

Supplementary Material for “Women’s Perceived Contributions to Diversity: The Impact of Target Race and Contextual Gender Salience”

This supplementary material file includes additional analyses and information about pre-testing methodology for our manuscript, “Women’s perceived contributions to diversity: The impact of target race and contextual gender salience.”

In this supplementary materials document, the interested reader will find:

- 1) manipulation checks for Studies 2A-2C, separated by study (page 2);
- 2) exploratory analyses regarding the effect of female and Asian/Latinx representation on PCD of Asian and Latinx women (page 2);
- 3) a detailed description of the pre-testing of Study 3 materials (page 3);
- 4) exploratory analyses regarding the downstream consequences of PCD in Study 3 (page 3); and
- 5) exploratory analyses regarding moderation of the primary effects by participant race and participant gender across Studies 1-3 (page 4).

Supplementary Materials

Studies 2A-2C: Manipulation checks, separated by study

We conducted manipulation checks separately across our three samples, to ensure that within each study, relative to the low representation conditions, participants assigned to the high Black/female representation conditions reported greater Black/female representation in the company, respectively.

In Study 2A, participants reported significantly greater levels of Black representation if they were assigned to the high race representation condition than the low race representation condition, $F(1, 188)=278.43$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.597$, and also reported significantly greater levels of female representation if they were assigned to the high gender representation condition than the low gender representation condition, $F(1, 188)=111.04$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.371$.

In Study 2B, participants reported significantly greater levels of Black representation if they were assigned to the high race representation condition than the low race representation condition, $F(1, 159)=7.48$, $p=.007$, $\eta_p^2=.045$, and reported significantly greater levels of female representation if they were assigned to the high gender representation condition than the low gender representation condition, $F(1, 159)=47.83$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.231$.

In Study 2C, participants reported significantly greater levels of Black representation if they were assigned to the high race representation condition than the low race representation condition, $F(1, 163)=190.90$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.539$, and reported significantly greater levels of female representation if they were assigned to the high gender representation condition than the low gender representation condition, $F(1, 163)=196.31$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.546$.

Across all three samples, the race representation manipulation impacted perceptions of Black representation in the company, and the gender representation manipulation impacted perceptions of female representation in the company.

Studies 2A-2C: PCD of Asian and Latina women

Although investigating the PCD of Asian and Latina women was not of theoretical interest in Studies 2A-2C given our focus on manipulating Black representation, we conducted two multiple linear regressions to examine whether Asian and Latina women's PCD were affected by female representation, Asian and Latinx representation, respectively, and the interactions between gender and race representation.

We found that for both Asian and Latinx women, female representation was negatively associated with PCD (Asian: $B=-.01$, $SE=.01$, $p=.014$; Latina: $B=-.01$, $SE=.01$, $p=.012$), and Asian/Latinx representation was negatively associated with PCD (Asian: $B=-.05$, $SE=.02$, $p=.031$; Latina: $B=-.06$, $SE=.02$, $p=.004$). Further, across both targets, the interaction between female representation and Asian/Latinx representation also affected PCD (Asian: $B=-.004$, $SE=.001$, $p=.002$; Latina: $B=-.004$, $SE=.001$, $p=.001$). Therefore, the PCD of Asian and Latina women, similar to the PCD of Black women, were affected by both gender and race representation.

Study 3: Pre-Testing of Study Materials

In order to ensure that our job description was perceived as suitable for applicants across gender and racial groups, and that our hypothetical job applicants were perceived as equally qualified for the position, we pre-tested the Study 3 job description and applicant resumes.

Pre-test participants were $N=101$ undergraduate students (80.2% female, 42.6% White). Participants read an advertisement for a hypothetical Marketing Communications Specialist position, and were asked "From the ad, this position appears to be suitable for (Check all that apply):" [response options: men, women, younger adults, older adults, African American adults, Asian adults, Latino/Latina adults, Caucasian adults]. Participants were then presented with eight hypothetical applicant resumes, and were asked to rate the extent to which each applicant was "qualified for the job" and "competitive for the job" on scales from 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Extremely*).

From the eight resumes shown to participants, we selected four resumes that were rated as similarly qualified for the job. Specifically, we averaged the qualification and competitiveness items together, and the four resumes we selected for use in Study 3 scored between $M=4.76$ and $M=5.90$ on the 7-point scale.

We ensured that at least 50% of our participants indicated that the job description was suitable for men and women, and applicants across the four racial groups (Asian, Black, Latinx, White). However, because a greater percentage of our participants reported that the job was suitable for women than men, we revised the job description to contain more masculine language. We created three revisions of the job description and pre-tested them with a separate sample of psychology undergraduate students ($N=31$; 58.1% female, 41.9% White). Participants were asked to respond to the same question as the initial pre-test: "From this ad, this position appears to be suitable for (Check all that apply): [same response options as above]." We selected the job description that obtained the most gender-neutral ratio of suitability for men and women (and maintained equal suitability across racial groups).

To further confirm that participants perceived the job to be equally suitable for both men and women, in a separate study ($N=150$; mTurk workers), we asked participants to evaluate eight targets (men and women who were White, Asian, Black, and Latinx) in their qualifications for the job (with no mention of hiring based on diversity in one of two between-subjects conditions). The race and gender of the targets were randomly assigned to one of the eight pre-tested resumes. Indeed, in the "no mention of diversity" condition, women were not rated as more qualified for the job than men, $F(1, 67)=2.84$, $p=.096$, $\eta_p^2=.041$. Therefore, this final round of pre-testing confirmed that the job advertisement, which was used in Study 3, would be perceived as suitable for both women and men.

Study 3: Downstream Consequences of Perceived Diversity on other Outcomes

To explore the downstream consequences of PCD, we first tested whether PCD were associated with perceptions of warmth, competence, and qualification for the job. Participants' perceptions of targets' contributions to organizational diversity were, in fact, positively associated with ratings of target warmth, $r(464)=.27$, $p<.001$, competence, $r(505)=.21$, $p<.001$, and qualification for the job, $r(505)=.49$, $p<.001$.

Next, we tested whether there was a significant interaction between target (White man vs. White woman vs. Black man vs. Black woman) and condition (control vs. gender discrimination

vs. race discrimination) on perceived warmth, competence, and qualification, similar to the interaction between target and condition on PCD reported in our manuscript. However, this interaction term did not reach statistical significance for perceived warmth, $F(6, 218)=1.87$, $p=.087$, competence, $F(6, 246)=.29$, $p=.939$, or qualification for the job, $F(6, 246)=.98$, $p=.439$. Nonetheless, post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that Black women were rated as more qualified for the job than White women, $p<.001$.

As a result, we tested whether PCD might mediate the association between target (White vs. Black women) and qualification for the job. We found evidence for a significant indirect effect of PCD, $B=.90$, $SE=.26$, 95% CI [.39, 1.41], indicating that differences between White and Black women's qualification for the job could be at least partially explained by their PCD. Next, we tested whether this effect occurred differentially across experimental conditions, specifically focusing on the comparison between the control condition (no gender discrimination) and the gender discrimination condition. We found a significant index of moderated mediation, $b=-.18$, $SE=.11$, 95% CI [-.45, -.003], indicating that the indirect effect through PCD was significantly stronger in the control condition, $B=.76$, $SE=.32$, 95% CI [.12, 1.37], than in the gender discrimination condition, $B=.58$, $SE=.25$, 95% CI [.09, 1.07]. Considering that the Black woman was perceived as more qualified for the job than the White woman, this indicates that gender salience may *decrease* the likelihood that a Black woman is perceived to be qualified for a diversity job due to relative decreases in the difference between Black women's and White women's PCD under such circumstances.

Studies 1, 2A-2C, and 3: Moderation by Participant Race and Gender

We tested for moderation of our primary effects by participant race (White vs. non-White) and participant gender (men vs. women).

In Study 1, there was no evidence for moderation by participant race, $F_s(3, 214)=1.12-2.03$, $ps>.110$, or participant gender, $F_s(3, 222)=.28-.81$, $ps>.49$.

Across Studies 2A-2C, neither participant race nor participant gender affected the PCD of White women versus White men, $ps>.49$, White women versus Black men, $ps>.35$, or White women versus Black women, $ps>.22$. Additionally, we tested for moderation of the primary effect reported in our manuscript (a two-way interaction between the White woman vs. Black woman dummy code and female representation) by both participant race and participant gender. The three-way interaction term was not significant in the case of participant race, $B=.01$, $SE=.02$, $p=.64$, or participant gender, $B=-.01$, $SE=.01$, $p=.53$. Thus, participant race and gender did not affect the Study 2 results reported in our manuscript.

In Study 3, the interaction between target and condition was not further moderated by participant race, $F(6, 208)=1.50$, $p=.181$; however, there was a significant two-way interaction between target and participant race, $F(3, 104)=5.38$, $p=.002$. When decomposed, this interaction indicates that although both White and non-White participants rated White men as contributing significantly less to diversity than White women, $ps<.001$, and White women as contributing significantly less to diversity than Black men, $ps<.001$, only White participants rated Black women as contributing more to diversity than Black men (White participants: $p<.01$, non-White participants: $p=.324$).

Furthermore, there was a significant two-way interaction between target and participant gender, $F(3, 117)=3.01$, $p=.033$, as well as a three-way interaction between target, condition, and participant gender, $F(6, 234)=2.59$, $p=.019$. Specifically, although both male and female

participants rated White men as contributing significantly less to diversity than White women, $ps < .001$, and White women as contributing significantly less to diversity than Black men, $ps < .001$, only female participants rated Black women as contributing more to diversity than Black men (female participants: $p < .05$, male participants: $p = .122$). Furthermore, while neither male nor female participants' perceptions of Black women's contributions to diversity shifted across experimental conditions (as reported in our manuscript), $ps > .136$, only female participants perceived White women to contribute more to diversity under conditions of gender discrimination compared to the control condition (female participants: $p = .050$, male participants: $p = .107$). However, it is important to note that there were only 27 male participants in the Study 3 sample (approximately 9 male participants per condition), and thus any conclusions about the effect of participant gender should be taken with extreme caution.