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Abstract

The technology industry is struggling to achieve and retain racial diversity in their talent pools (Pivotal Ventures & McKinsey & Co., 2019; Scott, Klein, & Onovakpuri, 2017). While companies and organizations in recent years have been focused on increasing diversity and decreasing discrimination in the workplace (cf. Cleveland, Shore, Anderson, Huebner, & Sanchez, 2018), organizations do not seem to be making data-driven decisions around diversity and inclusion efforts (Dobbin & Kalev, 2017) and they do not seem to be working ensure positive outcomes for diverse individuals after they are hired (Holvino, Ferdman, & Merril-Sands, 2004). This study examined the impact of workplace racial harassment on the relationship between workplace inclusion and turnover intention (i.e., intention to quit) on a sample of 105 technology employees of Color to determine the extent to which inclusivity efforts, in the face of racism, can predict the technology industry’s most pressing diversity issue: retention of talent. Racial harassment was found to be a significant moderator of the relationship between workplace inclusion and turnover intention at low and moderate levels of racial harassment. At high levels of racial harassment, there was no longer a relationship between workplace inclusion and turnover intention.
The Impact of Workplace Racial Harassment on Inclusion and Talent Retention

In the United States (U.S.), there is a lengthy history of workplace discrimination and the evasion of hiring and recruiting individuals based on race and other social identities (Belton, 1978). Historically, women and racial minorities have been excluded from many areas of the U.S. labor market (Hedman, 2016). Workplace diversity and inclusion initiatives to combat discriminatory practices can be traced back to 1965 when equal opportunity employment laws were enacted under President John F. Kennedy (and further executed by President Lyndon B. Johnson) after the dissolution of Jim Crow laws, a legal enforcement of racial segregation in the U.S. (Packard, 2002). Equal opportunity employment laws prohibit employers from discrimination in hiring on the basis of color, religion, gender, and nation of origin. This legislation came out of the Civil Rights Act (1964) to protect minority and women from employment discrimination. The original legislation was intended to protect racial minorities (i.e., Blacks) impacted by Jim Crow. Ironically, protection for women was added to the proposed bill as an attempt to prevent its passage, however the bill was passed leading to the granting of workplace protections to both women and minorities (Risen, 2014).

In subsequent years, civil rights laws were expanded to include other social identities, conditions, and histories (e.g., Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 protecting employees >40 years old, Vietnam Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974, forbidding discrimination on the basis of a worker’s military history; Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978; Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; and the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008, forbidding discrimination on the basis of family history and genetic information). However, despite advancements in protections, race- and gender-based discrimination continues to exist in the American workforce (Richard, Roh, & Pieper, 2013;
Dipboye & Colella, 2005; Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2014b; Goldman, Gutek, Stein, & Lewis, 2006; Tomaskovic-Devey, Thomas, & Johnson, 2005). Furthermore, women and racial minorities continue to be underrepresented in certain fields and occupy lower levels of power as compared to White men (Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 2002; Padavic & Reskin, 2002).

**Race, Racial Discrimination, & Racial Harassment**

Race is a social construct that includes all people: Whites, people of Color (e.g., Black, Asian, Latinx, Native American, etc.), and biracial people (Carter, 2007). Racial group membership involves the social practice of categorizing people based on the color of their skin, physical features, hair texture, and/or language, and associating a social status based on these physical markers (Carter, 2007). Race, as a social construct, does not reflect genetic differences (Bonham, Warshauer-Baker, & Collins, 2005) and is defined mostly by physical features alone (Painter, 2010). Still, race has significant power as a social category in the U.S. where the social hierarchy benefits Whites (i.e., presumes Whites to be superior) and disadvantages racial minorities (i.e., non-Whites) relegating them to lower social statuses (Marger, 2015). For the purposes of this paper, the term *people of Color* will be used to make a distinction between Whites and non-whites. It is recognized that differences among people of Color (e.g., Black, Asian, Latinx, etc.) differ considerably in their histories of oppression in the U.S. However, given that these groups are all at a general systemic disadvantage when compared with Whites (Foldy & Buckley, 2014) they will, at times in this proposal, be discussed as single group.

Race is often used, historically and currently, as a justification for social exclusion by one group from another (Cornell & Hartman, 2007). Racial discrimination, or being treated unfairly on the basis of race, refers to the unfair and/or negative treatment of people of Color based on
their marginalized social status (Marger, 2015). Scholars have demonstrated that discrimination, in general, is associated with an array of negative mental and physical health outcomes (cf. Pascoe & Smart-Richman, 2009; Carter, Johnson, Kirkinis et al., 2019). Racial discrimination, the behavioral manifestation of racism (Marger, 2015), has been found to induce significant stress on its targets (Williams & Mohammed, 2009; Sirin, Rogers-Sirin, Cressen et al., 2015) and is associated with a range of negative mental health outcomes (Carter, 2007; Araújo & Borrell, 2006) and negative emotional and psychological reactions (cf. Pascoe & Smart-Richman, 2009; Paradies, Ben, Denson et al., 2015; Carter, Lau, Johnson et al., 2017; Carter, Johnson, Kirkinis et al., 2019). Racial harassment, a form of racial discrimination, is overt, racial harassment, known as hostile racism (Carter et al., 2016). This overt type of racism is defined as actions, strategies, behaviors, and policies are intended to communicate to targets their subordinate status due to membership in a nondominant racial group (Carter & Helms, 2002; Jones, 1997; Kovel, 1970). Hostile, overt racism tends to be blatant and often includes an element of threat either to one’s safety, well-being, or livelihood (e.g., verbal or physical assaults, racial profiling by police). A subtler type of racial harassment identified by Carter and colleagues (2016) is avoidant/aversive racism, which includes behaviors, policies, and strategies that have the intended or unintended effect of creating/maintaining distance and/or minimizing contact between members of the dominant and nondominant racial groups (Feagin & McKinney, 2003). Examples of avoidant/aversive racism include, but are not limited to: an employee of Color that is excluded from social networks at work that could offer opportunities for advancement, having their achievements dismissed or denied, or not receiving adequate training to succeed. All of these examples of racism may be equally harmful, especially where workplace promotions and opportunities are concerned.
Racial Discrimination in the Workplace

In 2020, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) received over 67,000 workplace discrimination charges, indicating that despite legislation outlawing various types of discrimination, it continues to be a significant problem in the American workplace (EEOC, 2020). Among all forms of discrimination in the workplace, racial discrimination is particularly problematic due to its frequency: The EEOC (2020a) reported that racial discrimination was one of the most prevalent form of workplace discrimination complaint with about one-third of discrimination complaints cited as race-based (EEOC, 2020a). Furthermore, total monetary awards from employers to targets of race-based discrimination reached $71.3M in 2020 (EEOC, 2020bc). Workplace racial discrimination is also problematic due to its negative impact on employees and organizations: Triana, Jayasinghe, and Pieper (2015), in a meta-analysis on workplace racial discrimination examining 41 studies and 79 effect sizes, found negative relationships between perceived racial discrimination and job attitudes, physical health, psychological health, organizational citizenship behavior, and perceptions of diversity climate. The authors noted a surprising finding—the effect of perceived racial discrimination on job attitudes was stronger in studies published after the Civil Rights Act of 1991 (an act that strengthened and extended the Civil Rights Act of 1965). Furthermore, results indicated that effect sizes were stronger in samples that included more women and minorities, suggesting these groups may experience workplace discrimination more often and/or respond more strongly to perceived discrimination (Triana, Jayasinghe, & Pieper, 2015).

Scholars have worked to develop several measures of racial discrimination in the workplace. Triana, Jayasinghe, & Pieper’s (2015) meta-analysis indicated that workplace racial discrimination has been assessed utilizing a variety of measures. The most commonly used
measures were: Ethnic Harassment Experiences Scale (EHE; Schneider, Hitlan, & Radhakrishnan, 2000), the Workplace Prejudice and Discrimination Inventory (WPDI; James, Lovato, & Cropanzano, 1994), and the Perceived Discrimination Scale (PDS; Sanchez & Brock, 1996). It is noteworthy to mention that the EHE Scale measures the frequency of discrimination experiences over the past two years which may explain the weaker outcomes associated with the EHE Scale as previous research indicates that recent experiences of discrimination have the strongest effects on mental health (cf. Pascoe & Smart-Richman, 2009). The WPDI and PDS, in contrast, measure current and more recent experiences of racial discrimination. The PDS, was designed to measure perceived ethnic discrimination among Hispanic/Latinx employees and includes specific racial-cultural items around English-speaking ability and accents, thus may not be appropriate for use with a wider array of people of Color. The WPDI seems inappropriate for attempting to measure racial discrimination in the workplace because it assesses both racial and gender bias in a single measure (James et al., 1994). Furthermore, it was originally validated on only 46 employees, the majority of whom identified as White. A newer scale, the Racial Ethnic Harassment Scale (REHS; Bergman, Palmieri, Drasgow, & Ormerod, 2007) seems to be the strongest existing measure of workplace racial discrimination. It assesses participants’ experiences of workplace discrimination in the last year, includes both direct and indirect experiences of racial discrimination and items are not race or culture specific. Furthermore, strong evidence of validity has been collected on multiple samples of people of Color (see Measures for further detail).

Researchers and scholars studying racial discrimination have identified that racial discrimination does not only exist as overt, racial harassment, known as hostile racism (Carter et al., 2016). Overt, hostile racism is captured in the REHS (e.g., Vandalized your property because
of your race/ethnicity; Physically threatened or intimidated you because of your race/ethnicity; Assaulted you physically because of your race/ethnicity). The REHD also includes items that could be classified as avoidant/aversive racism (e.g., Did not include you in social activities because of your race/ethnicity; Made offensive remarks about your appearance because of your race/ethnicity; Made you feel uncomfortable by hostile looks or stares because of your race/ethnicity).

Several studies have found evidence that racism (often referred to as implicit bias, a term coined to soften the blow of calling out racism on perpetrators), continues to prevail in the American workplace: For example, indicators of one's race have been found to be associated with fewer calls for interviews and lower chances of receiving opportunities for mentorship: Resume studies reveal that individuals with “Black” sounding names receive fewer interviews and are rated as less qualified than identical resumes with “White” sounding names (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Kang et al., 2016). Furthermore, legal cases are ongoing at the time of this publication concerning employers who allegedly misused Facebook advertising tools to target hiring based on age, race, religious affiliation, and other demographic information (cf. Communications Workers of America v. T-Mobile).

Additionally, historically underrepresented groups in the workforce (e.g., people of Color) continue to be advanced at lower rates (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2021). For example, Blacks comprise 12.6% of the American workforce, but only 9.7% of middle and upper management positions (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2021). Attempts to explain these disparities include educational gaps among Whites and people of Color (Musu-Gillette, de Brey, McFarland, Hussar et al., 2017) and stereotypes of leadership qualities being associated with White males (Sy et al., 2010). However, these explanations do not account for the continued pay
disparity among White males in comparison with people of Color and women (i.e., Hispanics and Blacks are paid 53% and 61% of what Whites are paid. White women earn 77% of what White men earn, with that number dropping to 53-62% for Latina, Black, American Indian, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander women (Daly, Hobijn & Pedtke, 2017; Shore et al., 2018). Moreover, restrictions on formerly-incarcerated persons also limit opportunities for hiring, a restriction that disproportionality impacts people of Color (Agan & Starr, 2016). Furthermore, researchers have indicated that the culturally pervasive stereotypes (e.g., Blacks lacking “professionalism”) may lead to questions regarding some people of Color’s competence and fewer opportunities for advancement (Brown-Iannuzzi et al., 2013).

The enduring legacy of racial oppression in U.S. workplaces continues to cast a shadow over organizational diversity and inclusion initiatives. While some progress has been made in terms of legal protections, the existing body of research suggests that racism, in its various forms, continues to impact the experiences of employees of Color in the workplace and might have particular relevance for experience of inclusivity.

**Theory of Workplace Inclusivity**

The concept of inclusivity in the workplace was first coined by Mor Barak and colleagues (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998) who theorized that inclusivity and belonging in the workplace is a social need and that employee experience of belonging is foundational for a company’s success (Mor Barak, 2014). Researchers have since sought to identify what workplace inclusion entails and have reiterated that workplace inclusivity is important to everyone, not just those who have been excluded historically (Ferdman, 2014; Winters, 2014).
Perceptions of inclusion in the workplace are best understood in terms of psychological climate, which is defined as individuals' interpretations or perceptions of a group’s policies, procedures, rules, regulations, and rewards (Schneider et al., 1994, p. 18). Perceptions of inclusion (i.e., climate research) focuses on individuals cognitively-based, perceptions of the social context, however the primary goal of occupational climate research is to generalize perceptions across social settings (Dennison, 1996). Therefore, it tends to be explored from a psychological perspective by quantitative methods, such as attitudinal or behavioral scales (Dennison, 1996; Hicks-Clark & Iles, 2000).

There has been some confusion about the difference between the terms diversity and inclusion, as they are often used interchangeably. Diversity contains elements that overlap with inclusivity, but the two constructs differ in important ways (Shore et al., 2018). That is, “diversity can be mandated and legislated, while inclusion stems from voluntary actions” (Winters, 2014, p. 206). Diversity refers to the focus on expanding the workforce through the recruitment of women, people of Color, and individuals with other marginalized social identities into the workplace (Ferdman, 2014). Diversity is more about the “rightness” of supporting equal opportunity laws (Shore et al., 2018). Inclusivity, refers to the collective perception that there are expectations and norms allowing employees to behave in a manner that is consistent with their self-concept and the various identities that they hold, that they are included in decision-making, and supported in their uniqueness and perspective (Nishii, 2013). Inclusion is about the ability to be fully one’s self at work where “people of all identities and many styles can be fully themselves while also contributing to the larger collective as valued and full members” (Ferdman, 2017, p. 235). Inclusion encompasses many concepts, but essentially it is about
allowing members to “be authentically themselves” at work (Shore et al., 2018, p. 2) and fostering equality in decision-making, power, and resources (Ferdman, 2014).

Diversity and inclusion are intrinsically related: diversity is about “the mixture of attributes within a workforce that…affect how people think, feel, and behave at work” (Hays-Thomas & Bendick, 2013, p. 195) and inclusion focuses on the “workplace culture that shapes the experiences of employees” (Hays-Thomas & Bendick, 2013, p. 195). As such, various configurations of diversity and inclusion can exist. For example, a highly diverse workplace could exhibit low inclusion, and another workplace could be highly inclusive, with low diversity (Shore et al., 2011).

**Benefits of Workplace Inclusivity**

Not all diversity and inclusion practices are created equal: Some diversity practices (e.g., mandatory diversity trainings and programming) have been found to be associated with higher conflict, turnover, and lower cohesion and performance (cf. Jackson & Joshi, 2011; Mannix & Neale, 2005). Furthermore, some studies have shown such programming to actually increase bias in the workplace rather than diminish it (Dobbin & Kalev, 2017). In contrast, inclusion practices have been found to be highly beneficial in the workplace. Elements of inclusion have been found to be associated with a range of positive outcomes such as: high quality relationships with supervisors and group members, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational commitment behaviors, job performance, and wellbeing (Shore et al., 2011). Elements of inclusion (i.e., belongingness and uniqueness) were also found to be associated with supervisor ratings of creativity and job performance (Chung et al., 2016). Furthermore, studies on leader inclusion have found that inclusion was associated with employee involvement and creative
work (Carmeli et al., 2010), work engagement (Choi, Tran, & Park, 2015), and enhanced unit performance (Hirak et al., 2012).

Diversity and inclusion need each other to create optimal outcomes. Li, Lin, Tien, and Chen (2015) found that when teams were multiculturally diverse, high inclusion enhanced team information sharing and information elaboration. However, when inclusion was low in multicultural teams, these behaviors reduced. Downey, Van der Werff, Thomas and colleagues (2014) found evidence that inclusion practices (e.g., allowing a wider array of people to influence decision-making) was associated with perceptions of a climate of trust. The researchers also found that diversity practices were only associated with a perceived climate of trust when inclusion practices are also present, highlighting the interplay between diversity and inclusion. That is, diversity or inclusion practices alone may not be an adequate or effective human resource strategy (Mor Barak et al., 2016). Rather, they ought to be implemented together for the best outcomes.

Models of Inclusion. Diversity is rather straightforward, but how do we understand inclusion? Several models of workplace inclusion exist in the literature (e.g., Nishii, 2013; Shore et al., 2011). Shore et al.’s (2018) review of 42 studies on inclusion concluded that there are many ideas in the literature about what contributes to an experience of inclusion in the workplace. The authors suggested a multidimensional model of inclusiveness, attempting to integrate a large body of inclusion research and additional literature-driven components of workplace inclusion. However, the model is complex and these ideas have not yet been crystalized into clear and well-defined set of constructs with associated empirical testing.

Of the existing models of inclusion, the most empirically tested and validated model is Mor Barak and Cherin’s (1998) organizational inclusion model. Mor Barak and Cherin’s (1998)
model is based on social identity theory and the importance of group membership. In this mode, inclusion is conceptualized on an inclusion-exclusion continuum reflecting the extent to which individuals, especially those from minority groups, “feel part of important organizational processes that affect their jobs and the extent to which they have access to the organizational decision-making process and to its information networks” (Mor Barak & Levin, 2002, p. 136). The model contains three subscales: inclusion in decision making (employees’ perceptions of their ability to influence decision making); involvement in the workgroup (their level of involvement in group processes in the workplace); and access to information and resources (perceived ability to access resources to advance in the workplace). The organizational inclusion model has been empirically tested via a variety of research methodologies (cross-sectional and longitudinal) and analytic procedures (e.g., exploratory/confirmatory factor analysis, repeated measures, structural equations modeling, regression, mediation, etc.). Findings indicate inclusion is linked to increased diversity climate perceptions, increased leader-member exchange, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, wellbeing, decreased stress and intentions to quit (Brimhall et al., 2017; Findler et al., 2007; Hopkins et al., 2010; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; Mor Barak et al., 2006; Mor Barak, 2000; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002).

Researchers examining workplace inclusion have presented a variety of models and measures for inclusion. Mor Barak and Cherin’s (1998) model has the most robust evidence of validation. Scholars have posited that inclusion can only be attained when discrimination is confronted and addressed in organizations (Ashburn-Nardo, Morris, and Goodqin, 2008). Thus, it is surprising that a commonality among existing models of inclusion is silence about the role of race and racism in the attempt to create inclusive work environments.
**Racism, Inclusion, Turnover, & the Bottom Line**

Voluntary turnover (i.e., when an employee decides to leave the organization by their own choice; Price & Mueller, 1981), is a major challenge for organizations. It is costly to organizations to recruit, select, train, and onboard new employees, with cost estimates across industries equal to 6 to 9 months of an employee’s annual salary (e.g., $40,000 for an employee earning $80,000 annually) in time and labor to hire and onboard a new employee (Society for Human Resource Management, 2016). Therefore, voluntary turnover is considered highly detrimental for an organization. Turnover intention is defined as an individual’s intention to voluntarily quit an organization (i.e., intention to engage in this behavior). Measurement of turnover intention aims to estimate the probability that an individual will change their job within a certain timeframe and lead to actual turnover. Researchers have identified that turnover intention is the best predictor of actual turnover and that turnover intentions can negatively impact commitment level of the other employees (Azlin Natasha Armizi, 2008).

There are many factors that lead to turnover intentions such as: quality of work life (Almalki, Fitzgerald, & Clark, 2012); job satisfaction (Ahmad, Bashir et al., 2012); perceptions of fairness and recognition (Arkoubi, Bishop, & Scott, 2011), organizational commitment (Lovie-Tremblay, Paquet, Marchionni, et al., 2011); autonomy and intrinsic motivation (Galetta & Maura, 2011), age/tenure (Almalki, Fitzgerald, & Clark, 2012; Perez, 2008; Randhawa, 2007), job satisfaction (Perez, 2008), perceptions of organizational justice (e.g., Aghaei & Najaf et al., 2012; Aslam, Shumaila, Azhar, & Sadaqat, 2011; Muzumdar, 2012), and racial discrimination (Alderfer & Sims, 2003; National Institute for Occupational Safety & Health, 2007; EEOC, 2003; Nunez-Smith, Pilgrim, Wynia, Desai et al., 2009).
Racial Discrimination & Turnover in Tech

The examination of racial discrimination and turnover within the field of technology is rare. Scott, Klein, and Onovakpuri’s (2017) study of turnover in the technology industry among a nationally representative sample of U.S. adults found perceptions of unfair treatment to be the single largest driver of turnover among tech employees, most significantly impacting Black, Latinx, and Native American/Alaskan Native-identified employees. Specifically, in terms of perceptions of unfairness, the researchers found “bullying” and “hostility” to be the strongest predictor of leaving a job in the technology industry. It seems that there is something hostile going on in technology, particularly for people of Color, that is contributing to their decision to leave. It’s unclear if racial discrimination or harassment is the cause, but it seems likely given this data.

Researchers looking at other industries have found evidence that employees in inclusive organizational environments are less likely to leave the organization (Nishii & Rich, 2013) and when employees, specifically women and minorities, report feeling included, they also report higher job commitment and are less likely to quit (Findler, Wind, & Mor Barak, 2007). Given that racial discrimination, a form of social exclusion, is related to workplace inclusion, it is likely to have an impact the bottom line via outcomes such as turnover intention (Cho & Mor Barak, 2008; Mor Barak, Findler, & Wind, 2001; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002). What is unclear is the exact nature of the relationship between inclusion, racial discrimination, and turnover intention.

The Absence of Race in the Diversity & Inclusion Conversation

A major limitation in previous studies on and models of inclusivity is that researchers have not looked at the potential role of racial discrimination at all (e.g., the possibility for racial discrimination to exist in a highly inclusive environment or that inclusivity is not equally felt by
all employees). If researchers do not name and examine the role racial discrimination in the workplace within inclusivity research, it remains unseen. Previous literature and statistics suggest that racial discrimination in the workplace is happening—thus inclusivity may not be working for everyone. Bringing racial discrimination back into the conversation on inclusivity specifically allows for a possible extension of models of inclusivity and the potential to create truly inclusive organizations.

Carter’s (2000) theory of race-based organizations helps to fill the gap and explain how race and racial discrimination can influence the relationship between inclusivity and outcomes like retention and turnover. Carter’s (2000) theory holds that because race is the most visible social identity (unlike other social identities such as gender, religion, and sexual orientation that can remain hidden or made more ambiguous) and because of the current and historical legacy of racial segregation and racism in the U.S. that “race has been and continues to be the ultimate measure of social exclusion and inclusion” for American organizations. Given that visibility determines the rules and bounds of social interaction (Copeland, 1983; Kovel, 1984), racial dynamics become highly influential in influencing the functioning of organizations.

The race-based view stresses the importance of understanding racism and racial identity development (Carter, 1990; Carter & Johnson, 2019; Helms, 1990), positing that it is impossible for organizations to become culturally sensitive without first dealing with the influence of race (Carter, 2000; Midgette & Meggert, 1991).

Given that Whites continue to dominate the workforce in representation and in power, it can be argued that the primary issues at the root of addressing cultural diversity are racial in nature (Carter, 2000). The race-based perspective argues that racism and racial identity should be a basic, primary focus of organizational culture and efforts to address cultural difference (Carter,
The race-based perspective considers the sociopolitical and historical dynamics at play in current times—an area other models of inclusion remain silent about.

**A Re-Emphasis on Race**

A re-emphasis on race in the discussion of inclusivity is particularly important due to the unique and insidious history of race relations in the U.S. (Foldy & Buckley, 2014). Race, above all other social identities (e.g., gender, sexual orientation, religion, etc.), has the greatest impact on life changes and opportunities: It is the strongest predictor of wealth, education, health, housing, employment and other measures of wellbeing (cf. Braveman, Cubbin, Egerter et al., 2010; Paradies, 2006; Williams & Mohammed, 2009). Therefore, this study deliberately spotlights racism in response to these trends.

**Current Study**

The purpose of the current study is to contribute to the literature on organizational inclusivity by evaluating the role of racial harassment in the relationship between workplace inclusion and turnover intention in a sample of technology employees. This study offers an opportunity to examine the role of racism in the workplace and the impact it has on the relationship between inclusion and turnover intention. In the current state of the literature, there is no model that pulls an element of race into inclusion. Furthermore, there is a gap in the inclusivity literature pertaining to racism, which research indicates continues to be highly problematic in the American workplace. Lastly, few studies have been able to link inclusivity to key performance outcomes related to financial success (e.g., retention and turnover) as this study does. It was hypothesized that an expansion of Mor Barak & Cherin’s (1998) model of workplace inclusion with an additive focus social exclusion (i.e., racial harassment) would provide findings that could guide future examinations of inclusivity and influence companies’
strategies to enhance employee perceptions of inclusivity. In turn, findings could impact retention and reduced turnover and have direct financial implications of increasing companies’ bottom line.

**Research Question**

The current study explored the relationships between workplace inclusion, racial harassment, and turnover intention with a focus on the moderating effect of racial harassment on the association between workplace inclusion and turnover intention. The following hypotheses were tested:

H1. Higher levels of workplace inclusion will be predictive of higher levels of retention (i.e., reduced turnover intention; negative relationship)

H2. Racial harassment will be predictive of higher of turnover intention (positive relationship)

H3. Perceived workplace racial harassment will hinder the predictive, indirect relationship of workplace inclusion and turnover intention. That is, the “effectiveness” of workplace inclusion would be moderated by the degree of workplace racial harassment experienced (i.e., employees who perceive higher rates of racial harassment will be less likely to benefit from workplace inclusion efforts).

H4. Gender will be a significant covariate in the model.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants included 105 technology employees of Color (see Table 1). Inclusion criteria for participation was as follows: (1) participants must be currently working in the field of technology in effort to develop a baseline industry for data collection; (2) participating
employees must be based in the United States; (3) participants must be &ge; 18 years old to participate; (4) participants must identify as non-White (e.g., Black, Latinx, Asian, Native American, biracial, etc.); (5) participants must be employed by an employer (i.e., not self-employed).

Participants were limited to those working in the technology industry as there has been recent media attention on diversity in the technology industry (e.g., Clayton, 2020; Luca & Bazerman, 2020). Furthermore, anecdotes of high-profile employees leaving jobs in technology have been published, detailing graphic accounts of toxic work environments characterized by bullying, stereotyping, sexual harassment, and racial bias (e.g., Barton, 2020; Gyunn, 2020). Therefore, the focus on technology employees was highly relevant to the current conversation around workplace climate, racial harassment, and outcomes. While employees working in other industries likely also experience racial harassment at work, the experiences of all employees were beyond the scope of the current study.

An a priori power analysis was conducted utilizing G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007; Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009) to determine the number of participants required for the current study. Previous work using moderation indicates that $f^2$ effect sizes of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 are termed small, medium, and large, respectively (Cohen, 1988; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), however, the average effect size in tests of moderation is only 0.009 (Aguinis, Beaty, Boik, & Pierce, 2005). For the current study, a small to moderate effect size was used to determine the necessary sample. The analysis was based on the hierarchical linear regression used for this study. Using an alpha of 0.05, a power of 0.95, and a medium effect size ($f^2 = 0.15$), a total one tested one predictor (level of workplace inclusion) and one moderator (workplace inclusion*workplace racial harassment). The results of the power analysis
showed that a minimum of 105 participants were needed to achieve an appropriate power level for this study. The sample was inclusive of all genders, educational attainment levels, and socio-economic statuses.

**Design**

The current study is ex post facto and cross-sectional. For the moderation model, workplace inclusion served as the independent variable (X), racial harassment served as the moderator (M) and turnover intention served as the dependent variable (Y). See Figure 1 for model.

**Measures**

**Inclusion.** Inclusion was measured in line with Mor Barak & Cherin’s (1998) model of perceived organizational inclusion using the Inclusion-Exclusion Questionnaire (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998), a 14-item measure with three subscales: Work Group Involvement (6 items; “I feel part of informal discussions in my work group”); Influence in Decision Making (4 items; “I am consulted about important project decisions”); and Access to Information and Resources (4 items; “I am provided feedback by boss), although total scores have been used by previous researchers because the factors, although distinct, are highly correlated (e.g., Findler, Wind & Mor Barak, 2007; Mor Barak, Levin, Nissly et al., 2006). Items are rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree) with higher total scores indicating a greater the degree of perceived inclusion. This measure was originally developed on social work students (n = 158) with a total score Cronbach’s alpha of .80. The sample for Mor Barak & Cherin’s (1998) original scale construction was a majority female, (86% female, 24% male), multiracial (62% White, 17% Latinx, 13% Black, and 8% Asian) sample of social work students. The measure has demonstrated convergent validity with Porter and Lawler’s (1968) organizational satisfaction
scale and discriminant validity with Porter’s work alienation scale (Price & Mueller, 1986). This scale has also been utilized with a multi-racial sample of child-welfare workers (36% White, 32% Latinx, 19% Black, 8% Asian; n =418; Mor Barak, Levin, Nissly, & Lane, 2006) with an overall alpha coefficient of .83, as well as with a sample of technology employees in Israel (33% immigrant, 67% non-immigrant; n =144) with an overall alpha coefficient of .81 (Findler, Wind & Mor Barak, 2007). In line with the work of other researchers utilizing this scale, the overall scale (i.e., total score) will be utilized in data analysis. The Cronbach’s alpha for the total score with this sample was $\alpha = .84$; range of total scores was 25-84.

**Racial Harassment.** The 14-item Racial Ethnic Harassment Scale (REHS; Bergman, Palmieri, Drasgow, & Ormerod, 2007) was used to assess participants’ experiences of workplace harassment in the last year. Example items include: “Told stories or jokes which were racist or depicted your race/ethnicity negatively?” using a 5-point scale ($1 = \text{never}$ to $5 = \text{many times}$). Item responses were averaged to obtain a scale score, with higher scores indicating greater levels of racist workplace harassment. In a sample of military personnel ($n = 5,000$; 80% of total sample were participants of Color, 15% of total sample were women), the validity of REHS scores was supported by a positive correlation with scores on a measure of racial or ethnic discrimination (Bergman et al., 2007). Prior research with the REHS has not reported internal consistency reliability for the full scale (Bergman et al., 2007; Bergman, Palmieri, Drasgow, & Ormerod, 2012). However, in Velez, Cox, Polihronakis et al.’s (2018) study ($n = 276$, multi-racial, non-white, non-military women) the REHS items yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .96. The Cronbach’s alpha for scale on the current sample was .98; range of total scores was 14-68.

**Turnover Intention.** Intentions to quit one’s job was assessed with Roodt’s (2004) Turnover Intention Scale (TIS-6). Participants rated each item (e.g., “How often have you
considered leaving your job?” and “How often have you considered leaving your job?” on a 5-point scale (1 = never to 5 = always). Item responses will be averaged to create an overall scale score, with higher scores indicating greater intentions to quit. The TIS-6 was validated with a longitudinal data on a census-based sample (n = 2,429) of employees in an information technology company (cf. Bothma & Roodt, 2013). The sample was multiracial: White (44.1%), Black (26.3%), Other (16.3%), and Asian/Indian (13.3%) and the validation study was conducted over a period of four months to assess the predictive validity of the scale (i.e., if the scale could predict actual turnover). The results of the study confirmed the scale’s predictive validity (i.e., mean score differences between those who quit and a randomly selected group of those who stayed with the organization were compared, with significant results). Factorial validity was explored using an exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Results confirmed the TIS-6 as a one-dimensional construct, with item loadings between 0.73 and 0.81 and overall reliability of .80. The Cronbach’s alpha for scale on the current sample was .64. When one item (“How often do you look forward to another day at work?” was removed, the Cronbach’s alpha for this scale increased to .80. The modified version of this scale with the higher Cronbach’s alpha was used for this study; range of total scores was 7-23.

**Demographic questionnaire.** The demographic questionnaire collected relevant demographic information including age, race, gender, sexual orientation, position level, compensation type, and estimated pre-tax salary.

All measures included in this study were counterbalanced to control for order effects (i.e., survey measures will be administered in different, random orders for participants). The order of items within measures, however, did not change and was consistent with original validation studies.
Procedure

Approval for the study was obtained from the SUNY Albany Institutional Review Board (IRB). Given the sensitive nature of the research question, participants were recruited online only, outside of their respective workplaces. Participants were recruited by reaching out via e-mail to chapter leaders of groups focused on supporting professionals of Color in technology (e.g., National Society of Black Engineers, Techqueria, Latinx in Tech, Black in AI, etc.) and asking leaders to forward the survey links to chapter members (snowballing methodology). Participants were purposely sampled to be representative of entire organizations with a cross section that included different employee level (staff, management, upper management), department (e.g., administration, operations, etc.), and compensation type (e.g. salaried, hourly).

Emails detailed the study purpose, inclusion criteria besides race, IRB information, and a link to participate. Participants self-selected through recruitment emails. Prior to data collection, each participant was presented with informed consent. The introduction letter notified participants that by completing the survey they were consenting. The study was introduced by a letter indicating that all responses will be kept confidential. Participants were screened with initial required screening questions eliciting the inclusion criteria. Upon completion, participants received a debriefing form. All data collection was undertaken online and transmitted electronically to the primary investigator via Qualtrics including informed consent and debriefing (https://www.qualtrics.com). Skip logic skipped the questionnaires for respondents who do not identify as a person of Color. The questionnaire required answers to all study and the demographic questions. Participants who were not above 18 years of age and/or did not identify as a person of Color were brought to the debriefing page.
**Data Analysis**

The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to determine the ability of workplace inclusion to predict turnover intention; and (2) to determine the impact of racial harassment on the relationship between workplace inclusion and turnover intention.

**Preliminary Analyses**

**Missing Data.** One hundred and fifty-eight participants began the study. Twenty-eight participants completed only the screening and did not continue to the study questionnaires. Twelve participants completed only the screening and workplace inclusion scale. Six participants completed the workplace inclusion and racial harassment scales, but stopped at the turnover intention scale. Comparing incomplete responses to completed variable questionnaires, 71% of participants who began the study, completed the study questionnaires. As all responses were required besides demographic data, missing data did not occur at the item level within the variables of interest. The dataset sample \((N = 112)\) was further reduced, omitting seven participants who did not meet eligibility criteria (e.g., removed any participant who did not responded affirmatively to the validity check item). Only participants who completed all variable questionnaires were retained in the sample, resulting in a sample of 105 (see Table 1).

**Outliers.** Next, data was checked for outliers that might introduce bias into the results. Outliers in this study were considered values that fall three or more standard deviations away from the mean (Field, 2013). Cook’s distance and studentized residual values were examined to gauge outlier influence \([D = .002; SDR = .00]\). Results did not exceed Field’s (2013) suggested cutoff values. Mahalanobis distance was also reviewed \([MD = 2.97]\) to gauge the distance of individual cases from the mean of predictor variables. All tests indicated an absence of outliers that would bias results.
Meeting Assumptions. The normality of the variables in the dataset was assessed by reviewing skewness and kurtosis, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, and quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plot and probability-probability (P-P) plots. A visual examination of Q-Q and P-P plots indicated that the data was normally distributed for outcome and criterion variables. Skewness did not exceed the limits of +2/-2 and kurtosis did not exceed the suggested cut-off of 8.0 for the outcome or criterion variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). There were also non-significant Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests for these variables \( (p = 1.00) \). However, for the moderator (racial harassment), the dataset does seem to be non-normal as the majority of participants reported lower levels of racial harassment \( (kurt = -0.37) \). Given these conditions, the results will be interpreted with caution.

To ensure that assumptions of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression were not violated, data was examined to rule out multicollinearity among variables. Variable relationships were reviewed via correlation matrix and variance inflation factors (VIF) to meet the assumption of non-multicollinearity (i.e., that predictors are not highly correlated). Study variables were loosely correlated \( (r = -0.42 - 0.09) \); see Table 2) but did not exceed suggested cut-off value \( (r = 0.80) \).

Next, data was tested for autocorrelation to ensure independence of residuals. Results of Durbin-Watson’s \( [d = 1.55] \) indicated independence of residuals. Finally, to meet the assumption of homoscedasticity, data was checked to ensure that the residual variance in the outcome variable (turnover intention) was equivalent across the regression line and across all values of the moderator variable (racial harassment). A visual examination of the scatterplot revealed no violations of homoscedasticity.

Primary Analyses

It was predicted that the first step of the linear regression would reveal that (1) workplace inclusion would significantly predict turnover intention (negative direction); (2) racial
harassment would significantly predict turnover intention (positive direction); (3) the interaction term (workplace inclusion*racial harassment) would be significant, signaling that racial harassment is a significant moderator of the relationship; and (4) gender would be a significant covariate in the model.

**Moderation with PROCESS.** Hayes’ (2012) PROCESS model was employed to determine the moderating effect of racial harassment (M) on the relationship between workplace inclusion (X) and turnover intention (Y), with a covariate of gender (C). The predictor (workplace inclusion) and continuous moderator variable (level of racial harassment) were mean-centered for ease of interpretation. The predictor (workplace inclusion), criterion (turnover intention) and the interaction term (workplace inclusion*racial discrimination) were entered into Hayes’ R PROCESS syntax (2021) utilizing R Statistical Software (R Core Team, 2014). The full model was significant, \( F(3, 101) = 12.30; R^2 = .27, p = .00 \), as was a test of the unconditional interaction \( F(3, 101) = 5.53; \Delta R^2 = .04; p = .02 \).

Significant results were found for workplace inclusion predicting turnover intention \( B = -.081, 95\% CI (-.15, -.02), p = .01 \) in a negative direction, and racial discrimination predicting turnover intention \( B = .05, 95\% CI (.01, .09), p = .01 \) in a positive direction. The interaction term (workplace inclusion and racial harassment) predicting turnover was also found to be statistically significant \( B = .01, 95\% CI (.00, .01), p = .02 \). Given the history of women’s exclusion from the workplace (e.g., Hedman, 2016), gender was added as a covariate to control for gender differences in experiences of workplace and inclusion. When gender was added as a covariate, the model remained significant—it did not impact the overall model fit or change the amount of variance explained. Since gender was not significant, it was removed from the model.
Three hypotheses were supported, such that (1) higher workplace inclusion was inversely associated with turnover intention, (2) higher racial harassment was directly associated with turnover intention; and (3) workplace racial harassment significantly moderated the relation between workplace inclusion and turnover intention, and that adding racial harassment to the model had an estimated change in effect size of 4% on the relation. The fourth hypothesis that including gender as a covariate would significantly impact the model was not supported.

Post-Hoc Analyses

Johnson-Neyman Technique. Given that the moderation effect was significant, the nature of the effect was probed using the Johnson-Neyman (1936) technique. Hayes’ PROCESS macro for R incorporates the Johnson-Neyman technique to determine at which values (points) the moderator transitions from significant to nonsignificant, or vice versa, providing an understanding of how the relation changes across levels of the moderator. The interaction was probed by testing the conditional effects of workplace inclusion at three levels of racial discrimination: low (one standard deviation below the mean), medium (at the mean), and high (one standard deviation above the mean). As shown in Table 5, workplace inclusion was significantly related to turnover intention in two of three regions – when racial harassment was low ($p < .001$) and medium ($p < .001$). However, when racial harassment was high, workplace inclusion was not significantly related to turnover intention ($p = .29$).

Specifically, results pointed that when racial harassment (mean centered) levels were between -12.03 (i.e., 12 points below the mean) and 1.46 (i.e., 1.46 points above the mean), the moderator had a significant impact on the relationship between workplace inclusion and turnover intention. The impact of racial harassment on the main effect was nonsignificant when levels of racial harassment were above 1.72 (i.e., 1.72 points above the mean). In sum, workplace
inclusion was generally associated with low turnover (negative relationship), except at high levels of racial harassment, where there was no longer a relationship (Figure 2). That is, despite how inclusive the environment may feel, inclusion does not always protect turnover.

A closer look revealed that the main effect of workplace inclusion on turnover intention suggests that each time a person’s score on workplace inclusion increases by 1, their intent to turnover is predicted to decrease by .98 ($t = -2.94$, $p = .00$). The effect of workplace inclusion on turnover intention is also moderated by the level of racial harassment experienced: every time racial harassment increases by 1, the adjusted effect of workplace inclusion on turnover intention increases (i.e., the relationship becomes stronger) by .81 each time ($t = 2.56$, $p = .01$). That is, as racial harassment increased, turnover increased by 1 standard deviation.

**Discussion**

It has been demonstrated that technology sector struggles to achieve and retain racial and gender diversity in its employees (Pivotal Ventures & McKinsey & Co., 2019; Scott, Klein, & Onovakpuri, 2017). Across industries, efforts to ameliorate this issue have been met with a range of corporate diversity and inclusion initiatives (cf. Cleveland, Shore, Anderson, Huebner, & Sanchez, 2018). However, it is unclear how well such programs are working to retain talent of Color and it is unclear for which employees they are helpful. Racial discrimination is clearly a problem in the American workforce (cf. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2021; EEOC, 2020), especially in the technology sector (Scott, Klein, & Onovakpuri, 2017), yet corporate diversity and inclusion efforts seem to shy away from explicitly targeting race in their efforts. Instead, they have expanded their efforts to include an array of social identities, conditions, and histories (e.g., sexual orientation, ability, gender, etc.). While including multiple forms of diversity is positive, it dilutes the importance of race as a social identity. Some companies, like Facebook
have even gone as far as including “identities” such as diversity of thought (e.g., Williams, 2015; Woods, 2008), which downplays the importance of systematically marginalized and oppressed identities in current day diversity and inclusion efforts. Therefore, this study aimed to spotlight race and examine the impact of racial harassment on the relationship between workplace inclusion and turnover intention. Furthermore, this study sought to elucidate at which levels racial harassment impacts the relationship between workplace inclusion and the retention of talent of Color.

**Racial Harassment in the Field of Technology**

This study elucidated how racial harassment in the workplace impacts the relationship between inclusion and turnover for this sample of people of Color working in the field of technology. The findings echo those found by Scott, Klein, and Onovakpuri (2017) and add to the sparse research literature on retention of technology employees of Color. Findings from this study revealed that tech employees of Color experience racial discrimination and harassment in the workplace and it is impacting their decision to quit or stay at an organization.

It is important to highlight how the use of the Racial Ethnic Harassment Scale (REHS; Bergman, Palmieri, Drasgow, & Ormerod, 2007) impacted the results of this study. The REHS examines participants’ experiences of workplace discrimination in the last year and mostly captures the experience of overt, hostile (e.g., vandalized your property because of your race/ethnicity; physically threatened or intimidated you because of your race/ethnicity; assaulted you physically because of your race/ethnicity). Carter and colleagues (2016) outlined other types of racism that are subtler, yet also negatively impactful (i.e., aversive/avoidant; e.g., an employee of Color that is excluded from social networks at work that could offer opportunities for advancement, having their achievements dismissed or denied, or not receiving adequate training to succeed). Prior to
use in this study, it was unclear if the REHS would be a strong measure with this sample and able to capture the full experience of modern racial discrimination, given the overt nature of the items. It is disturbing that the REHS continues to be a useful measure, with validity for this relatively young, high-earning group working in technology. However, it is also noteworthy that the majority of the sample reported experiencing racial harassment (as per the REHS) at low and moderate levels, as opposed to high levels. Recent publications utilizing the REHS (e.g., Bergman, Palmieri, Drasgow, et al., 2012; Velez, Cox, Polihronakis et al., 2018) did not report range of scores on REHS for participants. This is an important finding as it may point to the need for a workplace racial harassment scale that encompasses more of the subtler, aversive/avoidant types of workplace racial discrimination that may be as negatively impactful as overt, hostile racial harassment. It is also possible that this group of young, high-earning employees of Color working in a White-male dominated space collectively sit in lower racial identity statuses which would make them both want to work in and assimilate to a White space and have a more difficult time perceiving and/or reporting racism (cf. xxx).

Race Should be Part of the Conversation

The findings of the main analyses point that racial harassment in the workplace impacts the relationship between workplace inclusion and turnover (i.e., talent retention). Findings revealed that workplace inclusion predicts turnover and that relationship is negative (high workplace inclusion is associated with decreased turnover). That is, a higher sense of inclusion and belonging (e.g., feeling part of a work group; feeling like your opinion matters in decision making; access to resources to do your job well) matters when it comes to retention of talent of Color. This finding echoes previous research that has found workplace inclusion buffers turnover (Nishii & Rich, 2013). However, in Nishii & Rich’s (2013) study, 81% of participants identified
as White, which is a sharp contract to the present study’s multiracial (majority Black) sample of people of Color. Therefore, findings from this study bolster the idea that inclusion seems to be important for all employees when it comes to turnover.

The effect size of the main analyses ($R^2 = .31$) was moderate, according to Cohen’s (1988, 1992) standards. Given that researchers have demonstrated a wide variety of additional variables that may impact turnover intentions (e.g., Almalki, Fitzgerald, & Clark, 2012; Arkoubi, Bishop, & Scott, 2011; Lovie-Tremblay et al., 2011), future research might include a more complex model that accounts for multiple covariates that may impact this relationship. Perhaps a more complex model would be able to produce a larger effect size in the future.

When racial harassment was added to the model as a moderator, the effect size increased 4% ($\Delta R^2 = .04$), which may seem small, but Aguinis, Beaty, Boik, and Pierce (2005) elucidated that the average effect size in tests of moderation is only 0.009 and have suggested that a more realistic standard for moderation effect sizes might be 0.005 (small), 0.01 (medium), and 0.025 (large), respectively. Thus, the effect size for the interaction (change in effect size) in this study is considered to be quite large, which means racial harassment does seem to have an impact in the relationship between inclusion and turnover. These findings support Carter’s (2000) theory of race-based organizations, suggesting that racial discrimination/harassment can influence outcomes like retention and turnover. As per Carter’s (2000) theory, racial dynamics do seem to be influential in the functioning of organizations, particularly in terms of outcomes like turnover. It is possible that with a larger sample size, the effect size would be larger. This study, although exploratory in nature, points toward the important for future research to continue to emphasize racial dynamics when exploring organizational outcomes like turnover.

**Gender**
Given the history of women’s exclusion from the workplace (e.g., Hedman, 2016), gender was added to this model because women may also experience gender discrimination in the workplace, in addition to racial harassment, which both could impact turnover intention. However, the addition of gender did not impact model in this study. It is possible that the sample size was too small to have an impact ($n = 44$). It is also possible that as per the minority stress theory (Meyer, 2003), if multiple identities were added as covariates (e.g., sexual orientation, ability status, etc.) there would be a greater impact. Crenshaw’s (1989) theory of intersectionality adds to this idea: if covariates (or even as another moderator) were included that could tap into the experience of being a woman of Color specifically (i.e., not separating gender from race), we may see more of an effect. Another possibility could be using more complex measure that accounts for both gender and racial discrimination such as Lewis’ (2015) measure of gendered microaggressions. This finding may be a critique of the way we tend to measure identity—as separate and distinct attributes, which does not easily lend itself to accounting for important intersections of identity.

**Inclusion ≠ Lack of Racism**

This study found that it’s possible for a workplace to exist with high levels of workplace inclusion and high levels of racial harassment—these two phenomena sometimes conflated and this research shows that is not the case. An employee, for example, can feel respected for their skillsets and the value they bring to their team and still experience racial harassment (e.g., overhearing a racial joke). The results point that concepts of workplace inclusion and racial harassment are distinct (i.e., not highly correlated), yet they influence each other in important ways, and together, have an impact when it comes to turnover intention. This aligns with the literature on inclusion being a social concept. Inclusion and belonging are social needs (Mor
Barak, 2014), and racial discrimination is a form of social exclusion. Furthermore, Mor Barak and colleagues (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998) theorized that inclusivity the employee experience of belonging is foundational for a company’s success (Mor Barak, 2014), and the results of this study support that theory by identifying an outcome of “success” (turnover intention) and providing statistical evidence of the role of workplace inclusion predicting a “success” outcome.

This study found that racial harassment significantly moderated the relationship between workplace inclusion and turnover intention, meaning that adding the interaction term (racial harassment x workplace inclusion) to the model changed the strength of the relation. Adding the interaction term to the model explains more variance in the relationship between workplace inclusion and turnover intention. Racial harassment did have a significant effect on how two other variables (workplace inclusion and turnover) relate to each other. This significant interaction finding is compelling given the relatively small sample size. Thus, results suggest that there may be more to understanding the relationship between inclusion and turnover than previously considered.

However, that relationship does not hold true across the board—only at low and moderate levels of racial harassment. That is, a strong culture of inclusion does not seem to help matters in the presence of high racial harassment in the workplace. Inclusion may make people feel good and have a significant effect on turnover, but perhaps inclusion in the face of harassment is empty—if people are being racially harassed then workplace inclusivity likely does not feel meaningful or “for” all employees, creating a conflict between what’s said and what’s done. This is an important finding for companies because this means that all of the time and money spent on
workplace inclusion tactics (e.g., fostering a sense of belonging) may be better spent on antiracism interventions.

It is important to note that this lack of relationship at high levels of racial harassment may be due to the skewed data (i.e., small number of participants who reported high levels of racial harassment). The skewed nature of the racial harassment scores (with the majority of the sample reporting low to moderate racial harassment) means that it is difficult to tell whether high levels of racial harassment, workplace inclusion no longer works, or if we just did not have enough participants reporting high levels of racial harassment to see a significant effect. A similar study with greater number of participants reporting high levels of racial harassment would be needed to elucidate this effect to be sure.

A major issue is that companies seem to dilute race from the conversation about diversity, equity, and inclusion. Meanwhile, these results point that race is a significant part of the conversation. If companies want to influence outcomes that matter, like talent retention, they may not want to continue to downplay racial harassment and/or discrimination in the workplace.

Mor Barak and Cherin’s (1998) model considers three major factors that influence the key outcomes (inclusion in decision making, involvement in the workgroup, access to information and resources), but it is silent on the role of the broader racial societal context. Mor Barak and Cherin’s (1998) model provides a foundation for which to explain the relationship between workplace inclusion and employee retention and turnover intentions, but findings from this study seem to point that the enduring racism in the U.S. context does seem to influence employees’ thresholds for feeling included in the workplace.

A Different Approach
Companies, especially in the wake of the #BlackLivesMatter movement, seem to be taking an interest in acknowledging racial injustice, with some companies making public statements of support and solidarity like Ben & Jerry’s “Dismantle White Supremacy” statement on their website (Ben & Jerry’s Homemade, 2021). Organizations also seem to be embracing “diversity strategy” by hiring Chief Diversity Officers and expanding human resources to include Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion departments (cf. Davidson, 2011). However, companies continue to be utilizing diversity and inclusion programs that do not work (cf. Dobbin & Kalev, 2017; Dobbin, Kim, & Kaelv, 2011) and seem to be avoiding naming racism or acknowledging race in the workplace, perhaps because it’s too difficult to discuss racism at work.

A possible solution is proposing a different approach. Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) is an organization that has approached diversity and inclusion from a more race-based organizational (i.e., racially and culturally aware) approach. FIFA has supported a clear, anti-racism campaign with slogans such as: “Stop racism. Stop violence”. They have also strengthened their own disciplinary rules with a view to helping to eradicate such behavior and publicly supported footballers demonstrating against racial injustice (e.g., taking a knee before football matches). FIFA’s efforts could even be characterized as anti-racist. Antiracism is a value-stance, attitude, and a set of behaviors that take a deliberate position and action against racism (Bonnett, 2000, p. 292; Pieterse et al., 2016). FIFA is one of the few organizations that have action behind their campaigns, slogans, and press releases, which is a step in the right direction and their zero-tolerance approach to racism likely makes employees of Color feel supported and valued.
Conclusion

Companies do not seem to rely on data or theory when it comes to workplace diversity, inclusion, and equity methodologies (Dobbin & Kalev, 2017; Dobbin, Kim, & Kalev, 2011). Perhaps companies are working to decrease general discrimination in the workplace (cf. Cleveland, Shore, Anderson, Huebner, & Sanchez, 2018), however organizations do not seem to focus on racism specifically. The findings from this study point that racial harassment is happening in the workplace for people of Color and it’s impacting their decision to leave and find employment elsewhere. We also found that inclusion doesn’t help matters at high levels of racial harassment. In the future, perhaps diversity and inclusion efforts should consider becoming more race-explicit and anti-racist if they are going to have a significant impact on retention of talent of Color.

Implications

Census projections posit a “majority-minority” population with Whites as a minority in ages 18-29 by 2027, and full population “majority-minority” by 2045 (Frey, 2018). With the American population diversifying quickly, companies will need to more intentionally attract and retain diverse talent. These findings provide evidence that racial harassment detracts from the benefits of inclusion and impacts key outcomes like retention and decreased turnover. Businesses may be incentivized to develop new, race-based interventions to enhance the reach of inclusivity and in turn, make a positive impact on companies’ bottom line. For these reasons, it is important for future research to continue to investigate racism as a major potential component of inclusivity.

Future research may also examine racial identity (of both Whites in power and people of Color reporting experiences of racial harassment and discrimination), racial socialization,
benefits, and other types of support at work (e.g., employee work groups). For example, participants with higher salaries may feel less inclined to leave their job, despite experiences of racial discrimination in the workplace. The study as it is currently presented does not account for all of these potential covariates (although those that are more easily captured will be in the demographic questionnaire) as this is an exploratory study and these examinations were beyond the scope of the research question.

Counseling psychologists consider vocational psychology (i.e., understanding the role of work in people’s lives) to be a cornerstone in the field (Blustein, 2006; Savickas & Baker, 2005). Scholars in the field of vocational psychology have argued the need for this discipline to broaden its focus to become more inclusive of all people who work (e.g., Blustein, 2001; Richardson, 1993). While the majority of scholars in vocational psychology have focused their research on career choice, satisfaction, and development, this study advances counseling and vocational psychology research by focusing on the often overlooked contextual and structural factors (i.e., workplace inclusion and racial harassment/discrimination). This study builds on previous work in vocational and counseling psychology with the construction of a theory-driven, empirically testable model to explain the outcomes and work experiences of people of Color who may face racial discrimination and marginalization at work. Furthermore, Duffy, Bluestein, Diemer, and colleagues (2016) argue that research in vocational psychology has focused on the privileged and does not adequately explain the work-based experiences of marginalized people (e.g., people who may be forced to make involuntary work-based decision)—for whom elements of context are often primary in driving the experience of work. Therefore, this exploratory work is an important contribution to counseling and vocational psychology as a whole, both in its subject matter and its anti-racist, social justice orientation. In addition, this work builds on literature in
the realm of organizational psychology as organizational psychologists might benefit from these findings and theoretical integrations as well. Organizational psychology has not historically paid much attention to issues of racism in the workplace, but the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP) have made statements that they stand against racism; are working to advise decision-makers regarding how I-O findings can inform effective policies and have begun projects and research intended to promote our understanding of racism and eliminate it from the workplace (cf. SIOP, 2020).

**Strengths & Limitations**

While this study has several strengths, such as adding to the dearth of literature on inclusion, being theory-informed, and emphasizing multiculturalism, there are inherent limitations. Limitations include the self-report nature of the data which may be laden with social desirability bias, especially given the potential evaluative context of employees being surveyed about their workplace. The decision to collect data anonymously outside of the workplace was made in effort to alleviate some of this pressure. Further, the study did not account for intersectionality in identities or other potential covariates (e.g., mental health status, job stress, pay satisfaction, etc.) as these examinations were beyond the scope of this study. It is important to note that race is not a stand-alone construct and intersectionality is highly important—there are many other elements by which individuals are shaped and constructed such as gender, class, sexual orientation, religion (Crenshaw, 1989; Strolovitch, 2007). The most comprehensive approach would be to explore all of these elements and how they are intertwined. In accordance with research, history, and theory, racism is particularly problematic in the U.S. workplace and its impact has great implications for both individual and organizational success. Lastly, although
this study is focused on the U.S. context given its unique racial history, findings may be relevant
to other nations with similar histories of racial discrimination.
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**Figure 1.** Model of Workplace Racial Harassment Moderating the Relationship Between Workplace Inclusion and Turnover Intention

**Figure 2.** Interaction of Workplace Racial Harassment Moderating the Relationship Between Workplace Inclusion and Turnover Intention
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary / gender-nonconforming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American/Black Caribbean</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Hispanic and/or Latinx</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/American Indian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and/or Latinx (non-White)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Multiracial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Level</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/ C-Level</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary - Paid a fixed amount for the year</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission-based</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based - Annual pay rate plus additional pay/bonus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., salary and stock options, equity, etc.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-tax Salary Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-24,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-49,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-74,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-99,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$124,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000+</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time - 30+ hours per week</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time - 10-30 hours per week</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Software Development</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analytics or Data Science</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Business Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UX/UI Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Inclusion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Harassment</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: $p < .05$, $p < .01$

Table 3. Variable Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Chronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Inclusion</td>
<td>60.85</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Harassment</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Conditional Effects of Workplace Inclusion by Levels of Racial Harassment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Harassment Level</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Lower CI</th>
<th>Upper CI</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-12.04</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Each row is a level of racial harassment. Low = 1 SD below M; Medium = M, High = 1 SD above M

Table 5. Simple Slopes Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Inclusion</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-2.94</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Harassment</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: $p < .05$, $p < .01$

Table 6. Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Lower CI</th>
<th>Upper CI</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: $p < .05$, $p < .01$

Model 1 = workplace inclusion predicting turnover
Model 2 = workplace inclusion + racial harassment predicting turnover
Model 3 = workplace inclusion x racial harassment predicting turnover
Appendix A. Recruitment Email

Dear Potential Participants,

I’m a doctoral student in Counseling Psychology at SUNY, Albany. I am writing to invite you to participate in my dissertation study, supervised by Alex Pieterse, Ph.D., about racial discrimination in the workplace in the field of technology. This survey is completely anonymous and we will not be asking for any identifying information about you or your workplace. The findings from this study will inform future research in the organizational and counseling psychology fields.

You are eligible to participate in this research study if you:
1. Identify as non-White (e.g., Black, Latinx, Asian, Native American, biracial, etc.)
2. Are 18 years of age or older
3. Currently work in the field of technology
4. Live/work in the United States
5. Are employed full- or part-time by an employer (i.e., not self-employed)

The survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Participants will be asked to answer a series of questionnaires pertaining to their experiences in the workplace. Participation is completely voluntary and you can stop the survey at any time.

If you’d like to participate please follow this link: XXXX. If you have any questions about the study, please contact me (kkirkinis@albany.edu) or Dr. Pieterse (email: apieterse@albany.edu).

Research at the University Albany, SUNY involving human participants, is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB (IRB #: XXXXX). If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact University at Albany Office for Pre-Award and Compliance Services at 1-866-857-5459 or hsconcerns@albany.edu.

Thanks for your help, time, and energy!

Katherine Kirkinis, Ed.M., M.A.
Appendix B. Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT INFORMATION FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPATION

Study Title: The Impact of Workplace Racial Harassment on Inclusion and Talent Retention

Principal Investigator: Katherine Kirkinis, Ed.M., M.A.

Co-Principal Investigator: Alex Pieterse, Ph.D.

IRB Study Number: XXXXX

I am a doctoral student at the University at Albany, in the Department of Counseling Psychology. I am planning to conduct a research study, which I invite you to take part in. This form has important information about the reason for doing this study, what we will ask you to do if you decide to be in this study, and the way we would like to use information about you if you choose to be in the study.

What are the possible risks or discomforts?

Your participation in this study may involve recalling harmful workplace experiences in the past. You may feel emotional or upset when answering some of the questions. If you are uncomfortable, you are free to not answer or to skip to the next question. As with all research, there is a chance that the confidentiality of the information we collect from you could be breached – we will take steps to minimize this risk, as discussed in more detail below in this form.

What are the possible benefits for me or others?

Possible benefits to you from this study may include feeling empowered to have a place to report experiences of racism that often are unheard and go unreported.

How will you protect the information you collect about me, and how will that information be shared?

The results of this study may be used in publications and presentations. Your study data will be handled as confidentially as possible. If the results of this study are published or presented, individual names and other personally identifiable information will not be used. To minimize the risks to the confidentiality, we will not collect any identifying information from participants. Data will be stored on a password-protected computer and Qualtrics website. We may share the data we collect from you for use in future research studies or with other researchers – if we share the data that we collect about you, we will remove any information that could identify you before we share it. If we think that you intend to harm yourself or others, we will notify the appropriate people with this information.

Financial Information
Participation in this study will involve no cost to you and you will not be paid for participating in this study.

What are my rights as a research participant?

Participation in this study is voluntary. If at any time and for any reason, you would prefer not to participate in this study, please feel free not to. You may withdraw from this study at any time, and you will not be penalized in any way for deciding to stop participation. If you decide to withdraw from this study, the researchers will ask you if the information already collected from you can be used.

What if I am a University at Albany student or employee?

You may choose not to participate or to stop participating in this research at any time. This will not affect your class standing, grades, employment, or any other aspects of your relationship with the University at Albany.

Who can I contact if I have questions or concerns about this research study?

If you have questions, you may contact the researchers at:

Katherine Kirkinis kkirkinis@albany.edu

Alex Pieterse apieterse@albany.edu

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, you can contact the following office at the University at Albany:

Institutional Review Board
University at Albany
Office of Regulatory and Research Compliance
1400 Washington Ave, MSC 100E
Albany, NY 12222
Phone: 1-866-857-5459
Email: rco@albany.edu

Consent

I have read this form and the research study has been explained to me. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions. If I have additional questions, I have been told whom to contact. I agree to participate in the research study described above and have the opportunity to print, save, or screenshot a copy of this consent form at this time. Do you consent to participate in this study? (Y/N)
Appendix C. Eligibility Screener

1. Do you live/work in the United States? (Y/N)
2. Are you > the age of 18? (Y/N)
3. Do you identify as non-White (e.g., Black, Latinx, Asian, Native American, biracial, etc.)? (Y/N)
4. Are you currently working in the field of technology? (Y/N)
5. Are you employed full- or part-time by an employer (i.e., not self-employed)? (Y/N)

Appendix D. Demographics Questionnaire

1. How old are you? [Age]
2. How do you identify your race? [Race]
   How do you identify your gender? [Gender]
3. How would you describe your position level? (staff, management, or upper management)
4. How would you describe your department? (administration, operations, etc.)
5. What type of compensation do you receive? (e.g. salaried, hourly)
6. What is your estimated pre-tax salary range (0-$24,000; $25,000-49,000; $50,000-74,000; $75,000-99,000; $100,000-124,000; $125,000+)?
Appendix E. Workplace Inclusion Measure

Workplace Inclusion-Exclusion (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998)

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements (1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree):

Work Group Involvement

1. Feel part of informal discussions in work group
2. Feel isolated from work group
3. Work group members don't share information with me
4. People in work group listen to what I say
5. My judgment is respected by members of work group
6. Work group members make me feel a part of decisions

Influence in Decision Making

7. Able to influence organizational decisions
8. Able to influence work assignment decisions
9. Consulted about important project decisions
10. Have a say in the way work is performed

Access to Communications and Resources

11. Provided feedback by boss
12. Don't have access to training I need
13. Have all the materials I need to do my job
14. Rarely receive input from my supervisor
Appendix F. Workplace Racial Harassment Measure

Racial Ethnic Harassment Scale (Bergman, Palmieri, Drasgow, & Ormerod, 2007)

Please indicate the frequency of the following behaviors experienced in the workplace over the past 12 months (1 = never to 5 = many times):

1. Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into an offensive discussion of racial/ethnic matters?
2. Told stories or jokes which were racist or depicted your race/ethnicity negatively?
3. Were condescending to you because of your race/ethnicity?
4. Put up or distributed materials (for example, pictures, leaflets, symbols, graffiti, music, stories) which were racist or showed your race/ethnicity negatively?
5. Displayed tattoos or wore distinctive clothes which were racist?
6. Did not include you in social activities because of your race/ethnicity?
7. Made you feel uncomfortable by hostile looks or stares because of your race/ethnicity?
8. Made offensive remarks about your appearance (for example, about skin color) because of your race/ethnicity?
9. Made remarks suggesting that people of your race/ethnicity are not suited for the kind of work you do?
10. Made other offensive remarks about your race/ethnicity (for example, referred to your race/ethnicity with an offensive name)?
11. Vandalized your property because of your race/ethnicity?
12. Made you feel threatened with retaliation if you did not go along with things that were racially/ethnically offensive to you?
13. Physically threatened or intimidated you because of your race/ethnicity?
14. Assaulted you physically because of your race/ethnicity?
Appendix G. Turnover Measure

Turnover Intention Scale-6 (Roodt, 2004)

Please indicate the degree to which you experience the following (1 = never to 5 = always):

1. How often do you dream about getting another job that will better suit your personal needs?
2. How often are you frustrated when not given the opportunity at work to achieve your personal work-related goals?
3. How often have you considered leaving your job?
4. How often do you look forward to another day at work?

Please indicate the likelihood of the following (1 = highly unlikely to 5 = highly likely):

5. How likely are you to accept another job at the same compensation level should it be offered to you?

Please indicate the extent of the following (1 = to a very large extent to 5 = to no extent):

6. To what extent is your current job satisfying your personal needs?
Appendix H. Debriefing Form

Thank you for your participation in this research study!

This study was concerned with people of Color's experiences of inclusion and racism in the workplace. Previous studies have found that such experiences can produce stress and even trauma-like reactions.

If you feel you have experienced such reactions, you may benefit from mental health care and treatment. If you're interested, you contact one of these resources:

**National Suicide Prevention Lifeline**, 1-800-273-TALK (8255). Trained crisis workers are available to talk 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Your confidential and toll-free call goes to the nearest crisis center in the Lifeline national network. These centers provide crisis counseling and mental health referrals.

**SAMHSA Treatment Referral Helpline**, 1-877-SAMHSA7 (1-877-726-4727). Get general information on mental health and locate treatment services in your area. Speak to a live person, Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. EST.

**Emergency Medical Services—911**. If the situation is potentially life-threatening, get immediate emergency assistance by calling 911, available 24 hours a day.

You may also find this resource, with a focus on racial equity, to be helpful or if interest:

**Racial Equity Resource Guide**, an interactive guide on racial equity