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CHAPTER I

Introduction

As various organizations become more diverse, there has become a need for more employees as well as employers to develop initiatives at the management and organizational levels to deal with organizational changes. Diversity, as it is understood in the workplace today, implies differences in people based on their identifications with various groups. (Carnevale & Stone, 1994, p. 22) Diversity is a process of acknowledging differences through action. (Carnevale & Stone, 1994, p. 22) Training has become an important strategy in adjusting to diversity in the workplace— and is what chief executive officers call an important leadership issue.

There has been an increase in the amount of emphasis human resource development departments (HRD’s) have placed on training. HRD concerns ways to improve employee performance in an organizational context. It deals philosophically with how individually-oriented change should be handled, not with what to do to create that change. Training is a method used to stimulate individual change. Its focus is short term and is directed at furnishing necessary knowledge or skill for carrying out present work duties efficiently and effectively. (Sredl and Rothwell, 1987, p. 24) More resources are being allotted for HRD to manage issues of diversity.

Demographic trends, and economic forces have created conditions at Old Dominion University that make it impossible for HRD departments not to have some type of diversification training. It has been shown how new economic forces have created conditions where the most productive organizations with the competitive advantage welcome the diversity
among their workers.

With the increase in both the need for training and diversity in the workplace, it is evident that these are two functions that could determine the success or failure of most organizations.

**Statement of the Problem**

The problem of this study was to determine the effectiveness of diversity training in the workplace, and what daily impact do these results have on workers at Old Dominion University.

**Research Goals**

To answer the research problem, the researcher sought to answer the following questions:

1. Are the diversity training seminars that are conducted at Old Dominion offered on a voluntary basis?
2. Are issues of diversity better dealt with as a result of training?
3. Are employees encouraged to attend and actively participate in the diversity training seminars?
4. Based on employee feedback, is the program beneficial to employees?
5. As a result of training sessions, is there more of an awareness of prejudice and bias in the workplace?
Background and Significance

Training has become a growing field and a popular human resource development (HRD) strategy among today's organizations and institutions of higher learning. Attracting the most qualified faculty and staff members at Old Dominion University is important to the overall development of the students. Diversity training is a strategy that creates a more cohesive and tenable working environment while enhancing the learning environment.

Although training improves employee morale, other factors such as the complexity of the work environment, the rapid pace of organization and technological change, and the growing number of jobs in fields that constantly generate new knowledge benefits greatly from training. (Handbook, 1993, p. 59)

Individuals from diverse cultural, ethnic, and racial backgrounds are entering the work force at a rapid pace and at record numbers. These individuals will bring different values, languages, skills, attitudes, communication styles, and a host of other job related factors to the work place. Along with a diverse work place, the student population will also be diverse. Attitudes of faculty and staff concerning diverse issues greatly impact the attitudes and behaviors of the student. Subsequently, organizations will be afforded the opportunity to implement training programs designed to extract productivity-enhancing synergies from these differences. (Hopkins, Powell, Hopkins, 1994, p. 430)

This study will show how differences in educational background, levels of responsibility, and diversification of duties show a necessity for diversity training.

Limitations

The scope of this research was limited to faculty and staff members of Old Dominion
University who are recent hires and currently work in the New Administration Building.

Assumptions

This research was based on the assumption that:

1. Training is a rapidly growing field in human resource development.
2. There is a significant need for training in higher education.
3. The population of faculty and staff is becoming more diverse at Old Dominion University.
4. Issues of diversity are becoming more of an important topic among employees.

Procedures

A survey titled Valuing Diversity Training will be distributed to faculty and staff working in the New Administration Building. The survey will help determine what percentage of the population (faculty and staff) feel that diversity training has had a positive impact in the working environment. The instrument will be administered to 38 participants of the most recently held seminar for Diversity Training and Multicultural Awareness.
Definitions of Terms

Key terms essential to the understanding of this study were:

**Benchmarking**- Refers to the continuous process of measuring one's own products, services, and practices against the world's toughest competitors, in order to identify areas for improvement.

**Diversity**- Differences in people based on their identifications with various groups.

**EEO**- Equal Employment Opportunity.

**HRD**- Human Resource Development.

**Higher Education**- Any type of formal schooling that extends beyond high school.

Overview of Chapters

In Chapter I, the reader was introduced to the term diversity training and its importance to human resource development. Chapter II will review the literature concerning diversity training and how it is an integral part of any organization or institution of higher learning. Chapter III will address the methods used for this study, and Chapter IV will discuss the findings. Chapter V will summarize and conclude the research while offering recommendations to advocates and users of training.
Chapter II

Review of Literature

Chapter II is the Review of Literature section of this research paper. In this chapter, the reader will be provided with an overview of valuing diversity training, diversity training, an overview of human resource development (HRD), and helping employees succeed in diverse settings.

Valuing Diversity Training

Diversity implies differences in people based on their identifications with various groups and a process of acknowledging differences through action. (Carnevale and Stone, 1994, p. 39) As the workplace becomes more diverse, learning to accept individual differences may be the key skill of the 1990s. Understanding others is critical to building productive teams, reducing conflict and enhancing management sensitivity. As these demographic trends continue to change, their becomes more of a need to have some type of diversity training in the workplace. Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action guidelines are areas which expose the workplace to diversity, but alone, they do not create conditions that capitalize on the full potential of heterogeneity. (Carnevale and Stone, 1994, p. 24).

What is needed is a more open-ended positive approach to diversity called valuing
diversity. Valuing diversity means being responsive to a wide range of people unlike oneself. That range covers race, age, gender, national origin, personal preferences, sexual orientation, etc. Valuing diversity is a prodigious task. It requires people to let go of assumptions about the universal rightness of their own values. (Carnevale and Stone, 1994, p. 24). Leaders of the organization must accept ideas and be committed to them before they can be properly managed into the organization. Although enormous amounts of resources are expended on interventions and diversity training, these efforts fail because leaders are not committed. Through workshops held by in-house trainers, and outside diversity experts, awareness of diversity issues are raised. Workers are becoming more sensitive to diversity and are learning new ways to deal with it.

**Diversity Training**

The following two training approaches are being used by various organizations as a part of diversity training: awareness-based training and skill-based training. Though interrelated, there are differences between the two approaches. Awareness training aims at heightening awareness of diversity issues and revealing worker's unexamined assumptions and tendencies to stereotype. Skill-based training represents a progression in intent. It goes beyond consciousness-raising to an effort at providing workers with a set of skills to enable them to deal effectively with workplace diversity.

Figure 1 depicts an awareness-based model. This model-based training promotes
Figure 1
Awareness-Based Diversity-Training Model

More Effective Multicultural Interaction → Improved Employee Morale
  * Greater Productivity
  * Increased Creativity → Improved Organization Competitive Position

Increase Knowledge, Awareness, and Sensitivity → Foster Appropriate Attitudes And Assumptions → Eliminate Stereotyping

Foster Appropriate Attitudes And Assumptions → Informational Diversity - Training Programs
effective intercultural communication. It works to achieve its longer range goals of improving morale, productivity and creativity which contributes to the organization's competitive position. Awareness-based training focuses on the cognitive features of diversity training. (Carnevale and Stone, 1994, p. 30) There are some critics who do not feel that awareness-based training is as useful of a tool as it proposes. Beverly Geber, associate editor of Training, notes some of the criticisms in her July 1990 article, "Managing Diversity". According to Geber, awareness training is "far to squishy, psychological, and unmeasurable". (Carnevale and Stone, 1994, p. 33) Also, in seeking to heighten awareness, it does not provide skills to enable participants to act more effectively.

Skill-based training is behavioral, and has long-range, organization-wide goals. It provides the tools to promote the effective interaction needed in a heterogenous work setting. Figure 2 depicts a skill-based training model. There are a specific range of skills involved in skill-based diversity training: self-awareness, clear headedness, openness, candor, and adaptability.

The benefits of diversity training have been demonstrated many times throughout organizations, and as trainers gain experience, they gain new insights into what is effective and what is not. According to experts H.B. Karp and Nancy Sutton, diversity training should be more pragmatic and less attitude driven. They believe that training should create an environment where all participants are free to express their attitudes.

Lastly, training is unlikely to be effective when organizations approach it as a one time intervention. It should be used on a continuous basis at the appropriate intervals. Follow-up activities are needed to evaluate programs by more than just written and verbal means.
Figure 2
Skill-Based Diversity-Training Model

More Effective Multicultural Interaction
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- Greater Productivity
- Increased Creativity

Improved Organization Competitive Position

Increase Knowledge, Awareness, and Sensitivity; Foster Appropriate Attitudes

Build New Diversity-Related Skills

Reinforce Existing Diversity-Related Skills

Inventory Skill-Building Methodologies

Skill-Oriented Diversity-Training Programs
Trainers need to devise tools to monitor changes in behaviors that are a result of training, and intervene when necessary to deal with those changes. Programs may have to be revised if evaluation results show little to no changes in behavior.

**Human Resource Development**

Human Resources Development (HRD) is defined by Hopkins, Sterkel-Powell, and Hopkins as "organized learning experiences sponsored by an employer and designed and/or conducted for the purpose of improving work performance while emphasizing the betterment of the human condition through integration of organizational goals and individual needs." (Hopkins, Sterkel-Powell, Hopkins, 1994, p. 429)

HRD is a very important part of business and industry. A survey dated 1982 in *Training* showed that there are over 200,000 full-time and 700,000 part-time trainers in the U.S. These figures do not include those trainers in the military. In just one year, there was an increase of 50,000 full-time trainers. (Sredl and Rothwell, 1987, p. xix) U.S. organizations spend an estimate of $30 billion per year on formal training for their employees, and another $180 billion on informal training. (Hopkins, Sterkel-Powell, Hopkins, 1994, p. 430) When compared with governmental spending on formal education, employers spent about the same as that spent by government to support formal education. (Sredl and Rothwell, 1987, p. xix)

A college-educated person who receives informal on-the-job training increases their earning potential and productivity by 13 percent as opposed to 19 percent for those who did not attend college. In-house training helps new employees in the socialization process and integrates them into the organizational culture. Highly regulated and specialized industries
tend to spend more on training than those not so specialized or regulated. (Sredl and Rothwell, 1987, p. xx) HRD efforts tend to be directed at areas within the organization that are most crucial for dealing with changes bought on by outside forces like technological change, diversity, and turbulent economic conditions. There is a growing demand for human resources specialists. Already more than 200 colleges and universities offer degrees in HRD and related fields.

Succeeding in Diverse Settings

Because diversity training often involves unlearning or modifying job styles and interpersonal strategies, training employees can be difficult. Veteran employees are frequently far more willing to listen to strategies on how to change minority employees and other issues, rather than on how to change themselves and their own work styles (York, 1994, p. 140). Another reason for employee resistance to diversity training is because they want to see "quick pragmatic solutions for problems that are complex, abstract, and long standing" (York, 1994, p. 140).

Summary

Chapter II presented an overview of valuing diversity, diversity training, an overview of human resource development, and helping employees succeed in diverse settings. Chapter III will address the methods and procedures used to collect data for this research study. Chapter IV will discuss the findings and Chapter V will summarize and conclude the research while offering recommendations to advocates and users of diversity training.
CHAPTER III

Methods and Procedures

To effectively complete this research study, proper and consistent methods and procedures must be followed. This study was designed to determine whether or not the most recent sessions of diversity training at Old Dominion University have been effective in the sense that they have created positive changes in the workplace environment. The descriptive method was used in this study. The chapter will describe the population, description of the instrument, methods of data collection, procedures for statistical analysis and summary.

Population

The population was composed of faculty and staff members who attended the diversity training session and currently work in the New Administration Building at Old Dominion University. The population consisted of 38 people. These participants were male and female recent hires required by the university to participate in the training session after a specified period of employment. There were a multitude of nationalities that makes this environment heavily diverse, making the selected survey instrument appropriate to use.

Description of Instrument

A survey was designed and administered as a follow-up to a Valuing Diversity / Multicultural Awareness training session conducted on November 15, 1994. The survey was administered to the population to be studied. The data used for this study was collected through the survey consisting of a series of open and closed-ended questions. The survey
asked the participant to rate the instructor, content of the training session, as well as information related to their feelings about their participation in the training session. The survey also dealt with answering the research goals which were stated in Chapter I of this research study. A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix A.

Methods for Collecting Data

The researcher first discussed the possibility of administering a follow-up survey to former trainees with Mrs. Kim Dove, Manager of Training and Development, at Old Dominion University. Since a follow-up of the training session had not been done, it seemed appropriate to administer surveys during the month of May, and collect the data soon after to determine what kind of feedback the trainees had. The survey was mailed through campus mail to 38 people who had in fact attended the session. The session was for new employees only. A cover letter was also included which explained the purpose of the study and asked that the participants to take the time to complete the survey. A copy of the survey cover letter can be found in Appendix B.

Procedures for Statistical Analysis

Upon receiving the responses, the researcher compiled the data from the study by specifying how respondents answered each of the questions. Those responses will be tallied in the form of percentages. Discussion and tables will be presented in Chapter IV of this study.
Summary

In this chapter, the methods and procedures used to collect data for this study were presented. An open and closed ended survey was administered to 38 participants in the Diversity Training and Multicultural Awareness Program on November 15, 1994. The data received from the surveys will be discussed in detail in the chapters that follow.
CHAPTER IV

Findings

This chapter is a presentation of the findings determined through this research. The statistical results of the findings are reported in this chapter. A diversity training survey was sent by campus mail to 38 employees in the New Administration Building at Old Dominion University. The purpose of the survey was to collect data from these former participants regarding their participation in and evaluation of the diversity training session they all attended in November 1994. Of the thirty-eight participants contacted, 36 or 95 percent responded to the survey.

Survey Results

The survey was used to collect data for this study to determine: 1) if it was your choice to attend this workshop? 2) if you believed it was beneficial to you? 3) whether the instructor encouraged the class to participate in the program? 4) if the overall quality of instruction in the program was substantial? 5) if participants were aware of stereotypes, prejudices, and biases? 6) whether the participants developed a better ability to manage their own stereotypes, prejudices, and biases in the workplace? 7) if an improved ability to identify issues in workforce diversity in the workplace was developed? 8) whether participants developed a better ability to manage diversity in the workplace? 9) and if the program met the participant's specific needs?

The following data, tables, and narrative discussion indicates the various participant's
responses to this survey.

Table 1 shows the numbers and percentages of participants who attended the workshop by choice, and those that did not have a choice to attend. The researcher found that over half (61%) of the participants attended the workshop by their choice. However, 14 (39%) of the participants did not attend the workshop by choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was it your choice to attend this workshop?</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the numbers and percentages of participants who felt the session was or was not beneficial to them. The majority (86%) of the participants felt that the workshop was a beneficial event. Only a small percentage of the participants (14%) felt that the workshop was not beneficial to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you believe it was beneficial to you?</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following tables (Tables 3 - 9) show how participants rated the next series of questions. The rating scale read as follows: 5 = exceptional, 4 = above average, 3 = average, 2 = below average, and 1 = poor. Table 3 showed participant responses to how much the instructor encouraged participation in the program. Ninety-two percent of the participants felt that the instructor encouraged participation in the program, while eight percent felt that there was not an exceptional amount of encouragement to participate. None of the participants rated the instructor below average or poor. The mean for the responses to this particular item was 4.88.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Number on Scale</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 showed how participants rated the overall quality of instruction by the instructor. Seventy-five percent of the participants rated the instructor high on quality of instruction, while twenty-five percent rated the instructor at a rating of four on a scale from 1 to 5. None of the participants rated the quality of instruction any lower than four. The mean for the response to this item was 4.75.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Number on Scale</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows how participants rated themselves on awareness of stereotypes, prejudices and biases. Fifty percent of the participants rated themselves as having a better awareness of stereotypes, prejudices and biases, while thirty-nine percent rated themselves with an above average rating, and eleven percent rated themselves at a rating of three which is average according to the scale. The mean for this item was 4.388.
Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Number on Scale</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows numbers and percentages of how participants rated themselves on having better ability to manage stereotypes, prejudices and biases in the workplace. Fifty-three percent of the participants rated themselves on having a better ability to manage their stereotypes, prejudices and biases in the workplace rather high, while 31% rated themselves with a rating of four and the remainder of the participants rated themselves at three which is average. The mean for this item 4.36.
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Number on Scale</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows numbers and percentages of how participants rated themselves on having a better ability to identify issues in workforce diversity in the workplace. At the end of the session, fifty-three percent of the participants rated themselves at five which is exceptional, while thirty-six percent of the participants rated themselves at four and the remaining participants rated themselves at three. The mean for this item 4.416.
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Number on Scale</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows numbers and percentages on how participants rated themselves on better ability to manage diversity in the workplace. Forty-four percent of the participants rated themselves at five on the rating scale. Forty-seven percent of the participants gave a rating of four while the remaining 8% gave a rating of three which is average. The mean for this item was 4.36.
Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Number on Scale</th>
<th>Number Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows numbers and percentages on how participants rated the program on how well it met their individual needs. Fifty-eight percent of the participants rated themselves at five for the program meeting their needs as employees, while thirty-one percent of the participants rated themselves at four. The remaining 8% of the participants rated themselves at three for the program meeting their particular needs as an employee. The mean for this item 4.5.
Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Number on Scale</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to questions on the survey, participants were asked to give additional comments and suggestions on the program. Some of the comments and suggestions made by participants were:

* have the sessions more frequently.

* have professional guided discussions.

* explore prejudice that stems from gender, region of birth, accents and religion.

* get educated! Learn about different cultures and the gay population. Be more tolerant!

* involve the supervisors.

* possibly have smaller groups.

* send flyers on campus and ask for volunteer programs and participation.

* I think it had a narrow definition of diversity, for example, race and sex. However,
there are many things that make us a diverse country but to cover all these things you would need a week session.

This synopsis of comments from the participants shows variety and also shows that people have very strong feelings about diversity on this campus.

The next series of comments are from participants concerning how they felt about their participation.

* had fun and learned.
* I would really appreciate more workshops on campus as a whole on a regular basis.
* I do believe this course is beneficial to all members of the university community.
* This was a well organized course but I don't feel this was beneficial to me.
* I learned a lot from the workshop and will carry the positive and useful learning back to my office.
* I'm glad I attended.
* It made me realize that understanding diversity and valuing it is a lifelong process.

Summary

The findings of this study document the responses of the participants in the Diversity Training seminar on November 15, 1994. Thirty-eight participants were mailed the Valuing Diversity Training survey, and of the thirty-eight, thirty-six responded. This was a response rate of 95 percent. The statistics resulting from their responses were tabulated in this chapter,
and those findings were then used to arrive at conclusions in Chapter V. From the conclusions, recommendations will be made.
CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this chapter was to report the summary, conclusions, and recommendations to summarize the findings of the research report.

Summary

This study was conducted to determine if the diversity training program offered to employees at Old Dominion University was beneficial. The research study surveyed 38 participants from the November 15, 1994, session to determine if due to the training: employees had more of an awareness of stereotypes in the workplace, and if they were overall able to deal with issues of diversity in the workplace.

The goals were to determine whether the diversity training seminars conducted at Old Dominion University were offered on a voluntary basis, whether issues of diversity were better dealt with as a result of training, if employees were encouraged to attend and actively participate in the diversity training seminars, if employees found the program to be beneficial and finally, was there more of an awareness of prejudice and bias in the workplace? This research report was limited to faculty and staff members of Old Dominion University who were recent hires and currently worked in the New Administration Building.

The significance of this study was based on the fact that training had become a growing field and a popular human resource development strategy among today's organizations and institutions of higher learning. One of the goals of the University was to attract quality faculty and staff to guide
students in a direction that would enhance their learning as well as becoming well-rounded persons, and without proper training on issues of diversity from a cultural, ethnic, and racial standpoint, faculty and staff could not guide the students in a direction that would benefit them.

This study showed how differences in educational background, levels of responsibility, and diversification of duties showed a necessity for diversity training. After collecting 36 responses from the participants, the researcher found that Old Dominion offered a quality program where the participants had an opportunity to actively participate in the learning and were able to take positive results back to the job. There were only a few of the participants who were not completely satisfied with the level of participation as they stated in some of their feedback comments.

Conclusion

The goals of this research were to answer the following questions:

1. Are the diversity training seminars that are conducted at Old Dominion University offered on a voluntary basis? Old Dominion does not offer training sessions continuously during the year. The sessions or workshops as they are referred to on the survey used in this research are offered one time each year. During November 15, 1994, new employees were offered the opportunity to attend a workshop on diversity training in the workplace, and of the 36 attendees, sixty-one percent (22) of the participants attended the workshop by choice, while thirty-nine percent (14) of the participants did not.

2. Are issues of diversity better dealt with as a result of training? The researcher discovered in the findings that over half (fifty-three percent) of the participants left the workshop
feeling that they were better able to deal with issues of diversity in their workplace environment. The training offered some insight to the problems employees face while they try to co-exist with people from different cultures, backgrounds, and of different educational levels.

3. Are employees encouraged to attend and actively participate in the diversity training workshops? Ninety-two percent of the participants felt they were encouraged to participate, although there was hesitation by some of the participants to open up and reveal how some of the activities made them feel.

4. Was the program beneficial to employees? Eighty-six percent of the employees agree that the program was beneficial. The percentage of those who felt that the program was not beneficial and the percentage of those who showed slight hesitation in opening up were around the same number of fourteen percent.

5. As a result of the training sessions, is there a better awareness of prejudice and bias in the workplace? Only fifty percent of the participants felt that they were more aware of prejudice and bias in the workplace. Based on the comments given on the surveys, participants felt like prejudice should have been dealt with in terms of gender, region of birth, accents and religion, not just based on sexual orientation and race. In addition, comments such as: they were given such a narrow definition of diversity, and that the instructor appeared to try and solve all of the issues in one day rather than extend the session for a week. Several suggestions were that supervisors get involved more, use smaller groups for a more effective understanding, and most of all, get educated!
Recommendations

Based on the conclusions made, the researcher makes the following recommendations:

1. Faculty and staff should have to attend mandatory training sessions, but trainers must be prepared for resistance which may prohibit learning.

2. The sessions should be made to serve a smaller number of participants.

3. There should be more than one session offered per year.

4. Persons holding executive positions at the university should be encouraged to attend and actively encourage participation in any kind of training workshops offered at the University.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Brown, W. Steven. Failure to Train is Failure to manage. HR Focus, December 1992.


Caudron, Shari, Training can damage diversity efforts. Personal Journal, April 1993.


Freeman, Jean M. Human resources planning - Training needs analysis. Management Quarterly, Fall 1993.


APPENDICES

APPENDIX A, Sample of Research Survey: Valuing Diversity

APPENDIX B, Sample of Cover Letter
APPENDIX A

Research Survey: Valuing Diversity
VALUING DIVERSITY SURVEY

PURPOSE: This survey is being distributed to determine if the diversity training and multicultural awareness course at Old Dominion University has given you the knowledge and the skills to effectively deal with issues of diversity in the workplace.

Directions: Please indicate your responses by circling one of the choices below; Under participant information, please indicate your response by placing a check in the space provided; comments can be answered in the space provided.

Participant Information:

Was it your choice to attend this workshop? _____ Yes _____ No

If no, do you believe it was beneficial to you? _____ Yes _____ No

Comments concerning your participation:

Instructor Evaluation

The instructor encouraged the class to participate in the program
1 2 3 4 5

Rate the overall quality of instruction in the program
1 2 3 4 5

Content Evaluation

I am more aware of stereotypes, prejudices, and biases
1 2 3 4 5

I am better able to manage my stereotypes, prejudices, and biases in the workplace
1 2 3 4 5
I am better able to identify issues in workforce diversity in the workplace

I am better able to manage diversity in the workplace

**Overall Evaluation**

The program met my needs as an employee

Additional suggestions and/or comments on this program:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your assistance! Your responses will help strengthen the diversity training program here at Old Dominion University.
APPENDIX B

Survey Cover Letter
May 1, 1995

Ms. NorLisa Mayes  
New Administration Building Room 218  
Norfolk, VA 23529

Dear NorLisa:

Old Dominion University is in the process of revising their Diversity Training Program and as an employee, you have had the opportunity to attend a training session as well as had an opportunity to interact on a daily basis with other employees different from yourself. These differences may or may not have caused a conflict during your employment. I would be interested in knowing some of your ideas about the training session you attended. Please take advantage of the comments section of the survey as your comments and suggestions will be given great consideration. These suggestions will enable the training department to better assist employees with future programs.

Enclosed you will find a survey questioning your feelings about your participation, the instructor, and the content of the training program. I ask that you would take the time to fill out this short survey about your experience. You are encouraged to write any comments you feel are appropriate as they will all be confidential and anonymous.

This survey will assist me in securing the requirements to complete my graduate program here at Old Dominion University, but your responses will assist the Training and Development department in recognizing the needs of the employees here and how to create a more pleasant working environment in which we work.

I greatly appreciate your time and cooperation in promptly completing this survey. Enclosed you will find my address in which to send your survey via campus mail. If you have any questions, you may contact me at home, 683-7007 or at work ext. 3080.

Sincerely,

Tatrece Dunlap