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**Problem Statement**

Diversity programs have been offered for several decades but it is unclear if organizations have clear goals for the programs and if they are determining the effectiveness of the programs. Diversity programs are generally offered for a variety of reasons. For example, the organization may feel the training is the right thing to do, or they may want to improve organizational performance as a result of training. How will the organization know if the training was effective? It will have to select and use an evaluation method to make such a determination. The evaluation process provides an opportunity to match the outcome of the training to the goals of the training in an order to determine the training’s success.

Continued research regarding the effectiveness of diversity training is important because successful diversity training could help minimize issues that organizations currently face. For example, one issue is that organizations lose money due to discrimination and harassment. Over 468 million dollars in monetary benefits were recovered for individuals who filed discrimination charges in fiscal year 2005 (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC], 2006). On the other hand, the increase in global competition and off-shoring of resources and the challenges that those issues bring are of concern to organizations (Society for Human Resource Management [SHRM], 2006). Another issue is that foreign-born workers now comprise about 13 percent of the workforce in the United States, which means that more people from other cultures are working side-by-side with U.S.-born workers (U.S. Department of Labor, 2001). These are challenges that could be overcome though diversity training, but only if the training is effective. Organizations could learn how to increase productivity and tap
the innovation of its multicultural, age diverse, gender diverse workforce, and individuals could learn more to increase their respect for the colleagues who might be different than themselves.

Considering these and other challenges that diversity training attempts to overcome, a number of important questions regarding the effectiveness of diversity interventions should be answered. This research attempts to provide some of these answers. Are organizations that establish a thoughtful approach to diversity more likely to have clear goals for the diversity training they conduct? Are organizations that implement a diversity program to drive competitive advantage more likely to have rigorous program evaluation? How important is top-level management support for implementing a diversity program to drive competitive advantage? What impact does the size of the diversity program budget have on the rigor in program evaluation? Do organizations that implement a diversity program to drive competitive advantage take a multifaceted approach to training? Will the clarity of the diversity program goals be related to the rigor in program evaluation? Finally, is there a relationship between the clarity of goals of the diversity program and the alignment of the evaluation metrics to the goals of the program?

**Literature Review**

**Background**

According to Carr-Ruffino (1996), “the U.S. workforce is becoming dramatically more diverse at all levels” (p. 11). What is diversity? The literature shows that definitions vary. According to Clements and Jones (2002), “definitions range from
functional descriptions to humanistic statements advocating acceptance of ‘otherness’ and to fairly detailed and inclusive analyses that embrace personal qualities and characteristics.” A more simple definition is provided by Arredondo (1996), in which she describes diversity simply as individual human differences. She explains differences as age, culture, ethnicity, gender, language, physical disability, race, sexual orientation, and social class (Arredondo, 1996, p. 8). This definition is most closely related to others in the literature (Arai, Wanca-Thibault & Shockly-Zalabeck, 2001, p. 445; Loden & Rosener, 1991, p. 18).

These differences prompted the development of sensitivity training, a precursor to diversity training, in the late 1940’s and 1950’s in the United States. Sensitivity training enabled people to learn to cope with their feelings towards one another in the workplace. Then the civil rights movement in the 1960’s and the feminist movement in the 1970’s brought an increased awareness of differences of people in the workforce. Discrimination based on gender, race, and age was not uncommon. Coincidentally, equal opportunity laws resulting from acts of discrimination may have sent an unintended message that individual differences are only “skin deep” (Griggs & Louw, 1995, p. 79). However, discrimination was further perpetuated in the 1980’s and 1990’s with increased globalization, immigration, and the recognition of cultural differences. Equal rights were being demanded by other groups, such as homosexuals and disabled workers, who also suffered from discrimination.

Organizations have had to respond to discrimination and diversity in the work force. Carr-Ruffino (1996) states that “what is emerging is an approach that values diversity and develops corporate cultures that welcome and nurture all types of
employees” (p. 11). There are a variety of motivations behind diversity. For example, the number of white male workers entering the workforce is now rivaled by the number of women, African Americans, Hispanics and Asians (Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1997, p. 6). Also, this evolution of the workforce is requiring organizations to see differences not as a deficiency, rather as assets to be embraced in order to promote creativity within the organization (Layng, 2000, p. 68). On a related note, competitive advantage and organizational efficiency are often attributed to diversity in the workforce (Arai et al., 2001, p. 446). Cox and Blake (1991) say “organizations that fail to make appropriate changes to more successfully use and keep employees from different backgrounds can expect to suffer a significant competitive disadvantage compared to those that do” (p. 47).

In order to manage and take advantage of diversity, organizations developed diversity training. This training is often intended to create an awareness of others that would result in a change of behavior towards them, thereby improving relationships and dissolving discrimination and harassment in organizations (Carr-Ruffino, 1996, p. 530; Hemphill & Haines, 1997, p.47; Wentling & Palma-Riva, 1999, p. 216). Improved relationships can result in a reduction of discrimination claims, which can be very costly. For example, the EEOC (2006) recovered 91.3 million dollars for charging parties for sex discrimination alone in 2005. Research shows another advantage of diversity training, which is that it can positively impact attrition, stock price, and profitability (Hayles & Russell, 1997, p. 91). Diversity training can also improve the efficiency of organizations. The productivity of organizations is improved by enhanced relationships and increased trust, which are paramount for effectiveness (Griggs & Louw, 1995, p.13).
Despite their intended positive outcomes, the programs are not always effective. A poll of 785 human resource managers indicates that only one third of programs were identified as successful, while nearly half were perceived as having only mixed success, and a smaller share as being either largely or extremely unsuccessful (De Meuse & Hostager, 2001, p. 34). Other studies show few direct effects on performance that were either positive or negative (Connerly & Pederson, 2005; Kochan et al., 2003, p. 17).

Training Evaluation

In order to recognize whether the training outcomes are positive or negative, the training program will need to be evaluated. The evaluation process shows how well the results of the training meet its objectives (e.g., a measurable decrease in discrimination complaints), and if appropriate, by also showing a financial return on investment (e.g., a measurable increase in production) (Phillips, 1997, p. 33). Organizations want to see a financial return or some other measurable proof of return because they invest over 50 billion dollars annually on training (Clark & Kwin, 2005, p.34). According to Burton-Goss and Kaska (1998), “changing organizations are demanding clarity about the value-added of every expenditure, and training is certainly no exception” (p.263). Whether the goal is a financial change or an attitudinal change, the program must be evaluated to determine its effectiveness for achieving its goal.

Research shows organizations are conducting such evaluations, but not to a great degree. A study conducted of 785 human resource professionals by Rynes and Rosen in 1995 (as cited in Connerly & Pederson, 2005, p. 103) showed that less than one third of organizations evaluate their diversity training. Rather, they rely on indicators of success that include reduced litigation and complaints, increased diversity of personnel, and
increased reliance on human resource staff to resolve diversity-related issues. A more recent study conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management (2005) of 400 human resource professionals indicates that 56% of organizations collect measurements on diversity-related practices such as training. Eighty-six percent of those who offer diversity training say that their diversity training is effective.

Organizations may not be evaluating training and learning to a great degree because the process can be difficult. According to Kolb’s learning styles, one reason for this difficulty may be that individual differences influence learning styles, and learning styles influence how people respond to different training approaches. Another insight is related to Gagne’s theory of instruction, which suggests that there is no one best way to learn everything (Connerly & Pederson, 2005, p. 63). There also is the issue of self-efficacy, or the learners’ perceptions of their own ability to learn a new behavior (Connerly & Pederson, 2005, p. 96). If learners do not believe that they can perform differently as a result of training, they may not, in fact, perform differently. Last, environmental factors such as organizational changes and workspace design can influence behavior on the job. Such behavior changes might occur after the training but might not be a result of the training. These factors can be difficult to identify and isolate during the evaluation process and they can influence the results (Noe, 2005, p.178).

Clearly there are many factors to consider when discussing diversity programs. These factors include goals and support for the program, evaluation methods, the learners, and the outcome of the training. The following section identifies concerns and questions regarding several dimensions of these factors.
Diversity Training Goals

Organizations will have different approaches to diversity. According to Arai et al. (2001), “an organization’s approach to diversity training depends on the pressures they feel to diversify, the type of diversity required, and management’s attitudes and commitment to diversity in the organization” (p. 452). Approaches to diversity can include not only training programs, but also an implementation of systems and processes that will support organizational change (Baytos, 1995, p. 157). Burkart (1999) indicates that the approach should also include coaching and accountability systems. Once the organization identifies its approach to diversity, it is assumed that it will then identify its corresponding goals for the program.

The literature indicates that goals of diversity training vary. For some organizations it is to increase the bottom line by avoiding discrimination law suits (Clements & Jones, 2002, p. 17). According to Baytos (1995), training must “cause people to change their attitudes, or at a minimum act in a different way than they have previously.” But Hemphill and Haines (1997) say that training should be behavior oriented, aimed at developing workplace relationship skills and not at changing attitudes. Loden (1996) emphasizes yet a different approach, identifying the outcomes of training as “prejudice identification, bias reduction, and empathy building.” Whatever the reason, there should be a clear identification of goals prior to implementing the program. As Arai et al., (2001) state, “current research cautions against developing training programs without first creating a strong set of goals to guide the process” (p. 451). It appears then that an intentional relationship exists between the approach to diversity and the goals for diversity training, which leads to the first hypothesis.
Hypothesis 1: Organizations that establish a thoughtful approach to diversity are more likely to have clear goals for the diversity program.

Competitive Advantage of a Diverse Workforce

One of the goals for the diversity program may be to increase the organization’s ability to compete in the marketplace. Holladay et al. (2003) said “diversity training is no longer perceived as the socially responsible thing to do, instead, it is now viewed as a strategic business objective with the capability to make the organization more competitive” (p. 246). Other literature also indicates that organizations want to capitalize on their human assets for organizational gains such as competitive advantage (Cox & Blake, 1991, p. 47; Foster & Harris, 2005, p. 5; Ivancevich & Gilbert, 2000, p. 87; Loden & Rosener, 1991, p. 26; Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1999, p. 220; Wright et al., 1995, p. 284).

To realize that training is achieving this goal, organizations need to evaluate the effectiveness of the program at meeting this goal. The evaluation will determine the extent to which the transfer of learning takes place (Kirkpatrick, 1998, p. 16). The learning should result in a change in behavior on the job, such as an increase in productivity. While considering how to evaluate this transfer, Burton-Goss and Kaska (1998) propose that “regardless of the context in which training has been delivered, the goal is to collect and analyze appropriate data to determine the value and effectiveness of our efforts, and to make whatever design or delivery changes and improvements necessary to gain maximum benefits for the time and effort expended” (p. 265).

Organizations utilize a variety of evaluation techniques. The literature describes several common models. Clements and Jones (2002) describe a systems model in which
the objectives for the training are determined, then the outcomes of the training are identified, which is then followed by getting feedback regarding the ability to tie the outcomes to the objectives. Another model, the Kirkpatrick Four Level Model includes measurement at four levels: Level 1 – reaction, Level 2 – learning, Level 3 – behavior, Level 4 – organizational results. A similar model by Jack Phillips known as the ROI model is based on Kirkpatrick’s model but adds a fifth step of calculating return on investment (Clements & Jones, 2002, p. 143). Another model is Hamblin’s five stage model, also similar to the Kirkpatrick model: Level 1 - reaction; Level 2 - learning behavior; Level 3 - job behavior; Level 4 – functioning, or identifying quantifiable financial improvements in the organization resulting from training; Level 5 - Ultimate Value, which connects training to the vitality and growth of the organization (Clements & Jones, 2002, pp. 141-142).

Specifically regarding the evaluation of diversity training, Russell and Hayles (1997) state that evaluation techniques should be “qualitative and quantitative, formal and informal, perceptual and factual, analytical and intuitive, and observation and self-report – and it should cover at least the following components: program evaluation, representation, climate, best practices and benchmarks, external recognition, and overall organizational performance” (p. 134). Despite this recommendation, other research indicates that the primary focus of evaluation focuses on reactions or perceptions rather than learning and transfer outcomes ( Holladay & Quiñones, 2005, p. 530).

Considering that there are extensive evaluation methods that link to the outcome of the training to the goals for the training, and considering that a common goal for diversity training is to increase competitive advantage, it can be assumed that
organizations will use extensive evaluation methods to determine how effective their diversity training programs are at reaching this goal. This assumption leads to the second hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 2:** Organizations that implement a diversity program to drive competitive advantage will be more likely to have rigorous program evaluation.

**Senior Management Support**

When training programs are implemented to drive significant organizational strategies such as to increase its ability to compete in the marketplace, they may establish support for the training program at top levels of the organization. The literature shows that it is important to have executive-level support in order for diversity initiatives to be successful (Carr-Ruffino, 1996, p.527; Hayles & Russell, 1997, p.48; Kerka, 1998, p.3; Loden & Rosener, 1991, p. 161; Sonnenschein, 1997, p. 17). Top-level support is critical for the deployment of diversity programs because, according to Connerly and Pederson (2005), “leaders set the expectations for the company” and implementation of diversity programs fail without it (p. 16). Conspicuous commitment from the highest levels of the organization should be established to champion the program. “More than ceremonial lip service is required” states Ellis and Sonnenfeld (1994). It appears that leaders will drive and support initiatives that are important to the organization and that there could be a relationship between the initiative and the level of support. This concept is the foundation for the third hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 3:** Organizations that implement diversity programs to drive competitive advantage will have support and buy-in for the program at top levels of management.
**Budgeting for Diversity Programs**

Another demonstration of support for a program may be the budget for the program. The literature revealed that organizations in the United States spend between 200 and 300 million dollars annually on diversity training specifically (Arai et al., 2001, p. 446). This amount of funding may not be surprising when the emphasis on the importance of diversity programs is considered.

Given an ample budget for the program, the organization could apply some of the funding to the evaluation of the program. As previously discussed, evaluation methods can be extensive. With the proper budget the organization would be able to implement rigorous evaluation methods. The relationship between budget and evaluation is inferred by Phillips (1997) who states “the view from the top determines to what extent the HRD department will evaluate its efforts.” It is implied that if top levels of management place importance on the program, it will provide the means to evaluate its effectiveness. This relationship is the basis of the fourth hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 4:** The size of the diversity program budget will be positively related to the rigor in program evaluation.

**Breadth of Diversity Programs**

In addition to providing a budget for program evaluation, organizations are likely to provide enough funding to support a multifaceted approach to diversity. A multifaceted approach to diversity is characterized by offering more than a one-time training event. The program is also likely to include multiple types of diversity training, in addition to other events such as social networks, coaching, and cultural awareness activities. Literature supports that training should not be the sole source to affect
organizational change, nor should it be one-time event (Cox & Blake, 2005, p.53; Plummer, 1998, p. 183). Wentling & Palma-Rivas (1999) take it further to suggest that diversity training should be specifically linked to leadership training, team building, and total quality management to be most effective.

As stated earlier, diversity may lead to competitive advantages (Cox & Blake, 2005, p. 54). Considering that organizations are implementing diversity programs to drive competitive advantage, they may offer training focused on leadership training and team building in order to increase organizational efficiency and agility. Studies show productivity gains of 10 to 15 percent as a result of having culturally diverse teams (Hayles & Russell, 1997, p.4). According to Carr-Ruffino (1996), organizations that support and care for all employees enjoy a variety of benefits that include recruiting and keeping the best talent, increasing organizational agility, growing and retaining its market share, and increasing productivity. An assumption might be made that to improve organizational performance, different types of diversity training is needed at different levels in the organization. This assumption leads to the fifth hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 5:** Organizations that claim to value diversity in order to drive competitive advantage take a multifaceted approach to training.

**Goals for Diversity Training**

The diversity program may have clear goals such as to drive competitive advantage. However, that drive may not be the only goal for the program, or the organization’s goal may be entirely different. As stated earlier, the goals for diversity programs vary, and a strong set of goals need to be defined before implementing the program (Arai et al., 2001, p. 451). Also stated earlier, it is the purpose of the evaluation
process to link the outcomes of the training to the goals of the training. Therefore, it is important that the measures of success for the program are identified before implementing the program as well. Literature suggests that the program must be aligned with specific business issues as well as other organizational initiatives whose goals should be clearly identified based on a thorough needs assessment (Hayles & Russell, 1997, p. 51; Connerly & Pederson, 2005, p.104; Kerka, 1998, p. 3). Therefore, it may be assumed that the clarity of goals for the program may have a direct correlation to the rigor in program evaluation as well as to the evaluation metrics for the program. These assumptions are the foundation for the remaining hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 6:** The clarity of goals for the diversity program will be positively related to the rigor in program evaluation.

**Hypothesis 7:** There will be a positive relationship between the clarity of goals for the diversity program and the alignment of evaluation metrics with those same goals.

Given the challenges of the evaluation process such as identifying clear goals for the training and tying the outcome of the training back to those goals, the need for research on determining the effectiveness of diversity training is important. The next section describes research that was conducted to determine if there is support for the seven hypotheses described in this section.
METHODS

Overview

This research was conducted to identify relationships between different dimensions of diversity training programs, particularly regarding the relationship between the objectives and the effectiveness of the training.

Survey

A 17-question survey was designed to elicit responses that might provide evidence to support the hypotheses. The survey was first piloted to a six-person group that included human resource directors, training managers, and trainers. Revisions were made to the survey and then the protocol was sent to the Office of Research Subject Protections at George Mason University where it was approved by the Human Subjects Review Board for distribution. The survey was setup and deployed using a commercial internet-based survey hosting service called Zoomerang™. The survey was designed so that recipients were not required to answer any of the questions and could opt out at any point. It can be viewed in Appendix A.

The survey was available to the 316 recipients for a period of 11 calendar days. At the time it was closed, a total of 43 completed surveys had been received, resulting in a 14% response rate. An additional 26 people, or 8%, responded by either partially completing the survey or by declining the invitation to participate in the survey. The remaining 247, or 78%, did not reply or take any action on the survey.

Sample

The sample group was comprised of 316 people whose names and email addresses were collected from articles published in Training & Development magazine,
from public websites of corporations, government agencies, and institutions of higher education, as well as from a voluntary networking hub available to members of the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD). Only those who had titles of chief learning officer, diversity officer/director/manager, human resources officer/director/manager, training director/manager, organization development practitioner, trainer, or consultant were selected for the survey. The sample included representatives from a variety of for-profit, non-profit, colleges and universities, and government agencies of small- to large-size from location across the United States and Canada.

Results

Job Titles of Survey Participants

The responses to the survey are confidential, therefore no specific identifying information was asked of the participants. However, they were asked to identify their role in the organization. The role most represented in the organizations is the training director or manager with 61.5% of the responses, followed by the human resources officer/manager/director with 20.5% of the responses. See graph 1.
Organization Size

Most of the participants are employed by organizations with at least 500 employees. The majority of the participants work in organizations with over 1,000 employees (25%), closely followed by those who work in organizations with 501 – 1,000 employees (22.5%) and organizations with over 5,000 employees (22.5%). The next significant group is those who work for organizations with between 51 and 500 employees. Only one person reported working for an organization with fewer than 50 employees. See graph 2.

Organization Type

The participants also were asked to identify the type of organization for which they work. The majority of respondents work for privately owned companies (41%) followed by those who work for not-for-profit organizations and publicly traded companies (both at 18%). The category with the fewest participants is “Other”, of which two were identified as a college or university. The other two were insurance and transportation. See graph 3.
Diversity Approach

The participants were asked if their organization had an overall approach to diversity that guides all diversity-related programs and training. Most organizations do have a thoughtful approach as 57.5% of the respondents indicated. The remaining 42.5% of the respondents work in organizations that do not have an overall approach to diversity, or they did not know if the organization had an approach to diversity. See graph 4.
Though 23 respondents indicated that they have an approach to diversity, 29 respondents identified the approach that their organization takes towards their diversity program. The majority of respondents (28.6%) indicated that their organization takes a multi-faceted approach to training, meaning that training is one component of their diversity approach. For example, one organization has a mandatory online course followed with a mandatory diversity awareness course while supervisors must also attend training to learn how to manage diversity on their teams. 24.1% of the respondents indicated that they use several instructional methods over time, such as instructor-led training and web-based training. See graph 5.

![Graph 5](image)

The 17 respondents who indicated that their organization did not have an approach to diversity, or did not know if their organizations had an approach to diversity, were asked to proceed to the last question in the survey. There were 18 responses to the final question in the survey that implies that one respondent who should not have answered that question provided an answer. Most organizations that did not have an
approach to diversity indicated that a need for diversity training had not been identified (50%) while others cited some form of constraint as the next reason. See graph 6.

![Graph 6: Reason for Not Implementing Diversity Training](image)

**Frequency of Responses**

In addition to asking about characteristic data of the sample group and whether or not their organization had an approach to diversity, respondents also answered more detailed questions regarding their approach to diversity. Those whose organizations did not have an approach to diversity were asked not to respond to these questions, though some did. See table 1 for frequencies of responses.
Table 1: Frequency of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Please describe your organization’s diversity initiatives.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Select the response that best represents the reason for implementing the diversity program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EEOC complaint/compliance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Right thing to do/social good</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To improve organizational performance and/or attract and retain talent to drive competitive advantage</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Please select the option that best describes your approach to diversity. Choose the one best response from the following scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One time training event to train employees who were available at the time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Repeat the same training event to get the most or all employees to attend</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use several instructional methods to deliver the training over a period of time</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In addition to training, accountability for a positive change in behavior has been identified</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A multi-faceted approach to diversity is used and performance results are linked to that approach</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Please rate the clarity of the goals and objectives for specific diversity training that has been conducted in your organization. Select one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unclear</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Somewhat clear</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Very clear</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Select the instructional methods used to deliver diversity training. Check all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Instructor-led training</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Computer-based training</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Web-based training</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Video</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Self-paced reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Are metrics for determining the success of the training established before implementing a diversity program? Select one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>If you answered “yes” to the previous question, select how clearly the evaluation metrics were aligned to the goals for the program. Select one. If you selected “no” or “don’t know”, please skip this question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unclear</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Somewhat clear</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Very clear</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12.        | Please select the evaluation approaches most commonly used to evaluate diversity training or events in your organization. Check all that apply.  
- None                                               | 2         |
- Administer a reaction survey                       | 21        |
- Test knowledge or skill gained at the end of the training | 12        |
- Compare gains in knowledge or skill using a pre- and post-test | 5         |
- Administer a pre- and post-test assessment to both training participants and a control group that are randomly assigned | 0         |
- Measure changes in behavior on the job to determine transfer of training | 9         |
- Measure objective changes in business unit or organizational performance as a result of training | 6         |
- Other                                               | 5         |
| 13.        | How much does your organization budget for diversity-related programs in one year? | 4         |
| 14.        | Please estimate the cost per diversity program for the delivery of the program. | 7         |
| 15.        | Please estimate the cost per diversity program for evaluation of the program. | 0         |
| 16.        | Who influences and helps set direction for your organization’s overall diversity approach? Select all that apply.  
- CEO or most senior leader                           | 20        |
- Executives                                         | 18        |
- Diversity Officer/Director/Manager                  | 10        |
- Middle Management                                   | 3         |
- HR/Training/Organizational Learning & Development   | 22        |
- Employees                                          | 8         |
| 17.        | Only answer this question if you replied “no” or “don’t know to question 4. Please indicate a reason why your organization may not have implemented diversity training. Check all that apply.  
- Budget constraints                                  | 2         |
- Other resource constraints                          | 2         |
- A need for this training has not been identified    | 9         |
- Don’t know                                          | 2         |
- Other                                               | 3         |
Descriptions of Statistics

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of each question specifically correlated for the hypotheses including the minimums, maximums, mean, and standard deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#6. Select the response that best represents the reason for implementing the diversity program. Please choose the one best response. (min. = 0; max = 1) *EEOC complaint compliance (value = 0) *Right thing to do/social good (value = 0) *Other (value = 0) *To improve organizational performance and/or attract and retain talent to drive competitive advantage (value = 1)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7. Please select the option that best describes your organization’s overall approach to diversity. Chose the one best response from the following scale. (min. = 1; max = 5) *One-time training event to train employees who were available at the time (value = 1) *Repeat the same training event to get most or all employees to attend (value = 2) *Use several instructional methods to deliver the training over a period of time (value = 3) *In addition to training, accountability for a positive change in behavior has been identified (value = 4) *A multi-faceted approach to diversity is used and performance results are linked to that approach (value = 5)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8. Please rate the clarity of the goals and objectives for specific diversity training that has been conducted in your organization. Select one. (min. = 1, max = 4) *Unclear (value = 1) *Somewhat clear (value = 2) *Clear (value = 3) *Very clear (value = 4)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11. If you answered “yes” to the previous question (#10), select how clearly the metrics were aligned to the goals for the program. Select one. If you selected “no” or “don’t know”, please skip this question. (min. = 2; max = 3) *Unclear (value = 1) *Somewhat clear (value = 2) *Clear (value = 3) *Very clear (value = 4)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16. Who influences and helps set direction for your organization’s overall diversity approach? Select all that apply. *If any of these, value = 0: Employees, HR/Training/Organizational Learning &amp; Development, Middle Management, Diversity Officer/Director/Manager *If any of these, value = 1: Executives, CEO or most senior leader *If selected options from both sets, value = 2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test of Hypotheses

To examine the hypotheses in this study, correlations between variables of interest for each hypothesis was conducted to determine the strength and direction of the relationships.

The first hypothesis predicted that organizations that establish a thoughtful approach to diversity are more likely to have clear goals for the diversity training they conduct. To test this prediction a question asking if the organization established an overall approach to diversity was correlated with a question asking about the clarity of the goals for the diversity training \((r = -.33, p < .01)\). There is a relationship and the correlation is in the expected direction. It was expected in this direction because it would seem likely that organizations that make an effort to design an approach to diversity would extend that effort into establishing clear goals for the outcome of the program. The respondents were provided a scale regarding the clarity of goals ranging from “not clear” to “very clear.” There were 10 organizations \((n=29)\) that indicated organizations had unclear or somewhat clear goals while 19 indicated that their goals were clear or very clear. Perhaps the relationship would have been significant if there were more respondents.

The second hypothesis predicted that organizations that implement a diversity program to drive competitive advantage will be more likely to have rigorous program evaluation. This hypothesis was tested by correlating a question asking the respondents to identify the reason they implemented a diversity program with a question asking them to identify all the methods used to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs \((r = .46, p < .01)\).
Most respondents (76%) indicated that their approach was to drive competitive advantage. However, the researchers summed the number of methods to create a continuous variable to correlate with the reasons for implementing the program. This was done because question 12 in the survey provided 7 choices of training evaluation methods. The researchers decided that organizations that use more than one evaluation method have rigor in the evaluation process. Therefore, a value of zero was assigned to the response “no evaluation”; then the researchers totaled the number of choices when the respondents selected one or more of the remaining options. The correlation was made using the sum of these selections, which the researchers used to indicate rigor.

The third hypothesis predicted that organizations that implement a diversity initiative in order to drive competitive advantage will have support and buy-in at top levels of management. Instances when organizations identified competitive advantage as the one reason for their diversity initiative were correlated with instances when organizations selected either the “CEO or other top leader” and/or “Executives” to indicate top-level support ($r = .46, p < .01$). The researchers created a three level continuous variable for top-level support with values of 0, 1, and 2. The choices of “Diversity Officer”, “Middle management”, “HR/Training/Organizational Learning & Development”, and “Employees” were assigned a value of 0 as they are considered lower-level support. The individual choices of “CEO or other top leader” and “Executives” were assigned a value of 1. When both “CEO or other top leader” and “Executives” were selected the response was assigned a value of 2. Top-level support was defined as having a value of either 1 or 2.
The fourth hypothesis predicted that the size of the diversity program budget will be positively related to the rigor in program evaluation. To test this hypothesis the budget for the annual budget for diversity-related programs was compared with the evaluation approaches most commonly used by the organizations ($r = .62, p > .1$). The results were in the expected direction however our analysis did not have sufficient power due to the low sample size ($n = 4$). A larger sample may provide better data to strengthen the correlation.

The fifth hypothesis predicted that organizations that claim to value diversity in order to drive a competitive advantage take a multifaceted approach to training. The hypothesis was tested by correlating the reason why the organization implements the program with the number of instructional methods used to deliver the training ($r = .57, p < .05$). The researchers defined a multifaceted approach as using more than instructional method to deliver training. The respondents were provided the opportunity to select multiple delivery methods. Those who selected more than one delivery method were correlated to those who selected a competitive advantage as their approach.

The sixth hypothesis predicted that the clarity of the goals for the diversity program will be positively related to the rigor in program evaluation. It was tested by comparing how clearly the respondents indicated the goals of their training are with the training evaluation approaches most commonly by them ($r = .43, p < .05$). The clarity of goals question used a scale to identify clarity with the range of being unclear (value = 1) to being very clear (value = 4). The rigor in program evaluation was determined by summing the number of evaluation methods used by the organization. This sum was correlated to the clarity of goals and showed a significant correlation.
The final hypothesis predicted that there will be a positive relationship between the clarity of the goals for the diversity program and the alignment of the evaluation metrics with those same goals. To test this hypothesis the respondents were asked to rate the extent to which the goals for the training were clear. They also were asked to rate the extent to which the alignment of the evaluation metrics with the goals for the training was clear. By comparing them (r = .34, p > .1) the researchers could see that the relationship was in the expected direction. Both questions used a scale to identify clarity with the range of being unclear (value = 1) to being very clear (value = 4). Though 19 (n=29) organizations responded that their goals for diversity training are clear or very clear, only 9 (n=14) organizations responded that their evaluation metrics were clearly aligned to those goals. Perhaps if there were more responses the relationship might be significant. Also, the lower number of responses to the second question may have influenced the correlation since the number of responses was not the same.

**Discussion**

In most cases the primary data support the hypotheses for this study. There are several data points worthy of further discussion. While the literature suggests that diversity programs be managed by a designated diversity officer or manager (Arai et al., 2001, p. 453; Hayles & Russell, 1997, p.71), the survey shows that 82% of the respondents were staff that had human resources or training management titles. Only 4.7% of the respondents were diversity officers. There were only three replies to the original email inviting people to participate in the survey that were received in which the recipient indicated that the diversity training function was managed by a diversity officer.
or equal employment opportunity officer rather than themselves (the three original recipients were training managers).

Most of the recipients who responded to the survey work in organizations that have over 500 employees. The data show that the larger the organization is, the more likely they are to have an approach to diversity though this relationship was not statistically significant. The majority of the sample group represents organizations that are privately owned. Within the sample group, organizations that are privately owned are less likely to have an approach to diversity.

Slightly more than half of the organizations surveyed indicated that they have an overall approach to diversity that guides all of their diversity-related programs and training. The data is inconsistent because the respondents who indicated that their organizations did not have an approach to diversity were asked to not answer the subsequent questions other than the very last question. However, 23 respondents indicated their organization had an approach, yet 29 respondents indicated the type of approach that their organization took towards diversity. This is true of most of the subsequent questions in the survey. Though the respondents had the choice to answer “yes”, “no”, or “don’t know” to the question asking if their organization has an approach, some chose not to answer it. 23 replied “yes”, 15 replied “no”, and 2 replied “don’t know.”

The first hypothesis predicted that organizations that establish a thoughtful approach to diversity are more likely to have clear goals for the diversity training they conduct. The relationship between the approach and the clarity of the goals was not evident, however. The approach to diversity programs was identified in the survey as a
range from simple (one time training event to train employees who were available at the time) to complex (a multifaceted approach to diversity is used and performance results are linked to that approach). The assumption was that if an organization has put together a well-planned approach to valuing diversity or to implementing a diversity initiative, then that planned approach would carry through to the establishment of clear goals for the related training. The relationship between these variables might not have been established because of the response choices devised for the survey. The intent was to provide choices that would display a range of options ending with the most sophisticated option. However, the intent and meaning of “a multifaceted approach” might not have been clear and therefore should have been more explicitly described. It was not consistently described as the others were with the emphasis on the training component.

The second hypothesis predicted that organizations that implement a diversity program to drive competitive advantage will be more likely to have rigorous program evaluation. The data show a significant correlation between these variables. The respondents were asked to select the one response that best represents the reason for implementing the diversity program. 76% indicated their reason was to improve organizational performance and/or attract and retain talent to drive competitive advantage.

The assumption about this relationship is that if organizations provide resources to improve its ability to compete, then it would want to know that its tactics to improve this ability have been working. Therefore, if diversity training is one of the tactics, then it would be rigorously evaluated to prove its effectiveness. The data show that
organizations use at least five different methods of varying rigor to evaluate their diversity programs. Two organizations did not evaluate their programs at all, however.

The third hypothesis predicted that organizations that implement a diversity initiative in order to drive competitive advantage will have support and buy-in at top levels of management. A strong relationship was found between these variables. The researchers defined top levels of management as the chief executive officer (CEO) and other executives. These survey choices carried weight whereas the remaining choices, such as human resource managers and training managers, did not. CEOs and other executives were selected 38 times, whereas human resources managers were selected 22 times as the level at which support for the program exists. The assumption is that upper management is most likely to have the responsibility to establish organizational strategies, and that competition in the market place is often a strategy they pursue. Therefore if the organization wants to be competitive, it will implement tactics to reach that goal. A tactic may be the establishment of an internal framework to increase its ability to compete, including performance improvement measures such as training and education.

The fourth hypothesis predicted that the size of the diversity program budget will be positively related to the rigor in program evaluation. The survey results were in the expected direction but the correlation was not significant. The sample group was asked to provide the annual budget for their organization’s diversity-related programs, however only four people responded with a monetary value. As a result, there was little data to correlate. The survey responses ranged from $4,000 to $100,000. Several comments were provided that indicated their budget for diversity training was not separate from the...
general training budget. The assumption was that if given an ample budget for the program, then the organization would allocate some of that money towards evaluating the effectiveness of it. Conversely, if not given an ample budget, then there would be less rigor in evaluation, if any evaluation. Unfortunately, this relationship could not be determined due to the size of the sample data and the possible fact that diversity program budgets are embedded in entire organizational training budgets.

The fifth hypothesis predicted that organizations that claim to value diversity in order to drive a competitive advantage take a multifaceted approach to training. This correlation proved significant. It is assumed that if the organization is going to use diversity for its competitive advantage, then it will use training and education in addition to other types of activities to promote and value diversity.

Some survey respondents indicated various approaches that their organizations take to diversity programs. In addition to training, some organizations also hold cultural potluck lunches, celebrate Black History Month, and they host cultural dance and music festivals. One organization holds audio conferences and publishes articles about diversity in the employee newsletter. Some have employee network groups, and some organizations offer diversity training in conjunction with sexual harassment and multicultural awareness training.

It is assumed that in order to maintain a competitive advantage that many levels of employees would need to have a variety of skills. For example, it would be doubtful that a diversity program that only provides an awareness of diverse people would have an impact on an organization’s ability to compete in the marketplace. However, a diversity program that is comprised of separate training events for executives (perhaps focused on
leadership), sales people (perhaps focused on understanding diverse markets), and
customer service (perhaps focused on communicating with multicultural customers)
might have an impact on an organization’s ability to compete in the marketplace.

The next hypothesis predicted that the clarity of the goals for the diversity program will be positively related to the rigor in program evaluation. There was a significant correlation between these variables. 90% of those responding to the question about clarity of goals felt that their goals had some clarity, which ranged from somewhat clear to very clear. The researchers considered rigor to include using multiple evaluation methods and using sophisticated evaluation methods. In addition to the evaluation methods provided as choices in the survey, some respondents indicated that their organization also use an annual “changes in climate” survey (assumed to be organization or marketplace climate), an equal opportunity/affirmative action survey, and a culture survey in the organization as forms of program evaluation.

The assumption is that if the goals for the diversity program are clear, then it would be likely that organizations would evaluate the programs with some rigor. When goals are clear, evaluation is easier because the metrics have been established and can be measured against. Also, if the effort was made to make the goals clear, then it was expected that the same effort would be made to know that the program had achieved those goals. The data show that organizations have clear goals for the program and they rigorously evaluate them.

The final hypothesis predicted that there will be a positive relationship between the clarity of goals for the diversity program and the alignment of the evaluation metrics with those same goals. The researchers speculated that organizations that establish clear
goals and outcomes for their diversity program will also ensure that the metrics they use to evaluate the program will align with the goals for the program. The data did not show a significant relationship between these variables though the relationship was in the expected direction. One reason for this may be because there was a small sample size of the responses to the question about the alignment of the evaluation metrics with the goals. There were only 14 responses to this question, and none of them identified their goals as being very clear.

However, this result is unexpected because common training evaluation methods rely on associating the training outcomes to the designed objectives for the training. For example, Hussey (1996) states that, “objectives should be clearly defined for each plan or programme, so that the reason for it is understood, and the expected results made specific” (p. 47). Again, the sample size may have influenced the data results and thereby caused a contradiction to common practice explained in the literature.

Overall, four of the hypotheses were supported by significant correlations in primary data. A survey of the literature also supports most of the hypotheses. However, some literature contracts the data results. The insignificant correlations and varying support of the literature may be a result of the relatively small sample size of the survey responses.

Limitations

There were two primary limitations to this research. They are the size of sample population and the survey tool functionality. First, the size of the sample population was not significant. Though the survey was sent to 316 people, the response rate for completed surveys was only 14% (n = 43). It would have been most desirable to have
been able to send the survey to a large enough target group resulting in several hundred responses, however the ability to gain access to membership directories or other means to collect contact information of the appropriate people in the targeted positions for this study was very limited. Additionally, it is difficult to assume specifically who, within each organization, had access to the information that was to be asked of them. Ten of the 316 survey recipients (3%) responded to say that they did not have responsibility for diversity training in their organization.

In addition to the sample size, particular functionality in the survey tool may have complicated the results. For example, the fourth question in the survey asks “*Has your company established an overall approach to diversity that guides all diversity-related programs or training? Select One. If you select “No” or “Don’t know” please proceed to question 17.*” The survey software did not provide the ability to force the respondents to question 17 if they answered “no” or “don’t know.” As a result, some of the respondents answered “no” or “don’t know” yet they continued to answer the survey questions that they should not have been answering. This issue was realized when an analysis of the responses revealed that 23 respondents selected “yes” but 29 responses were received for most of the subsequent questions. The 23 that selected “yes” should have been the only ones to be allowed to continue answering the questions. A probable reasons why a person may have responded to question 4 and the subsequent questions is that they might not have understood that the subsequent questions were indicators that their organization has an approach to diversity. If this was the case and if question 4 was answered incorrectly, the number of organizations that have an approach to diversity would be higher than indicated.
**Future Directions**

The literature review indicates that the evaluation of diversity programs to determine how effective they are is not practiced in a standard fashion, though primary data shows it is practiced with rigor. While organizations appear to face various risks in regards to organizational performance and talent management, they should do what they can to mitigate those risks and valuing diversity might be a step in the right direction. As organizations are faced with competing in a global economy, off-shoring their workforce, trying to replace large numbers of retiring baby boomers with younger staff, hiring people from diverse cultures, responding to changing laws and mandates resulting from discrimination charges, and tapping the creativity and innovation within its own staff, they could leverage diversity training to help achieve these goals. However, diversity training would only be a good investment of resources if it is proven to work.

Ideally, additional research should take place in a variety of organizations where control groups and pre- and post-tests of knowledge and behavior can be provided so that the effectiveness of diversity programs can be more objectively studied. Ample time is needed to look for long-term results, and environmental factors need to be monitored to identify if any changes in the organization might influence the outcome of the training such as acquisitions, organizational restructuring, leadership changes, etc. By conducting such research, compelling arguments can be made for establishing and maintaining effective and successful diversity programs.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, most hypotheses were supported by primary and secondary data. Organizations that establish a thoughtful approach to diversity are not necessarily more
likely to have clear goals for their diversity training programs. Organizations that implement diversity programs to drive competitive advantage are more likely to have a rigorous program and also have support for the program at top levels of management. The size of the diversity program budget is not related to the rigor in program evaluation. However, the clarity of the goals is related to the rigor in program evaluation. Finally, there is not a significant relationship between the clarity of the goals of the diversity program and the alignment of metrics to the goals of the program.

While the primary data did not support each of the hypotheses, there is one source in the literature that supports much of this research. In a study conducted by Arai et al. (2001) of characteristics of successful diversity training programs, they found that “…training adoption was associated with (1) larger sized organizations, (2) positive top management beliefs about diversity, (3) high strategic priority of diversity relative to other competing objectives, (4) presence of a diversity manager, and (5) existence of a large number of other diversity-supportive policies” (p. 453). Clearly there is much interest in diversity training programs and the effectiveness of these programs, yet much research still to take place.
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Appendix A

This is the online survey that was administered from November 9, 2006 through November 19, 2006 using a web-based tool called Zoomerang™.

Thank you for taking time to consider this survey. Please review these notes and then click on the arrow to take the survey.

Informed Consent - This research is being conducted to collect evidence that supports my hypothesis that there will be a positive relationship between the clarity of the goals of the diversity training program and the likelihood that the effectiveness of the program will be evaluated.

Risks - There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research.

Benefits - There are no benefits to you as a participant other than to further research in the study of diversity training programs and the evaluation of training.

Confidentiality - The data in this study will be confidential. Names and other identifiers will not be collected. While it is understood that no computer transmission can be perfectly secure, reasonable efforts will be made to protect the confidentiality of your transmission.

Participation - Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the survey at any time and for any reason. If you decide not to participate or if you withdraw from the survey, there is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. There are no costs to you or any other party.

Contact - In addition to contacting Foster Rockwell or Dr. Wolf, you may also contact the George Mason University Office of Research Subject Protection at 703-993-4121 if you have questions or comments regarding your rights as a participant in the research. This research has been reviewed according to George Mason University procedures governing your participation in this research.

By completing this survey you agree to participate in this study. The George Mason University Human Subjects Review Board has waived the requirement for signing a consent form. However, if you would like to sign a consent form prior to beginning the survey, please contact Foster Rockwell or Dr. Paige Wolf as previously noted. Thank you.

http://www.zoomerang.com/members/print_survey_body.zgl?ID=L22T6W3GF7LC

11/25/2006
1. What is your role in the organization? Select one.
   - Chief Learning Officer
   - Consultant
   - Diversity Officer/Director/Manager
   - Human Resource Officer/Director/Manager
   - Training Director/Manager
   - Trainer
   - Other, please provide title (up to 44 characters)

2. How many people are currently employed by your organization? Select one.
   - 1-50
   - 51-200
   - 201-500
   - 501-1,000
   - 1,001-5,000
   - 5,001+

3. Select the option that most closely describes your organization. Select one.
   - Government (Federal, State, or Local)
   - Not for profit
   - Privately owned
   - Publicly traded

4. Has your company established an overall approach to diversity that guides all diversity-related programs or training? Select one. If you select "No" or "Don't know" please proceed to question 17.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

5. Please describe your organization's diversity initiatives.

6. Select the response that best represents the reason for implementing the diversity program. Please choose the one best response.

- EEOC complaint/compliance
- Right thing to do/social good
- To improve organizational performance and/or attract and retain talent to drive competitive advantage
- Other, list reason (up to 44 characters)

7. Please select the option that best describes your organization's overall approach to diversity. Choose the one best response from the following scale.

Evaluating Diversity Training 44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-time training event to train employees who were available at the time</th>
<th>Repeat the same training event to get most or all employees to attend</th>
<th>Use several instructional methods to deliver the training over a period of time</th>
<th>In addition to training, accountability for a positive change in behavior has been identified</th>
<th>A multi-faceted approach to diversity is used and performance results are linked to that approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the clarity of the goals and objectives for specific diversity training that has been conducted in your organization. Select one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Somewhat clear</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Very clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select the instructional methods used to deliver diversity training. Check all that apply.

- Instructor-led training
- Computer-based training
- Web-based training (internal/intranet)
- Video
- Self-paced reading
- Other, briefly describe (up to 44 characters)

Are metrics for determining the success of the training established before implementing a diversity program? Select one.

- Yes
11) If you answered "Yes" to the previous question, select how clearly the evaluation metrics were aligned to the goals for the program. Select one. If you selected "No" or "Don't know", please skip this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Somewhat clear</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Very clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) Please select the evaluation approaches most commonly used to evaluate diversity training or events in your organization. Check all that apply.

- None
- Administer a reaction survey
- Test knowledge or skill gained at the end of the training
- Compare gains in knowledge or skill using a pre- and post-test
- Administer a pre- and post-test assessment to both training participants and a control group that are randomly assigned
- Measure changes in behavior on the job to determine transfer of training
- Measure objective changes in business unit or organizational performance as a result of training
- Other, briefly explain (up to 44 characters)

13) How much does your organization budget for diversity-related programs in one year? Leave blank if unknown.

14. Please estimate the cost per diversity program for the delivery of the program. Leave blank if unknown.

15. Please estimate the cost per diversity program for evaluation of the program. Leave blank if unknown.

16. Who influences and helps set direction for your organization's overall diversity approach? Select all that apply.
   - CEO or most senior leader
   - Executives
   - Diversity Office/Director/Manager
   - Middle management
   - HR/Training/Organizational Learning & Development
   - Employees

17. Only answer this question if you replied "No" or "Don't know" to question 4. Please indicate a reason why your organization may not have implemented diversity training. Check all that apply.
   - Budget constraints
   - Other resource constraints
A need for this training has not been identified

Don't know

Other, briefly describe (up to 44 characters)

Submit