



Missouri State
U N I V E R S I T Y

BearWorks

MSU Graduate Theses

Spring 2020

Diversity Pep-Talk: Finding Strengths in Differences – An Examination of Diversity Workshops in Middle School

Taylor S. Smith

Missouri State University, Smith6192@live.missouristate.edu

As with any intellectual project, the content and views expressed in this thesis may be considered objectionable by some readers. However, this student-scholar's work has been judged to have academic value by the student's thesis committee members trained in the discipline. The content and views expressed in this thesis are those of the student-scholar and are not endorsed by Missouri State University, its Graduate College, or its employees.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/theses>



Part of the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Smith, Taylor S., "Diversity Pep-Talk: Finding Strengths in Differences – An Examination of Diversity Workshops in Middle School" (2020). *MSU Graduate Theses*. 3470.

<https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/theses/3470>

This article or document was made available through BearWorks, the institutional repository of Missouri State University. The work contained in it may be protected by copyright and require permission of the copyright holder for reuse or redistribution.

For more information, please contact BearWorks@library.missouristate.edu.

**DIVERSITY PEP-TALK: FINDING STRENGTHS IN DIFFERENCES – AN
EXAMINATION OF DIVERSITY WORKSHOPS IN MIDDLE SCHOOL**

A Master's Thesis

Presented to

The Graduate College of
Missouri State University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science, Psychology

By

Taylor Shea Smith

May 2020

Copyright 2020 by Taylor Shea Smith

DIVERSITY PEP-TALK: FINDING STRENGTHS IN DIFFERENCES – AN EXAMINATION OF DIVERSITY WORKSHOPS IN MIDDLE SCHOOL

Psychology

Missouri State University, May 2020

Master of Science

Taylor Shea Smith

ABSTRACT

Negative views regarding diversity can lead to bullying, decreased empathy, and overall detrimental academic and social environments. The aim of this study was to implement and evaluate diversity workshops designed to raise awareness about and illuminate barriers among middle school children that manufacture from real and/or perceived differences. These workshops utilized activities that fostered communication between students about diversity but also the commonalities among themselves. A goal of the discussions was to prevent issues associated with infrequent peer group intermingling, because infrequent contact can result in diminished empathy, unmet basic needs, and reduced effectiveness of contact hypothesis. Specifically, the design of workshops was to promote positive views about diversity, celebrate group differences, and highlight the respect and acceptance of individual differences. Researchers analyzed pre- and post-surveys to determine whether workshops changed diversity attitudes of students and reduced victimization/aggression. The analysis included examination of the basic needs (i.e., autonomy, competence, relatedness) to determine possible relationships with core diversity influences (i.e., bullying/aggression) and overall diversity perceptions. While no differences in basic psychological needs scores existed, basic psychological needs did predict diversity perceptions and aggression. Findings encourage future empirical research about the role of psychological needs in relation to diversity attitudes and perceptions.

KEYWORDS: diversity, bullying, victimization, basic psychological needs, Self-Determination Theory, Contact Hypothesis, stereotype

**DIVERSITY PEP-TALK: FINDING STRENGTHS IN DIFFERENCES – AN
EXAMINATION OF DIVERSITY WORKSHOPS IN MIDDLE SCHOOL**

By

Taylor Shea Smith

A Master's Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate College
Of Missouri State University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Science, Psychology

May 2020

Approved:

Adena Young-Jones, Ph.D., Thesis Committee Chair

Christie Cathey, Ph.D., Committee Member

Thomas Kane, Ph.D., Committee Member

Julie Masterson, Ph.D., Dean of the Graduate College

In the interest of academic freedom and the principle of free speech, approval of this thesis indicates the format is acceptable and meets the academic criteria for the discipline as determined by the faculty that constitute the thesis committee. The content and views expressed in this thesis are those of the student-scholar and are not endorsed by Missouri State University, its Graduate College, or its employees.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following people for their support during the course of my graduate studies. First, I would like to thank my influential faculty: Adena Young-Jones, Christie Cathey, and Thomas Kane. Adena inspired me to pursue research about diversity and believed in my abilities since meeting me as an undergraduate. She constantly encouraged me to enhance my academic knowledge while honing abilities I have been able to transfer to my everyday life. Christie was a key supporter of my talents and motivated me to become a better educator. Her enthusiasm for teaching and student improvement is contagious. Tom was a big supporter of my success from the first time I enrolled in one of his classes as a graduate. I wish I had the opportunity to learn more from him; however, I appreciate all that he has done and taught me. These amazing individuals are the reason I am able to achieve my goal of attaining a Master's degree – I could not have done it without them. Finally, I would like to thank my family. My family has been vital to my success in both life and academia. Specifically, my parents have been constantly supportive which has enabled me to achieve my goals.

I dedicate this thesis to Randy and Sandra Smith.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	Page 1
Literature Review	Page 3
Contact Hypothesis	Page 3
Empathy	Page 5
Self-Determination Theory	Page 6
Bullying in School	Page 10
Diversity Workshops	Page 11
Study Overview	Page 14
Research Question	Page 15
Hypotheses	Page 15
Methods	Page 16
Participants	Page 16
Gaining Permission	Page 16
Procedure	Page 17
Conditions	Page 18
Workshop Activities	Page 19
Materials	Page 24
Results	Page 27
Discussion	Page 29
Hypothesis One: Decreased Bullying	Page 29
Hypothesis Two: Favorable Diversity Perceptions	Page 30
Hypothesis Three: Basic Psychological Needs	Page 31
Limitations and Future Research	Page 32
References	Page 35
Appendix	Page 52

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Diversity Workshop Demographics	Page 44
Table 2. Skewness and Kurtosis Values by Scale	Page 45
Table 3.1. Synthesized Aggression Scale (SAS) Mean Scores	Page 46
Table 3.2. Perceived Victimization Questionnaire (PVQ) Mean Scores	Page 47
Table 3.3. Perceptions of Diversity (POD) Mean Scores	Page 48
Table 3.4. Basic Psychological Needs Scale (BPNS) Mean Scores by Condition	Page 49
Table 4.1. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Aggression	Page 50
Table 4.2. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Perceptions of Diversity	Page 51

INTRODUCTION

The term ‘diversity’ encompasses differences that exist among groups; it has no naturally occurring positive or negative meaning. Yet, diversity is a heated issue in society today, especially within the realm of academia. This is primarily due to the swiftly changing demographic make-up among students, which causes groups to retreat from others who may act or view the world differently (Ayers et al., 1999; Henfield & Washington, 2012). To address shifting needs among children operating within diverse populations, restructuring coursework and school environments may be necessary (Ayers et al., 1999; Elicker, Snell, O’Malley, & Thompson, 2009; Pass, 2009; Swail, Redd, & Perna, 2003). Diversity workshops, delivered to students/teachers, may combat diversity-related issues by fostering inclusive environments that are associated with psychological/behavioral well-being and encouraging meaningful connections through indirect and real contact (Allport, 1954; Dovidio, Eller, & Hewstone, 2011; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kawakami, 2003; Espelage, Aragon, & Birkett, 2008). Ideally, such interventions should decrease bullying/aggression, increase empathy, improve overall well-being, and enhance positive perceptions of peer differences (Allport, 1954; Ayers et al., 1999; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002; Lee, 2014; Pettigrew, 1998; Butrus & Witenberg, 2012).

Diversity workshops may enable the implementation of contact hypothesis principles and, thusly, diminish in-group preferences. An in-group is whoever an individual considers to be part of their group; this can be both real (e.g., blood relatives, sex, socioeconomic status, and individuals with the same skin color) and perceived (e.g., co-workers, religious patrons, and political affiliates). People naturally create in-groups, which also imply the cognitive construction of out-groups. The out-group is any faction that a person views as different from

their in-group(s) (Tajfel, 1982). For workshops to succeed, practitioners must examine the dimension for which individuals view their out-group peers (often minority populations) as different.

Current trends are for historically underrepresented groups (i.e., ethnicity, exceptionality, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, etc.) to be growing in proportion to other groups; a trend particularly prevalent in academic settings (Ayers et al., 1999; McFarland et al., 2017; Pass, 2009). Such growth in diverse minority groups occurs for religions, sexual identifications, race, ethnicities, and other domains. While classrooms become more diverse, the responsibility of promoting and maintaining positive intergroup relationships challenge school systems (Fox & Stallworth, 2005; Larochette, Murphy, & Craig, 2010). To combat escalating tensions, many academic institutions have developed programs to constructively address peer relation difficulties stemming from diversity. Introducing the topic of diversity early in education can potentially promote overall acceptance of others, open discussions with peers, and prompt divergent thinking about out-groups (Pass, 2009). Additionally, workshops that facilitate contact hypothesis principles could alleviate tension caused by real and perceived in-group/out-group distinctions (Allport, 1954).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Contact Hypothesis

People, intentionally or not, live in close proximity to others who have the same ethnic backgrounds, socioeconomic status, and/or values. Though individuals cannot control who moves into the home or apartment next to theirs, people gravitate toward those similar to themselves (Allport, 1954; Backstrom, Huttenlocher, Kleinberg, & Lan, 2006; Klein, Jacobs, Gemoets, Licata, & Lambert, 2003). Reduced variation in the characteristics of populations often occurs in private schools, religious institutes, health care centers, clubs that provide leisure activities, and even places where individuals shop (Backstrom et al., 2006). Because reduced contact with individuals from different groups abounds, people often compensate for being ill-informed about other groups by relying on stereotypes and preconceived notions to make judgments when interacting with out-group members (Bodenhausen & Lichtenstein, 1987; Klein et al., 2003; Shapira, Shoal, & Hanani, 1997). People dislike feeling uncomfortable or ignorant in novel situations, so they acquire knowledge from other people and media sources such as books, movies, the internet, and television. These indirect and superficial sources of understanding often lead to the perpetuation of stereotypes because actual contact with out-group members is minimal. Media sources may diverge significantly from an accurate portrayal of people in out-groups; therefore, actual contact is important for eliminating the biases contained in stereotypes and incomplete information about out-group members.

Contact hypothesis proposes that prejudice can be reduced through contact between in-group and out-group members, under certain conditions (Allport, 1954), which include: 1) interaction must occur between members of an out-group perceived as having equal status

(Dovidio et al., 2003), 2) several interactions must occur which are seen as cooperative by both parties (see Workshop Activities section; Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011), 3) other individuals are perceived as representative of the out-group (Pettigrew, 1998), and 4) authority figures facilitate personal/cooperative contact. These conditions, when in place, reduce prejudice (Allport, 1954). Equal status forces people to recognize any differences among the groups and reconsider why the few perceived/existing differences are of importance. Once an individual interacts with a person of equal status, both must work toward accomplishing a mutually beneficial goal.

To address the cooperation tenet of the contact hypothesis, Everett (2013) suggested in-group and out-group members jointly partake in activities such as neighborhood beautification or crime watch. Other activities might include a community garden, volunteering, or participating in community and campus groups. Authority figures (e.g., researchers, teachers, board members, and parents) or institutions (e.g., universities, non-profit organizations, and businesses) should foster these exchanges by creating situations where neither party has an advantage over the other. Finally, to avoid the trap of subtyping (i.e., claiming out-group individuals are ‘exceptions to the rule that is defined by their stereotype’), they must be seen as representative of the population whose stereotype is being challenged. All of these contact conditions, when in place, combine to reduce prejudice through actual, physical contact (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew et al., 2011; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1954, 1961). Workshop facilitators, and teachers, can encourage contact, which follows these guidelines by encouraging students to expand their experiences through activities, including out-group members as part of the in-group when opportunities arise, working towards superordinate goals with out-group members, and/or via assignments which promote real or imagined contact with diverse populations.

Another way to utilize the contact hypothesis is through indirect contact. Witnessing or imagining positive interactions between various groups help to reduce prejudice and stereotypes (Dovidio et al., 2011). This strategy is an alternative to teaching homogenous groups about diverse and historically underrepresented populations such as during diversity workshops/trainings or throughout academic curriculum in general. Various studies validate the method of imagined intergroup contact (Crisp & Turner, 2009; Tausch et al., 2010; Turner, Hewstone, Voci, & Vonofakou, 2008; Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997). Whether through the observation of positive interactions between perceived groups (Wright et al., 1997), recognition of connections to out-groups (Turner et al., 2008), mentally simulating positive interactions through every day experiences (Crisp & Turner, 2009), writing about an imagined positive experience with another individual (Everett, 2013), or physical contact with out-group members which is then generalizable to other groups (Tausch et al., 2010), presenters can utilize indirect contact in workshops to educate when direct contact is not possible. Indirect contact is also an affordable and straightforward technique to approach diverse concepts in the classroom.

Empathy

Training that promotes empathy can mitigate negative perceptions toward out-group members. Empathy occurs when an individual connects to the perspective of another by mentally experiencing the other person's perspective in a situation or life in general (Brouwer & Boros, 2010; Butrus & Witenberg, 2012; Kasl & Yorks, 2016; Neukrug, Bayne, Dean-Nganga, & Pusateri, 2013). Two types of empathy, cognitive and emotional, exist. Both are vital for people to comprehend what historically underrepresented groups deal with every day.

Cognitive empathy involves taking the perspective of another person in a specific situation, while emotional empathy entails understanding the feelings and disposition of the individual (Huang & Su, 2014; Verhofstadt et al., 2016). Both types of empathy develop at a young age with the emotional empathy developing first (Bensalah, Caillies, & Anduze, 2016). While some people are naturally inclined to possess greater empathy, related skills can be cultivated over time and through effort to connect with other individuals (Bensalah et al., 2016).

A person's empathy level plays a pivotal role in tolerance toward out-group members; the more empathy someone displays, the more understanding they are of diverse people and topics (Blake, Lund, Zhou, Kwok, & Benz, 2012; Brand, Felner, Shim, Seitsinger, & Dumas, 2003; Butrus & Witenberg, 2012; Espelage et al., 2008; Lee, 2014). Vital to workshop effectiveness is the promotion of empathy skills by enhancing the perspective-taking of students in diversity training through both direct and indirect contact; successfully breaching egocentrism is essential for this to happen. Egocentrism, the self-absorption that is often typical of young adults, may impede the ability of people to remove themselves from social situations enough to feel empathy towards others (Elkind, n.d.; Piaget, 1932). Workshop facilitators should strive to combat egocentrism while promoting and enhancing empathy within individuals such as through contact, imagined or real, with various out-groups. In conjunction with supporting empathic growth, encouraging opportunities to internalize motivations towards learning about diversity is also essential.

Self-Determination Theory

Through the lens of the self-determination theory, this study examines relationships among perceptions of diversity and bullying. Current research has not yet linked self-

determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002) to diversity workshop interventions. According to SDT, an individual's motivation toward a task can derive from intrinsic or extrinsic motives, and the extent to which these motives drive someone resides along a continuum (Reeve, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2000a). This continuum ranges from amotivation (i.e., possessing neither intrinsic nor extrinsic motivation) to intrinsic motivation (i.e., finding an activity or action inherently enjoyable). Different degrees of extrinsic motivation (i.e., seeking external rewards) define the middle of the continuum (Ryan & Deci, 2000b).

Intrinsic motivation is consistent with maximizing motivation and deep-level learning and is an ideal outcome for students learning about diversity. Essentially, through internalization of a task, an individual perceives the behavior as inherently gratifying and interesting (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002; Ryan & Deci, 2000a). Often, these tasks have no perceptible reward and are challenging to the person while promoting learning and growth (Cerasoli & Ford, 2014). Utilizing the SDT continuum of motivation, researchers and educators can use the basic psychological needs (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness) to support people in moving along the spectrum toward intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002; Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991; Levesque, Copeland, Patti, & Deci, 2010; Reeve, 2009). This progress, achieved through meeting the basic psychological needs, correlates with enhanced well-being, which should improve empathy while reducing aggression towards out-group members (Allport, 1954; Ayers et al., 1999; Butrus & Witenberg, 2012; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002; Dovidio et al., 2011; Dovidio et al., 2003; Espelage et al., 2008; Lee, 2014; Pettigrew, 1998).

Autonomy. The need of autonomy consists of a capacity to independently decide how to think or act. Choices are vital to the sense of self, and autonomy increases when people are responsible for determining their own paths (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002). When decisions are

autonomous, people are more likely to exert effort, willingly work harder, and enhance the productivity of the initial effort (Reeve, 2009). Yet, people may not want autonomy in every situation (Carver & Scheier, 2000). Guidance is sometimes preferred to independence when challenging situations present themselves in daily lives. This is typically true in novel situations such as new assignments or unique experiences involving diversity.

Knowledge of both the role of autonomy and understanding when to reduce autonomy in favor of promoting competence are essential in the classroom and other educational settings (i.e., workshops, trainings, etc). Regardless of the domain, appropriately encouraging autonomy of students will ultimately enhance their academic experiences and improve performance (Chang, Chen, Tu, & Chi, 2016; Patall, Cooper, & Wynn, 2010; Wichmann, 2011; Young-Jones, Cara, & Levesque-Bristol, 2014). This is imperative to realize because authority figures cannot allow too much autonomy involving sensitive subjects such as diversity, yet they must allow enough freedom for students to explore and experience the topic in a positive/productive manner.

Competence. Competence is the psychological need to feel capable and effective (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002; Reeve, 2009). If competence is autonomously supported (e.g., useful feedback from a reliable source), then intrinsic motivation will be enhanced (Deci et al., 1991). Fortunately, opportunities arise frequently in trainings/workshops to allow students to feel competent in sensitive, diversity related situations.

Academic domains also foster social comparisons that fulfill the competence need; this atmosphere frequently facilitates competition and explicit assessments between students (e.g., grades, grade point average, etc.). Unfortunately, while these environments are a common source of gaining competence, successfully meeting this need might also result in aggression towards peers. Competent students may bully classmates because they consider themselves

superior (Graham, n.d.). The result is a facilitated aggression towards others, thwarting those individuals' own psychological needs. Competence may also decline in overly competitive environments for students who are not above average (Deci et al., 1991).

Ultimately, topics such as diversity can make individuals uncomfortable because they feel incompetent. When subjects are taboo and unreliable sources flood media outlets, people may not feel confident in the knowledge they possess. Voluntary participation (autonomy) in diversity workshops assists in increasing aptitude and comprehension to combat this distress (Simpkins & Riggs, 2014).

Relatedness. The third psychological need is relatedness. This is the need to relate to subject material and/or develop supportive, secure, warm, and caring relationships with other people (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002; Deci et al., 1991; Reeve, 2009). Relatedness is achievable through familial relationships, peer networks, connections to the topic, and/or simply finding commonality with another individual. People who can relate to others and develop the necessary networks best navigate stress-evoking situations.

Relatedness to peers is essential for positive educational outcomes (Beachboard, Beachboard, Li, & Adkison, 2011; Espelage et al., 2008). Relationships develop in multiple ways (i.e., being a majority group member, working towards a common goal such as a group project or presentation, taking part in a diversity workshop with peers perceived as different, having a shared experience) and different types of associations can meet the psychological need of relatedness. Informative trainings such as diversity workshops can foster relatedness by focusing on, promoting and celebrating differences (both chosen and not). Moreover, instructors can focus on creating cohesive and tolerant classroom environments to aid in the formation of

relatedness. These cohort formations are vital to enhancing the experience of students' learning about diversity and furthering their academic knowledge (Kackar-Cam & Schmidt, 2014).

Motivation Types. Although developing intrinsic motivation for an undertaking, such as participating in a diversity workshop is ideal, many times this is difficult to obtain. Students without an intrinsic desire to learn about diversity need assistance from authority figures to navigate a progression from extrinsic toward intrinsic motivation through workshops, projects, and assignments. This can be potentially challenging depending on the task at hand. Consider the participation of students in a diversity workshop. Although interventions are positive from a societal standpoint, a possibility exists that participation may evoke external praise and motivation while highlighting a students' lack of competence about diversity, thus thwarting their need for competence. Forces continually push and pull against each of the basic psychological needs and can easily thwart them. Meanwhile, other situations are unable to evoke any motivation other than extrinsic or amotivation. For instance, circumstances within academia may promote bullying. While aggression towards a peer is probably not intrinsically rewarding, the attention, encouragement, and/or perceptions of competence (if one asserts physical or psychological dominance over another individual) might be motivation enough.

Bullying in School

Children can incur ridicule from classmates for a number of diverse reasons including socioeconomic (i.e., clothing brands, reduced/free meal plans, etc.), individualization (i.e., dying their hair, wearing a cross, etc.), physiological (i.e., skin color, height, etc.), or other various demographic aspects. Bullying is an imbalance of power in which the victim is repeatedly subjected to aggressive behaviors (i.e., verbal, physical, nonverbal, or exclusion; Olweus, 1994).

Although a seemingly all-inclusive definition, what constitutes bullying varies from person to person (Barcaccia, Schneider, Pallini, & Baiocco, 2017; Litwiller & Brausch, 2013; Rivers & Smith, 1994; Sanders & Phye, 2004; Young-Jones, Fursa, Byrket, & Sly, 2014). Regardless of the exact definition, bullying may have lasting effects on individuals. Bullying can result from peers perceiving in-group/out-group differences as relevant rationale for attempting to assert one's dominance through physically or psychologically abusive means (Juvonen & Graham, 2001; Sanders & Phye, 2004).

Diverse classifications also place certain populations more at risk for victimization. Students in historically underrepresented groups may face greater impediments than those of white males because they are at an increased risk for becoming a target of out-group-based bullying (Blake et al., 2012; Brand et al., 2003; Espelage et al., 2008). Being the target of bullying behavior may result in feelings of depression, which can negatively affect the target's ability to navigate effectively in social, personal, and educational environments (Lee, 2014). The psychological effects can further expand into their daily lives and may even continue to college or the workforce (Young-Jones et al., 2014). Ultimately, implementing diversity teachings (e.g., promoting works from diverse authors, attending panels, participating in activities, etc.) and examining research (e.g., contact hypothesis, Self-Determination Theory, etc.) will improve empathy, caring, social skills, and tolerance to combat this occurrence (Ayers et al., 1999).

Diversity Workshops

To address the lack of sensitivity to variations between individuals based on group membership, many schools are now exploring diversity workshops or training programs. Diversity workshops have primarily focused on race and gender (Cisse & Casstevens, 2013;

Liberman, Block, & Koch, 2011; Lindsey, King, Hebl, & Levine, 2015; Paluck, 2006). Though gender and race define potentially significant barriers for constructive peer relationships, teaching individuals that diversity involves both physical (e.g., race, sex, etc.) and non-physical (e.g., religion, socioeconomic status, etc.) characteristics is also important (Ayers et al., 1999; Park, Denson, & Bowman, 2013). Societal and academic tension among peer groups can potentially center on religion, socioeconomic status, and sexual orientation. To promote positive attitudes about diversity on multiple fronts, trainings need to expand by incorporating overall awareness through inclusion and contact, while simultaneously promoting empathy and overarching themes of acceptance, awareness, and inclusion.

Intervention facilitators must learn to effectively discuss and communicate these concepts to a variety of generations. Diversity workshops often consist of forums where an individual(s) from a historically underrepresented group is present to answer questions, diversity training manuals which provide possible questions with pre-prepared answers (Peel, 2009), lectures to address aspects of diversity, and/or open/honest discussions that take place among groups presented by knowledgeable facilitator(s) (Werner-Wilson, 2001). Alternatively, workshops involving children typically incorporate activities and guest presenters who focus on the celebration of diversity and the formation of positive peer connections (Ferdman & Brody, 1996; Freeman, Izzard, Faulkner, & Charles, 2012; McLennan, 2008; Pass, 2009; Rynes & Rosen, 1995). For example, one teacher brought Native Americans in to speak with her class about their tribe and history, produced crafts with the children, made food, and read books (Pass, 2009).

While the overarching consensus is that trainings are valuable, research does not indicate whether diversity workshops achieve permanent change in attitudes (Hill & Augoustinos, 2001; Peel, 2009). The fact remains that most articles regarding these trainings include anecdotal

evidence, utilize direct quotes and qualitative evaluations to promote usefulness, and/or detail the actual training procedures (Ayers et al., 1999; Peel, 2009). A deficit in empirical appraisals of diversity workshop effectiveness remains unaddressed, particularly among middle school children (Irvine, 2003; Peel, 2009).

STUDY OVERVIEW

The proposed study involved the construction and implementation of a diversity workshop intervention entitled Diversity Pep-Talk: Finding Strengths in Differences. Developed according to the principles of contact hypothesis, various elements combined to promote positive diversity perceptions; moreover, researchers expected this workshop to decrease bullying/aggression and victimization. Unique to this study was the integration of Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002) tenets when examining the data. Current research lacks information about how diversity workshop objectives connect with the SDT/basic psychological needs (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness). This experiment utilized a motivational approach to investigate the differences in students' perceptions of diversity before and after training provided by educated presenters to expand literature in this area.

Presenters possessed knowledge to answer students' questions, in depth, about diversity, including the roles of optimal intergroup contact, empathy, and perspective taking, as well as principles of the Self-Determination Theory. Concurrently, they facilitated learning and combated negative effects of stereotypes during the intervention while promoting basic psychological needs and implementing activities designed to apply conditions specified by the contact hypothesis to reduce prejudiced attitudes. Objective, measurable outcomes of diversity training advantages and the effect on students, including incidences of bullying within the school environment, were expected. Furthermore, data could possibly guide the improvement of diversity education for middle school students while meeting critical research needs in the fields of diversity training preparation and evaluation in relation to the SDT.

Research Question

Will a diversity workshop positively affect students' attitudes about diversity?

Prediction: Diversity workshops will have an effect on students' attitudes towards diversity.

Hypotheses

1. Will a diversity intervention workshop decrease perceptions of bullying? Prediction:
Self-reports of both perceived victimization and occurrences of aggressive/bullying behavior will decrease as a function of training.
2. Will a diversity intervention workshop improve favorable diversity perceptions?
Prediction: Favorable perceptions of diversity will increase as a function of training.
3. Will the reported basic psychological needs predict perceptions of aggression and perceptions of diversity? Prediction: The basic psychological needs should predict rates of perceived bullying (i.e., aggression) and perceptions of diversity.

METHODS

Participants

The sample population consisted of 109 students from Springfield, Missouri middle schools (i.e., Hickory Hills and Jarrett). Researchers randomly assigned students to one of four conditions (i.e., control, Fast Friends only, diversity workshop and Fast Friends combination, and diversity workshop only); they removed 13 students from the dataset for not completing either a pre- or post-survey packet and deleted five students' data for invalid identification codes. Finally, researchers removed 23 students from analyses for missing more than five percent of their data. These deletions resulted in a final total of 68 students with viable data across the four conditions (i.e., control ($n = 8$), Fast Friends only ($n = 23$), diversity workshop and Fast Friends combination ($n = 14$), and diversity workshop only ($n = 23$)). Participants were 8th graders between the ages of 11 and 14. The majority of the sample was White, female, and from unidentified socioeconomic status families (see Table 1).

Gaining Permission

After obtaining Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval (Approval Date: 12-04-2016, IRB-FY2017-334; see Appendix), researchers (i.e., a group of undergraduate and graduate students from the Missouri State University Educational Psychology Research Lab) found classes willing to incorporate and utilize the diversity workshop by contacting counselors and teachers from area districts. Once schools conveyed interest in the workshop, facilitators scheduled data collection and presentation days based on the pre-planned school curriculum and

workshop presenter availability. Presenters brought consent forms to the school for staff to disperse. Students then took home an informed consent document which consisted of three parts.

The first page was an ‘advertisement’ for the workshop, which highlighted the main information from the consent forms. This document encouraged students to participate in an optional research project featuring interactive diversity activities, developed through a pilot study, which promoted aspects of the contact hypothesis. Next was a consent form for adolescents that provided a summary of the project (i.e., to examine student motivation and perceptions) and their rights as a participant (i.e., allowed to withdraw or decline to answer at any time); the document was constructed to be at a 6th grade reading level to raise the likelihood that participants were able to understand the purpose and requirements of the project. Finally, the packet contained a second consent form for parents/guardians to review and sign. This form incorporated the same information as the previous two pages but was composed at a level comprehensible for high school graduates. Both verbal and written instructions conveyed to students and parents/guardians that the child could withdraw or decline to participate at any time throughout the experiment. Facilitators required consent from both the student and a parent/guardian for participation in the project; failure to sign and return the documents by the beginning of the first data collection meant students could not participate in the workshop.

Procedure

After teachers permitted use of their class time for the delivery of our workshop, the researchers designated a six-digit identification code for matching pre- to post-data (facilitators deleted rosters containing the corresponding codes following post-data collection and before analysis) to each student (with parental/guardian consent) who chose to participate in the study.

These codes indicated the school, teacher, hour, and participant number in order to track conditions and responses. An Excel spreadsheet randomly assigned each class to one of four conditions. Researchers developed these conditions to determine the effectiveness of their activities, while utilizing the established procedure of Fast Friends, to enhance understanding between individuals. All students in the four experimental conditions utilized iPads to report data. Specifically, for the pre-surveys collected on week one, students completed the following: Synthesized Aggression Scale, Perceived Victimization Questionnaire, Index of Empathy in Children and Adolescent, Perceptions of Diversity, and School Hierarchy Questionnaire. Upon completion of the packet, students engaged in one of the conditions (unless assigned the control condition). Discussions and debriefings followed each of the three diversity activities for every condition.

Approximately one week after the workshop, students completed the same initial survey packet excluding the School Hierarchy Questionnaire (this questionnaire did not require a post survey). A Basic Psychological Needs Scale and Demographic Information Form replaced the School Hierarchy Questionnaire. The researcher counterbalanced all scales within Qualtrics (an online survey system) to control for order effects. Each survey (pre- and post-) took students between 30 and 45 minutes to complete.

Conditions

Condition One. Presenters collected pre-data the first week and then gathered post-data the following week (i.e., control/condition one, in which no intervention occurred between pre- and post- data collection). Students received the workshop (i.e., Statement Stockpile, React to the Label, and Web Activity; see Workshop Activities) on the third week. Sequencing training

after data collection ensured that the control students benefited from the project and prevented diversity workshop activities from influencing student reports of study variables.

Condition Two. The second condition involved three rounds of Fast Friends (see Workshop Activities) on the second week with post-data collection on the third week.

Condition Three. Condition three was a combination of the Statement Stockpile, React to the Label, and Web Activity along with one round of Fast Friends on the second week with post-data collection on the third week.

Condition Four. Condition four included the three diversity activities without Fast Friends on the second week with post-data collection on the third. The first and fourth conditions incorporated the same workshop exercises; however, administration of the workshops at different time points during the study distinguished them from one another.

Workshop Activities

Statement Stockpile. The Statement Stockpile provides a visual representation of the struggles students endure, identify why people refuse to request assistance, and allow peers to communicate with each other about common problems. Presenters facilitated these discussions regarding personal experiences among students to ensure constructive interactions between out-groups and allow other students to take on the perspective of their peers. The common goal of identifying shared experiences also emerged to intensify the game.

Facilitators requested a student volunteer to sit facing their peers at the front of the classroom (developed by researchers). Once seated, presenters read statements intended to ‘weigh students down’ emotionally (e.g., “I have had a rumor started about me,” “I have had an embarrassing moment at school,” “I have been told I was too young to do something.”).

Experimenters asked other students to raise their hand if the statement was true about them allowing a visual of commonalities between in- and out-group members. If at least one student raised their hand (the statements ensured that most participants would raise their hand), the volunteer received a textbook. The volunteer grasped the ever-increasing stack of books with their arms extended out, elbows locked, and palms facing up. This activity continued until either the student asked for assistance to hold the books or they dropped.

Typically, no volunteer directly requested help from peers or presenters. Instead, they attempted to hold the burden alone, which provided the students with a visual representation of the emotional weight individuals carry. Once the books fell, facilitators inquired as to why people avoid assisting others or requesting help when the emotional struggles (e.g., overlooking a homework assignment, being teased in school, hearing rumors, parents grounding you, peers excluding you from a party, having a family member die or in the hospital, classmates bullying you, etc.) begin to accumulate.

Often the students remained quiet following these questions until presenters rephrased the issue to inquire how they feel when asking for assistance. After establishing that most classmates both experienced similar emotional struggles and feelings of embarrassment when requesting help, facilitators delved into how diversity factors can cause some students to experience additional stressors and prevent other individuals from approaching them to offer assistance. Researchers allowed students to ponder and discuss these ideas.

React to the Label. The purpose of the React to the Label activity was to place students in out-groups with which they rarely find themselves associated and then reflect on their experiences. Researchers facilitated these interactions to ensure personal contact between peers

was constructive. This activity required students to mentally experience other individuals' (i.e., out-group) perspectives in an educational setting.

During the React to the Label activity, facilitators placed a label (e.g., bully, turn away from me, leader, be confused about everything I say, band nerd, cheerleader, etc.) on each students' forehead; students were unable to see their own label (adapted by researchers from Party Games, 2008). Researchers instructed the students to react to their peers' labels while being dramatic, extremely stereotypical, and overly exaggerated in their speech and behaviors toward each other. Specifically, presenters encourage them to "make the other person feel as if they were their label and only that one label." The researchers collaborated with teachers and assistants to secretly apply labels that were opposite of the students' typical personality (i.e., quiet and shy students received labels such as "leader" while outspoken students were given "turn away from me," "be confused by everything I say," and "bully"). Critical thinking questions (i.e., "Who figured out their label?", "Who did not?", "What did it feel like to be viewed as one label?", "Where any of the labels accurate?", etc.) followed the activity. The class discussed how people may not always know what others have labeled them, making it difficult to break away from stereotypes. Several students were upset that their peers refused to recognize anything else about them besides the forehead label even though the stickers were both good and bad. One student told researchers, "I liked that everyone thought I was smart and could help with their homework, but nobody asked me if I like sports or video games too."

In debriefing the activity, researchers encouraged students to recognize that labels limit how people treat each other and emphasized imagining how other individuals (i.e., out-group members) may experience life through labels placed on them by peers. Individuals are more than what people observe and stereotyping can prevent meaningful connections. This discussion

tended to require the most time because students had a significant amount to communicate about stereotyping and their views regarding in-/out-group experiences.

Web Activity. The Web Activity provided students with a visual representation of connections they have with out-group members. The cooperative goal of building a giant web encouraged students to interact with members from out-groups whom had equal status within the confines of the circle (i.e., each person was able to contribute equally). Presenters participated within the circle(s) to facilitate student exchanges and contact.

Instructors created a circle(s) of students sitting on the ground (adapted by researchers from Many Voices, n.d.). Additional presenters participated within the circle as well and began with a ball of yarn. The facilitator read ‘diversity statements’ (e.g., “I have or have had a family member in the military”, “I wear glasses or contacts”, “I am an only child”, “I know someone from another country”) out loud while overseeing the group(s) progress. If the statement applied to an individual, then that student raised their hand and it remained in the air until they received the ball of yarn. At that time, they grabbed the string and proceeded to roll the ball to another person with their hand raised until everyone had their arm down. The presenter continued to the next sentence and allowed the process to begin again. Students could grab the string once per statement if it applied. As students held the string, a web began to form in the middle of the group, and often the common goal of creating as many connections as possible emerged to expand the web.

For this conclusion activity, students sat facing each other, allowing visible connections to form in the middle of the circle. Individuals were unable to deny their links to classmates, even the people they viewed as different (i.e., out-group members). The web highlighted commonalities among the group, even with strangers (i.e., the presenters). Discussion time

allowed students to develop ideas for ways of making the school environment more inclusive. For instance, several students said they would invite someone new to sit with them at lunch the next time a peer was alone and the statements from this presentation could be talking points to find connections.

Fast Friends. The purpose of Fast Friends was to connect on a deeper level with members of an out-group. Questions posed to group members encouraged sharing and perspective taking as students worked together to complete all inquiries in the activity. Presenters explained that students would take turns answering questions within a group as they followed instructions on an iPad (Aron, Melinat, Aron, Vallone, & Bator, 1997). The researcher split students into pairs prior to the study with the assistance of teachers and counselors that work directly with the class. Presenters paired students with partners with whom they rarely interact (i.e., allowing direct contact with someone outside their ‘friend group’). Each pair/group received an iPad to facilitate a series of escalating questions (i.e., increasing in personal disclosure) aimed to enhance intragroup connections (e.g., “What is your favorite TV show or movie? ,” “Name one thing you and me appear to have in common. ,” “How would you describe a true friend?”). Once pairs finished the questions, facilitators switched students into new groups to repeat the process. This activity was self-explanatory and independently cultivated connections between relative strangers, so no discussion followed; in other conditions the exclusion of conversation allowed more time for other activities and in-depth dialogue of diversity concepts.

Materials

To assess the impact of the Diversity Workshop model on perceptions of diversity and bullying researchers administered the following measures:

- 1) *The Synthesized Aggression Scale* is a 23-item, self-report measure of aggression adapted from both the Buss Perry Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992) and other self-report aggression instruments (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Little, Jones, Henrich, & Hawley, 2003; Echols & Graham, 2013). It includes four aggression subscales: physical (e.g., “Some kids hit, kick, or punch others.”), verbal (e.g., “Some kids call other people names.”), relational (e.g., “Some kids ignore others or stop talking to them.”), and cyber (e.g., “Some kids post negative things on other people’s Facebook, Twitter, or other social media accounts.”). The four subscales were aggregated into a single scale, which demonstrated high internal consistency ($\alpha = .96$).
- 2) *The Perceived Victimization Questionnaire* is a 12-item, self-report measure of victimization based on four aggression subscales: physical (e.g., “Other people start physical fights with me.”), verbal (e.g., “Other people say mean things to me.”), relational (e.g., “I get left out from other groups of friends.”), and cyber (e.g., “Other people send mean texts to me.”) (Echols & Graham, 2013). Researchers reworded Synthesized Aggression Scale items in order to measure the frequency of aggressive acts experienced by youth (as the targets or victims of peer aggression, not as the perpetrators of such). This scale demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = .87$).
- 3) *Index of Empathy in Children and Adolescent* inspects the students’ current acceptance and empathy towards others (e.g., “I get upset when I see a peer being hurt.”, “Peers who cry because they are happy are silly.”, “It makes me sad to see a peer who can’t find

anyone to play with.”). The lead researcher altered the “Index of Empathy for Children and Adolescents” for the purpose of this study and removed questions 2, 8, 11, 13, and 16 based on relevance to the study overall. Additionally, the lead researcher combined questions 1/12, 3/9, 5/19, and 6/14 respectively to remove gender from the scale by replacing identifiers with “peer” and deleted repetitive items (i.e., questions 12, 9, 19, and 14). The researcher renumbered the 13-item, self-report scale for aesthetic purposes (Bryant, 1982). This altered scale demonstrated low internal consistency ($\alpha = .36$). The low internal consistency resulted in removal of empathy scores from analysis.

- 4) *Perceptions of Diversity* estimates students’ perceptions toward various ethnic groups (e.g., “I like people who are White.”, “I trust Black people.”, “I respect Hispanic people.”, “I am comfortable being around Asian people.”). Researchers adapted the 48 items from previous measures of trait stereotyping in which respondents specify the extent to which members of various racial/ethnic groups characterized positive and negative traits (Bigler, 1995; Brown & Bigler, 2002). This altered scale demonstrated high internal consistency ($\alpha = .90$).
- 5) *Basic Psychological Needs Scale* examines need satisfaction in the domains of autonomy (e.g., “I feel like I can make a lot of inputs to deciding how my school work gets done.”), competence (e.g., “People at school tell me I am good at what I do.”), and relatedness (e.g., “I really like the people I go to school with.”) through the use of 21 self-report items (e.g., Deci et al., 2001; Ilardi, Leone, Kasser, & Ryan, 1993; Kasser, Davey, & Ryan, 1992). This scale demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = .82$).

- 6) *Demographic Information Form* collects objective and descriptive information about the students who participate in the study (i.e., classification, ethnicity, grade level, socioeconomic status, etc.).

RESULTS

This study examined the joint effects of basic psychological needs and diversity training on perceptions of diversity, aggression, and victimization within middle school students. Likert-type scales obtained data for each condition pre- and post- diversity workshop interventions. Three 2 X 4 mixed ANOVAs examined each scale (excluding the basic psychological needs and empathy scales) pre- to post- and between workshop conditions, two hierarchical regressions were performed to investigate the relationship of basic psychological needs scores with aggression (i.e., bullying) along with the scale results on diversity perceptions, and a post hoc power analysis was conducted using G*Power for each ANOVA; the conditions failed to meet the minimum number of participants needed. Furthermore, researchers analyzed assumptions and linearity, normality, additivity, and homoscedasticity were met. Experimenters also examined skewness and kurtosis for each scale (Table 2). Furthermore, Levene's tests revealed that each ANOVA met the homogeneity assumption.

In order to study the effects of each condition a 2 (pre-/post-) X 4 (conditions) mixed ANOVA was conducted for each scale (excluding the basic psychological needs and empathy scales). No version of the diversity workshop affected participants' scores pre- to post- for any of the scales nor did statistical differences exist pre- to post- and between conditions for any of the scales (i.e., synthesized aggression scale (hypothesis 1) [$F(3, 64) = 1.56, p = .21$], perceived victimization questionnaire (hypothesis 1) [$F(3, 64) = .79, p = .50$], and perceptions of diversity scale (hypothesis 2) [$F(3, 64) = .82, p = .92$]). Regardless of condition, most scores slightly decreased pre- to post- for the scales (see Table 3.1, Table 3.2, & Table 3.3). These were not significant reductions, but opposite from the espoused hypotheses of this study.

Scores on the Basic Psychological Needs Scale (BPNS) did not significantly differ between conditions (Table 3.4). Researchers examined scores to determine if any conditions were outliers. Next, two hierarchical regressions were conducted to explore hypothesis 3 (i.e., if BPNS scores predicted aggression and perceptions of diversity). First, researchers used a regression to analyze the basic psychological needs scores as predictors of aggression (i.e., bullying). Model 1 (competence scores were included; [$F(1,66) = 24.16, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .27$]), Model 2 (the autonomy variable was added; [$F(2,65) = 11.91, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .27$]), and Model 3 (relatedness scores supplemented; [$F(3,64) = 8.09, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .28$]) were overall significant. This time competence was found to be a predictor of aggression in Model 1 ($[\beta = -0.52, p < .001]$: explained 26.8% of the variance), Model 2 ($[\beta = -0.53, p < .001]$: explained 26.82% of the variance) and in Model 3 ($[\beta = -0.50, p = .022]$: explained 27.5% of the variance; see Table 4.1).

Researchers conducted the second regression in order to investigate the relationship between the basic psychological needs, perceived victimization, and/or synthesized aggression as predictors of perceptions of diversity. All models were found to be significant: Model 1 (BPNS totals were expected to predict perceptions of diversity scores; [$F(1,66) = 19.65, p < .001, R^2 = .23$]), Model 2 (perceived victimization was included; [$F(2,65) = 10.28, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .01$]), and Model 3 (the aggression variable was added; [$F(3,64) = 8.35, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .04$]). However, the basic psychological needs were the exclusive predictors of diversity perceptions (Model 1 $[\beta = 0.48, p < .001]$: explained 22.9% of the variance, Model 2 $[\beta = 0.42, p < .001]$: explained 24% of the variance, and Model 3 $[\beta = 0.37, p = .005]$: explained 28.1% of the variance; see Table 4.2).

DISCUSSION

This study examined the effects of various diversity interventions at the middle school level. Research in the area of early diversity interventions necessitates empirical expansion and this workshop fulfilled that need (Freeman et al., 2012; McLennan, 2008; Pass, 2009). The anticipated benefits of this project were significant, as the results increase understanding of the link between diversity training and the acceptance of others among middle school students, student attitudes, bullying, and academic motivation. Unfortunately, no version of the diversity workshop affected participants' scores pre- to post- for any of the scales nor did statistical differences exist pre- to post- and between conditions for any of the scales. Only the predictor models for aggression and diversity perceptions were significant.

The experiment proposed three hypotheses. First, instances/perceptions of bullying would decrease. Second, the training will improve favorable diversity perceptions. Finally, the basic psychological needs predict bullying/aggression and positive diversity perceptions.

Hypothesis One: Decreased Bullying

Researchers initially expected to reduce both perceived victimization and occurrences of aggressive/bullying behavior through diversity training, but the data did not support this hypothesis. Minority individuals often report little emphasis on diversity in the classroom which may produce victimization among peers (Blake et al., 2012; Brand et al., 2003; Cisse & Casstevens, 2013; Elicker et al., 2009; Espelage et al., 2008; Juvonen & Graham, 2001; Sanders & Phye, 2004). Thus, researchers intended the diversity interventions to fill a deficit of insufficient knowledge in middle school children and to reduce group differences.

Society expects children to leave academia well-rounded, but competition which highlights differences inundates academia at every level. As a result, status and competence reign supreme among classmates. This cultivates an environment which values success (socially and intellectually) above all else. Over the years, even bullying behavior has become more vindictive and discreet (e.g., cyber-bullying) as a way to protect the status of the social elites (Juvonen & Graham, 2001; Olweus, 1994; Sanders & Phye, 2004). To combat this toxic relationship, instructors should encourage competition within students (e.g., try to beat your last test score) while minimizing comparisons between individuals and classrooms.

Hypothesis Two: Favorable Diversity Perceptions

Contact hypothesis is a useful tool for positive perceptions of diversity (Allport, 1954). Because the sample was relatively homogenous, and based on literature, researchers expected indirect contact through interactive activities would reduce prejudice and ultimately increase positive diversity perceptions (i.e., experiencing other individuals' stereotypes, discussing statements/scenarios that apply to every teenager, etc.; Allport, 1954; Crisp & Turner, 2009; Tausch et al., 2010; Turner et al., 2008; Wright et al., 1997). However, the results of this study were unable to substantiate these methods for shifting attitudes.

Future interventions may need an extensive combination of both direct and indirect contact over several workshops to comprehend diversity concepts. Moreover, adolescences' minds are in a constant state of development and as mentioned previously, although able, might be incapable of overcoming their egocentrism. Thus, the incorporation or addition of an activity which contains a superordinate goal for diverse groups (i.e., containing both in- and out-group

members) could be the explicit factor needed that encourages positive diversity perceptions when false egotistical beliefs preoccupy students' minds.

Hypothesis Three: Basic Psychological Needs

The basic needs contribute to the overall well-being of a person, which would typically enhance the ability to empathize (Allport, 1954; Ayers et al., 1999; Butrus & Witenberg, 2012; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002; Dovidio et al., 2011; Dovidio et al., 2003; Espelage et al., 2008; Lee, 2014; Pettigrew, 1998); this, in turn, should lead to reduced occurrences of aggression towards peers. Unfortunately, the study found no significant results through variance analysis to support this assertion. Regression outcomes *did* reveal that competence was the sole predictor of aggression (i.e., bullying); unexpectedly, the negative beta indicated that a higher competence level leads to less aggressive behavior which is contrary to research.

However, neither of the other subcategories (i.e., autonomy and relatedness) nor the total basic needs scores (i.e., overall well-being) predicted aggression. Thus, the study is unable to conclusively establish the supposition that improved overall well-being would actually amplify, instead of reducing, bullying events. Alternatively, the second regression showed that basic psychological needs scores were the sole predictor of positive diversity perceptions. The main distinction is that while competence may predict aggression, it is the combination of fulfilling all three basic needs that forecasts positive diversity perceptions. This aligns with expectations that students with high overall scores of competence, autonomy, and relatedness would view others in a more favorable light as they may be able to focus more on peers than themselves.

Limitations and Future Research

The most significant explanation for the deficit of effect is inadequate sample sizes for each condition. Though many individuals participated, the number of students in each condition was insufficient for significant results. Data cleaning (i.e., deleting participants missing a pre- or post-survey, who had too little data, and/or an invalid identification code) further reduced the sample size numbers in each condition. For future research, larger sample sizes in each condition will enhance overall study validity and strengthen the possibility of significant results.

Another factor contributing to the results is the population age. Accurate data is difficult to record from middle school students. While researchers took measures to ensure accurate self-report, several students did not take the study seriously; some students made comments which rejected diversity awareness and disregarded the value of learning to be open-minded, aware, tolerant, and/or empathetic. Many of their written-in answers during data collection also exemplified this attitude. For instance, the multiple options for gender surprised numerous students. Thus, several chose the third option and wrote random information (e.g., “attack helicopter” and “mailbox”). This can happen in any study, but children appear to be more prone to deliberate falsification of data as a joke.

A third factor is the school districts themselves. Respondents to this study were from predominantly White areas. While diversity workshops should be effective for all demographics, a visibly less homogenous group could increase the success of this intervention for children by utilizing direct contact with out-groups. Although adolescents identify many differences between peers, it is effortless to target easily perceptible distinctions (e.g., skin color). Particularly because this is an interactive workshop, minority perspectives from peers may provide a more realistic connection to the material.

Low internal consistency for the Index of Empathy scale is a fourth limitation in this study. Researchers attempted to shorten the survey length for students after the pilot study (while also removing gender specific pronouns) by combining questions that measured the same concepts. However, by integrating these questions the internal consistency for the scale decreased. Allowing students to complete the entire empathy scale (or replace it with an abridged, validated empathy scale) in future studies will produce more accurate and comprehensive results.

Finally, presenter inconsistency across all conditions contributes to the lack of significant findings. Ideally, the same researchers would administer the entire study; however, this was not possible due to both presenter and classroom schedules. Although presenters receive the same training and provide the same information to students, individual differences influence the conveying and receiving of information. Preferably, the same experimenters should collect the data and present the workshop to combat this issue.

Future research should aim to address these shortcomings and expand on the data with larger sample sizes while continuing to focus on cultivating safe environments which celebrate diversity. Furthermore, researchers should emphasize the effects of Self-Determination Theory in conjunction with contact hypothesis by encouraging out-group interactions, promoting choices throughout the workshop, and fostering environments to display knowledge/convey experiences. Each of the basic needs cultivates opportunities for contact hypothesis to eliminate in-/out-group bias. Individuals, and primarily schoolchildren, will always find ways to develop out-groups based on real or perceived differences (Ayers et al., 1999; Cisse & Casstevens, 2013; Liberman et al., 2011; Sherif et al., 1954, 1961; Wright et al., 1997). Thus, while few significant results

emerged from this study, it is imperative that diversity workshops and interventions continue to permeate the realm of academia.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Aron, A., Melinat, E., Aron, E. N., Vallone, R. D., & Bator, R. J. (1997). The experimental generation of interpersonal closeness: A procedure and some preliminary findings. *Society for Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(4), 363-377, doi:10.1177/0146167297234003
- Ayers, J. F., Wheeler, E. A., Fracasso, M. P., Galupo, M. P., Rabin, J. S., & Slater, B. R. (1999). Reinventing the university through the teaching of diversity. *Journal of Adult Development*, 6(3), 163-173.
- Backstrom, L., Huttenlocher, D., Kleinberg, J., & Lan, X. (2006). Group formation in large social networks: Membership, growth, and evolution. *KDD '06: Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining (ACM, New York, NY, USA)*, 44-54.
- Barcaccia, B., Schneider, B. H., Pallini, S., & Baiocco, R. (2017). Bullying and the detrimental role of un-forgiveness in adolescents' wellbeing. *Psicothema*, 29(2), 217-222, doi:10.7334/psicothema2016.251
- Beachboard, M. R., Beachboard, J. C., Li, W., & Adkison, S. R. (2011). Cohorts and relatedness: Self-Determination Theory as an explanation of how learning communities affect educational outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 52, 853-874, doi:10.1007/s11162-011-9221-8
- Bensalah, L., Caillies, S., & Anduze, M. (2016). Links among cognitive empathy, theory of mind, and affective perspective taking by young children. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 177(1), 17-31.
- Bigler, R. S. (1995). The role of classification skill in moderating environmental influences on children's gender stereotyping: A study of the functional use of gender in the classroom. *Child Development*, 66(4), 1072-1087.

- Blake, J. J., Lund, E. M., Zhou, Q., Kwok, O., & Benz, R. (2012). National prevalence rates of bully victimization among students with disabilities in the United States. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 27(4), 210-222.
- Bodenhausen, G. V., & Lichtenstein, M. (1987). Social stereotypes and information-processing strategies: The impact of task complexity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(5), 871-880.
- Brand, S., Felner, R., Shim, M., Seitsinger, A., & Dumas, T. (2003). Middle school improvement and reform: Development and validation of a school-level assessment of climate, cultural pluralism, and school safety. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(3), 570-588.
- Brouwer, M. A. R., & Boros, S. (2010). The influence of intergroup contact and ethnocultural empathy on employees' attitudes toward diversity. *Cognition, Brain, Behavior. An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 14(3), 243-260.
- Brown, C. S., & Bigler, R. S. (2002). Effects of minority status in the classroom on children's intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 83, 77-110.
- Bryant, B. K. (1982). An Index of Empathy for Children and Adolescents. *Child Development*, 53, 413-425.
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 452-459.
- Butrus, N., & Witenberg, R. T. (2012). Some personality predictors of tolerance to human diversity: The roles of openness, agreeableness, and empathy. *Australian Psychologist*, 48, 290-298.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2000). Autonomy of self-regulation. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 284.
- Cerasoli, C. P., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation, performance, and the mediating role of mastery goal orientation: A test of Self-Determination Theory. *Journal of Psychology*, 148(3), 267-286, doi:10.1080/00223980.2013.783778

- Chang, Y., Chen, S., Tu, K., & Chi, L. (2016). Effect of autonomy support on self-determined motivation in elementary physical education. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 15, 460-466.
- Cisse, G., & Casstevens, W. (2013). Train bound for needs: Cultural diversity training. *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*, 33(1), 58-62.
- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66, 710-722.
- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist*, 64, 231–240.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (Eds.), (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Gagné, M., Leone, D. R., Usunov, J. U., & Kornazheva, B. P. (2001). Need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former eastern bloc country: A cross-cultural study of Self-Determination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(8), 930-942.
- Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist, Current Issues and New Directions in Motivational Theory and Research*, 26(3-4), 325-346, doi:10.1207/s15326985ep2603&4_6
- Dovidio, J. F., Eller, A., & Hewstone, M. (2011). Improving intergroup relations through direct, extended and other forms of indirect contact. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 14(2), 147-160, doi:10.1177/1368430210390555
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, present, and the future. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6(1), 5-21.

- Echols, L. & Graham, S. (2013). Birds of a different feather: How do cross-ethnic friends flock together? *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 59(4), 461-488.
- Elicker, J. D., Snell, A. F., O'Malley, A. L., & Thompson, M. N. (2009). A training framework and follow-up observations for multiculturally inclusive teaching: Is believing that we are emphasizing diversity enough? *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2, 63-77.
- Elkind, D. (n.d.). Egocentrism in adolescence. *Child Development*, 1025-1034.
- Espelage, D. L., Aragon, S. R., & Birkett, M. (2008). Homophobic teasing, psychological outcomes, and sexual orientation among high school students: What influence do parents and schools have? *School Psychology Review*, 37(2), 202-216.
- Everett, J. C. (2013). Intergroup contact theory: Past, present, and future. Retrieved February 25, 2019, from <http://www.in-mind.org/article/intergroup-contact-theory-past-present-and-future>
- Ferdman, B. M., & Brody, S. E. (1996). Models of diversity training. *Handbook of Intercultural Training*, 282-303.
- Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2005). Racial/ethnic bullying: Exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 438-456, doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2004.01.002
- Freeman, G., Izzard, M., Faulkner, R., & Charles, J. (2012). University school of education promoting diversity awareness and initiatives. *The Professional Educator*, 36(1).
- Graham, S. (n.d.). Bullying: A module for teachers. *American Psychological Association*. Retrieved February 22, 2018, from <http://www.apa.org/education/k12/bullying.aspx>
- Henfield, M. S., & Washington, A. R. (2012). "I want to do the right thing but what is it?": White teachers' experiences with African American students. *The journal of Negro Education*, 81(2), 148-161.

- Hill, M. E., & Augoustinos, M. (2001). Stereotype change and prejudice reduction: Short- and long-term evaluation of a cross-cultural awareness programme. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 11(4), 243-262.
- Huang, H., & Su, Y. (2014). Peer acceptance among Chinese adolescents: The role of emotional empathy, cognitive empathy, and gender. *International Journal of Psychology*, 49(5), 420-424, doi:10.1002/ijop.12075
- Ilardi, B. C., Leone, D., Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1993). Employee and supervisor ratings of motivation: Main effects and discrepancies associated with job satisfaction and adjustment in a factory setting. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23(21), 1789-1805.
- Irvine, J. (2003). *Educating Teachers for Diversity: Seeing with a Cultural Eye*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Juvonen, J., & Graham, S. (2001). *Peer Harassment in School*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Kackar-Cam, H., & Schmidt, J. A. (2014). Community-based service-learning as a context for youth autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *The High School Journal*, 83-108.
- Kasl, E., & Yorks, L. (2016). Do I really know you? Do you really know me? Empathy amid diversity in differing learning contexts. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 66(1), 3-20, doi:10.1177/0741713615606965
- Kasser, T., Davey, J., & Ryan, R. M. (1992). Motivation and employee-supervisor discrepancies in a psychiatric vocational rehabilitation setting. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 37(3), 175-188.
- Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1993). A dark side of the American dream: Correlates of financial success as a central life aspiration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(2), 410-422.
- Klein, O., Jacobs, A., Gemoets, S., Licata, L., & Lambert, S. M. (2003). Hidden profiles and the consensualization of social stereotypes: How information distribution affects stereotype content and sharedness. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, doi:10.1002/ejsp.168

- Larochette, A., Murphy, A. N., & Craig, W. M. (2010). Racial bullying and victimization in Canadian school-aged children. *School Psychology International*, 31(4), 389-408, doi:10.1177/0143034310377150
- Lee, J. (2014). Too cruel for school: LGBT bullying, noncognitive skill development, and the educational rights of students. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, 49, 261-290.
- Levesque C., Copeland, K. J., Pattie M. D., and Deci E. L. (2010). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In: Penelope Peterson, Eva Baker, Barry McGaw, (Eds). *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 6, 618-623.
- Liberman, B. E., Block, C. J., & Koch, S. M. (2011). Diversity trainer preconceptions: The effects of trainer race and gender on perceptions of diversity trainer effectiveness. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 279-293, doi:10.1080/01973533.2011.589327
- Lindsey, A., King, E., Hebl, M., & Levine, N. (2015). The impact of method, motivation, and empathy on diversity training effectiveness. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 30, 605-617, doi:10.1007/s10869-014-9384-3
- Little, T. D., Jones, S. M., Henrich, C. C., & Hawley, P. H. (2003). Disentangling the “whys” from the “whats” of aggressive behaviour. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27(2), 122-133.
- Litwiller, B. J., & Brausch, A. M. (2013). Cyber bullying and physical bullying in adolescent suicide: The role of violent behavior and substance use. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 42, 675-684, doi:10.1007/s10964-013-9925-5
- Many Voices. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.manyvoices.org/blog/resource/web-of-connection-game/>
- McFarland, J., Hussar, B., de Brey, C., Snyder, T., Wang, X., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., ... Hinz, S. (2017). The Condition of Education 2017 (NCES 2017144). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved [2017] from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2017144>.

- McLennan, D. (2008). The benefits of using sociodrama in the elementary classroom: Promoting caring relationships among educators and students. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35, 451-456, doi:10.1007/s10643-007-0195-2
- Neukrug, E., Bayne, H., Dean-Nganga, L., & Pusateri, C. (2013). Creative and novel approaches to empathy: A neo-rogerian perspective. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 35(1), 29-42.
- Olweus, D. A. (1994). Annotation: Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 35(7), 1171-1190, doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.1994.tb01229.x
- Paluck, E. L. (2006). Diversity training and intergroup contact: A call to action research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(3), 577-595.
- Park, J. J., Denson, N., & Bowman, N. A. (2013). Does socioeconomic diversity make a difference? Examining the effects of racial and socioeconomic diversity on the campus climate for diversity. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(3), 466-496, doi:10.3102/0002831212468290
- Party games: Forehead detective, the flour game and numerology. (2008). Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2008/nov/17/party-games-guide>
- Pass, S. (2009). Teaching respect for diversity: The Oglala Lakota. *The Social Studies*, 212-217.
- Patall, E. A., Cooper, H., & Wynn, S. R. (2010). The effectiveness and relative importance of choice in the classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(4), 896-915, doi:10.1037/a0019545
- Peel, E. (2009). Intergroup relations in action: Questions asked about lesbian, gay and bisexual issues in diversity training. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 271-285, doi:10.1002/casp.997
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Reviews Psychology*, 49, 65-85.

- Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35, 271-280.
- Piaget, J. (1932). *The Moral Judgment of the Child*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Reeve, J. (2009). *Understanding Motivation and Emotion*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rivers, I., & Smith, P. K. (1994). Types of bullying behavior and their correlates. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20, 359-368.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67, doi:10.1006/ceps.1999.1020
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Self-Determination Theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78, doi:10.1037/110003-066X.55.1.68
- Rynes, S., & Rosen, B. (1995). A field survey of factors affecting the adoption and perceived success of diversity training. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(2), 247-270.
- Sanders, C. E., & Phye, G. D. (2004). *Bullying*. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Shapira, B., Shoval, P., & Hanani, U. (1997). Stereotypes in information filtering systems. *Information Processing & Management*, 33(3), 273-287.
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1954/1961). Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The robbers cave experiment. *Classics in the History of Psychology*, 1-136.
- Simpkins, S. D., & Riggs, N. R. (2014). Cultural competence in afterschool programs. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 144, 105-117.
- Swail, W. S., Redd, K. E., & Perna, L. W. (2003). Retaining minority students in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 30(2), 1-187.

- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33, 1-39.
- Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J.B., Psaltis, C., Schmid, K., Popan, J., Cairns, E., & Hughes, J. (2010). Secondary transfer effects of intergroup contact: Alternative accounts and underlying processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99, 282-302.
- Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., Voci, A., & Vonofakou, C. (2008). A test of the extended intergroup contact hypothesis: The mediating role of intergroup anxiety, perceived ingroup and outgroup norms, and inclusion of the outgroup in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(4), 843-860.
- Verhofstadt, L., Devoldre, I., Buysse, A., Stevens, M. Hinnekens, C, Ickes, W., & Davis, M. (2016). The role of cognitive and affective empathy in spouses' support interactions: An observational study. *PLoS ONE* 11(2), 1-18, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0149944
- Werner-Wilson, R. J. (2001). Experiential exercises in MFT training: Gender, power, and diversity. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 23(2), 221-229.
- Wichmann, S. S. (2011). Self-Determination Theory: The importance of autonomy to well-being across cultures. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, 50, 16-26.
- Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(1), 73-90.
- Young-Jones, A., Cara, K. C., & Levesque-Bristol, C. (2014). Verbal and behavioral cues: Creating an autonomy-supportive classroom. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(5), 497-509, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2014.880684>
- Young-Jones, A., Fursa, S., Byrket, J. S., & Sly, J. S. (2014). Bullying affects more than feelings: The long-term implications of victimization on academic motivation in higher education. *Social Psychology of Education*, 18(1), 185-200.

Table 1

Diversity Workshop Demographics

Demographics	%
Race	
White	51
Non-White	46
Unidentified	3
Gender	
Male	37
Female	51
Other	12
Socioeconomic Status	
Low	24
Middle	15
High	16
Unidentified	46
Grade Level	
7 th	10
8 th	90

Table 2

Skewness and Kurtosis Values by Scale

	Skewness	Kurtosis
Synthesized Aggression Scale	2.99	13.51
Perceived Victimization Questionnaire	1.16	5.08
Basic Psychological Needs Scale	0.66	4.33
Perceptions of Diversity	0.12	2.71

Table 3.1

Synthesized Aggression Scale (SAS) Mean Scores

	Pre	Post
SAS Total	37.57	34.21
SAS Condition 1	48.62	29.62
SAS Condition 2	35.13	34.00
SAS Condition 3	37.14	37.00
SAS Condition 4	36.43	34.30

Table 3.2

Perceived Victimization Questionnaire (PVQ) Mean Scores

	Pre	Post
PVS Total	22.19	23.31
PVS Condition 1	20.12	18.12
PVS Condition 2	23.17	24.74
PVS Condition 3	22.71	24.64
PVS Condition 4	21.61	22.87

Table 3.3

Perceptions of Diversity (POD) Mean Scores

	Pre	Post
POD Total	177.00	176.10
POD Condition 1	183.00	183.20
POD Condition 2	177.50	174.50
POD Condition 3	174.30	174.30
POD Condition 4	176.00	176.30

Table 3.4

Basic Psychological Needs Scale (BPNS) Mean Scores by Condition

	Mean
BPNS Total	32.88
BPNS Condition 1	32.54
BPNS Condition 2	32.07
BPNS Condition 3	33.07
BPNS Condition 4	33.70

Table 4.1

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Aggression

	β	b	t	p	F	p	R^2
Model 1					24.16	< 0.001*	0.268
Competence	-0.52	-1.03	-4.92	<0.001*			
Model 2					11.91	<0.001*	0.2682
Competence	-0.53	-1.05	-4.06	<0.001*			
Autonomy	0.02	0.04	0.16	0.876			
Model 3					8.09	< 0.001*	0.275
Competence	-0.50	-1.00	-3.68	<0.001*			
Autonomy	0.06	0.12	0.44	0.66			
Relatedness	-0.10	-0.14	-0.77	0.44			
<i>Note.</i> $N = 68$; *** $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.001$							

Table 4.2

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Perceptions of Diversity

	β	b	t	p	F	p	R^2
Model 1					19.65	< 0.001*	0.23
BPNS Total	0.48	1.53	4.43	< 0.001*			
Model 2					10.28	< 0.001*	0.24
BPNS Total	0.42	1.33	3.28	< 0.001*			
PVQ Total	-0.12	-0.23	-0.96	0.340			
Model 3					8.35	< 0.001*	0.28
BPNS Total	0.37	1.18	2.93	0.005**			
PVQ Total	0.01	0.02	0.07	0.944			
SAS Total	-0.26	-0.40	-1.92	0.060			
<i>Note. N = 68; ***$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.001$</i>							

APPENDIX

Date: 5-9-2017

IRB #: IRB-FY2017-334
Title: Diversity Pep-Talk: Finding Strengths in Differences
Creation Date: 10-19-2016
End Date: 12-4-2017
Status: **Approved**
Principal Investigator: Adena Young-Jones
Review Board: MSU
Sponsor:

Study History

Submission Type	Initial	Review Type	Expedited	Decision	Approved
Submission Type	Modification	Review Type	Expedited	Decision	Approved

Key Study Contacts

Member	Adena Young-Jones	Role	Principal Investigator	Contact	ayoung@missouristate.edu
Member	Taylor Smith	Role	Primary Contact	Contact	smith6192@live.missouristate.edu
Member	Christie Cathey	Role	Investigator	Contact	christiecathey@missouristate.edu
Member	Leslie Echols	Role	Investigator	Contact	leslieechols@missouristate.edu
Member	Megan Culp	Role	Investigator	Contact	megan112@live.missouristate.edu
Member	Megan Drew	Role	Investigator	Contact	drew214@live.missouristate.edu
Member	Elizabeth DeLong	Role	Investigator	Contact	delong90@live.missouristate.edu