpatrickpartners.com/the-kirkpatrick-model/

Knapp, S., Gottlieb, M. C., & Handelsman, M. M. (2017). Enhancing professionalism through self-reflection. *Professional Psychology, Research and Practice*, *48*(3), 167–174. doi:10.1037/pro0000135

Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. (2007). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *58*(1), 515–541. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085546 PMID:16903805

Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *4*(2), 193–212. doi:10.5465/amle.2005.17268566

Kraiger, K., Ford, J. K., & Salas, E. (1993). Application of cognitive, skill-based, and affective theories of learning outcomes to new methods of training evaluation. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(2), 311–328. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.78.2.311

Kulik, C. T., & Roberson, L. (2008a). Common goals and golden opportunities: Evaluations of diversity education in academic and organizational settings. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *7*(3), 309–331. doi:10.5465/amle.2008.34251670

Kulik, C. T., & Roberson, L. (2008b). Diversity initiative effectiveness: What organizations can (and cannot) expect from diversity recruitment, diversity training, and formal mentoring programs. In A. P. Brief (Ed.), *Diversity at work* (pp. 265–317). Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511753725.010

Law, D.Y. (1998). *An evaluation of a cultural diversity training program* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Auburn University.

Madera, J. M., King, E. B., & Hebl, M. R. (2013). Enhancing the effects of sexual orientation diversity training: The effects of setting goals and training mentors on attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *28*(1), 79–91. doi:10.100710869-012-9264-7

Majumdar, B., Browne, G., Roberts, J., & Carpio, B. (2004). Effects of cultural sensitivity training on health care provider attitudes and patient outcomes. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship: an Official Publication of Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing*, *36*(2), 161–166. doi:10.1111/j.1547-5069.2004.04029.x PMID:15227764

Paluck, E. L. (2006). Diversity training and intergroup contact: A call to action research. *The Journal of Social Issues*, *62*(3), 577–595. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00474.x

Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*(1), 339–367. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607 PMID:18851685

Pendry, L. F., Driscoll, D. M., & Field, S. C. T. (2007). Diversity training: Putting theory into practice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *80*(1), 27–50. doi:10.1348/096317906X118397

Perry, E. L., Kulik, C. T., & Field, M. P. (2009). Sexual harassment training: Recommendations to address gaps between the practitioner and research literatures. *Human Resource Management*, *48*(5), 817–837. doi:10.1002/hrm.20316

Robb, L. A., & Doverspike, D. (2001). Self-reported proclivity to harass as a moderator of the effectiveness of sexual harassment prevention training. *Psychological Reports*, *88*(1), 85–88. doi:10.2466/pr0.2001.88.1.85 PMID:11293058

Roberson, L., Kulik, C. T., & Pepper, M. B. (2009). Individual and environmental factors influencing the use of transfer strategies after diversity training. *Group & Organization Management*, *34*(1), 67–89. doi:10.1177/1059601108329732

Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001). The science of training: A decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*(1), 471–499. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.471 PMID:11148314

Sanchez, J. L., & Medkik, N. (2004). The effects of diversity awareness training on differential treatment. *Group & Organization Management*, *29*(4), 517–536. doi:10.1177/1059601103257426

Smith, T. B., Constantine, M. G., Dunn, T. W., Dinehart, J. M., & Montoya, J. A. (2006). Multicultural education in the mental health professions: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *14*(1), 132–145. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.132

Voss, R. S., Lucas, A. D., & Ward, S. A. (2014). Supranational culture II: Comparison of Schwartz value survey data against Hofstede, Globe, and Minkov as predictors of civilizational affiliation. *International Journal of the Academic Business World*, *8*(2), 63–76.

Ward, S. (2020). Reconceptualizing the teaching of ethics in a global classroom. *International Journal of Ethics Education*, *5*(1), 39–50. doi:10.100740889-020-00087-y

Weaver, V. J., & Dixon-Kheir, C. (2002). *Making the business case for diversity*. SHRM.

Winne, P. H. (2005). Key issues in modeling and applying research on self-regulated learning. *Applied Psychology*, *54*(2), 232–238. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2005.00206.x

ADDITIONAL READING

Chang, E. H., Milkman, K. L., Gromet, D. M., Rebele, R. W., Massey, C., Duckworth, A. L., & Grant, A. M. (2019). The mixed effects of online diversity training. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *116*(16), 7778–7783. doi:10.1073/pnas.1816076116 PMID:30936313

Conners, B., Johnson, A., Duarte, J., Murriky, R., & Marks, K. (2019). Future directions of training and fieldwork in diversity issues in applied behavior analysis. *Behavior Analysis in Practice*, *12*(4), 767–776. doi:10.100740617-019-00349-2 PMID:31976288

Devine, P. G., & Ash, T. L. (2022). Diversity training goals, limitations, and promise: A review of the multidisciplinary literature. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *73*(1), 403–429. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-060221-122215 PMID:34280325

Fantini, A. E. (2020). Reconceptualizing intercultural communicative competence: A multinational perspective. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, *15*(1), 52–61. doi:10.1177/1745499920901948

Hughes, C. (2018). Conclusion: Diversity intelligence as a core of diversity training and leadership development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *20*(3), 370–378. doi:10.1177/1523422318778025

James, K. (2019). Reconceptualizing identity in intersectionality: Using identity to dismantle institutionalized oppression in the communication discipline. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *42*(4), 412–416. doi:10.1080/07491409.2019.1682915

Janssens, M., & Steyaert, C. (2019). A practice-based theory of diversity: Respecifying (in) equality in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *44*(3), 518–537. doi:10.5465/amr.2017.0062

Liera, R., & Ching, C. (2019). Reconceptualizing "merit" and "fit": An equity-minded approach to hiring. In Higher Education Administration for Social Justice and Equity (pp. 111-131). Routledge.

Lumineau, F., Hanisch, M., & Wurtz, O. (2021). International management as management of diversity: Reconceptualizing distance as diversity. *Journal of Management Studies*, *58*(6), 1644–1668. doi:10.1111/joms.12686

Noon, M. (2018). Pointless diversity training: Unconscious bias, new racism, and agency. *Work, Employment and Society*, *32*(1), 198–209. doi:10.1177/0950017017719841

Onyeador, I. N., Hudson, S. K. T., & Lewis, N. A. Jr. (2021). Moving beyond implicit bias training: Policy insights for increasing organizational diversity. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *8*(1), 19–26. doi:10.1177/2372732220983840

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Affective-Based Outcomes: Perception and behavior are driven by measures of internal conditions.
Change Traps: The same efforts done repeatedly to address diversity problems.
Cognitive Learning: In diversity training, refers to the extent to which attendees acquire knowledge about cultural diversity issues conveyed by the trainer.

Continuous Improvement: A process representing an ongoing effort to improve results.

Diversity Training: A distinct set of instructional programs aimed at facilitating positive intergroup interactions, reducing prejudice and discrimination, and enhancing the skills, knowledge, and motivation of participants to interact with diverse others.

Social Cognitive Theory: Identifies how external forces (e.g., learned cultural norms) and internal forces (e.g., your thoughts) impact your learning.

APPENDIX

Figure 3a. Kirkpatrick model for a diversity training

Learning and Development Session Participant Survey

Session Title: _____

Delivered By: _____   Date: _____

The following training evaluation is derived from The Kirkpatrick Model of evaluating trainings. The result of this assessment helps the Professional Development Coordinator to strategically develop effective learning sessions. Upon completion of the learning session, participants are strongly encouraged to complete this evaluation form.

Instructions: Thinking about the session you just completed, please indicate to what degree you agree with each statement using this rating scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strongly Disagree										Strongly Agree

LEVEL I: REACTION	Strongly Disagree										Strongly Agree
1. I understood the learning objectives.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. I am confident that I will be able to apply what I learned in this session on the job?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. My learning was enhanced by the knowledge and experiences shared by the facilitator.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. I was comfortable with the pace of the program.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5. I found the room atmosphere to be comfortable.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6. I am committed to try to apply what I have learned.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7. I was engaged with what was going on during the program.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8. The activities and exercises aided in my learning, discovery, and/or reflection.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9. I would recommend this program to my co-workers if asked.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Figure 3b. Kirkpatrick model for a diversity training

(Optional) Please provide comments to help us improve this session in the future:

A. From what you learned and reviewed, what will you be able to apply as a graduate student in your department?

B. How committed are you to applying what you learned and reviewed to your work/academic environment?

C. What other feedback would you like to share?

After reading each statement, please select either True or False that best represents the materials, outcomes and takeaways conveyed in the learning session, even if it conflicts with your personal view.

LEVEL 2: LEARNING		
	TRUE	FALSE
10. Workplace civility usually is demonstrated through manners, courtesy, politeness, and general awareness of the rights, wishes, concerns, and feelings, of others.		
11. A weakness-focused social influence strategy is characterized by communications and expressions of how subordinates may impede goal striving and attainment.		
12. Workplace misunderstandings will naturally decrease with a very diverse workforce		
13. The differences among people have no influence on perspectives of what is appropriate or inappropriate behavior.		
14. Values, beliefs, attitudes, and norms are shaped by environmental and other nurturing influences since birth.		
15. It's often easier to agree on what behaviors are considered uncivil compared to agreeing on what are civil behaviors?		
16. Our cultural perspectives and lived experiences have no influence on how we understand our interactions		
17. If you are informed, and carefully contemplate and analyze a situation, then it's not possible for you to be wrong.		

Appendix A. Assessment for "Reducing Workplace Conflict: Promoting a Climate of Respect and Inclusion."   Created on 2/14/2020